

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. What business are we in right now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

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

#### EDUCATIONAL FLEXIBILITY PARTNERSHIP ACT

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Educational Flexibility Partnership Act, the Ed-Flex program that has been debated here today. I congratulate Senator FRIST and Senator JEFFORDS for their work on this bill of which I am a co-sponsor.

Ed-Flex does the important work of granting waivers of certain statutory and regulatory requirements so that local schools can implement creative programs that are custom-tailored to the needs of their kids and allows some State education agencies to waive State requirements along with Federal mandates so that local schools can innovate effectively.

I think this is an extremely important program. We have been saying for some period of time that too much of education is directed out of Washington, that problems in education are not solved in Washington as much as they are at the local level. If we can allow people to have the flexibility in Kansas, Nebraska, Vermont, Tennessee, Texas or California to solve their education problems with these dollars, they will get more education done, and they will have more effective education done than if we direct it out of Washington. It is a basic premise. It works. It has worked on a number of programs. We allowed this to take place in welfare reform. We had a number of different experiments on welfare reform that led welfare rates to decline 50 percent. We solve it in Kansas differently than they solve it in other States. It worked. Education—we have a problem. But it is not a uniform problem that you can say, OK, if we just do this and this and this all across the Nation with programs, the problem is solved. It doesn't work that way. We have different educational needs in different places.

Ed-Flex is tried and true as a concept. It is a needed concept in education, because we need more flexibility to get these dollars into the classroom than people back here deciding how to spend it.

I might note that Ed-Flex is already in place in 12 States, including my home State of Kansas. Schools there have already submitted 43 waiver requests in an effort to better serve the unique needs of Kansas students. At this point, no waiver has been rejected. Around two dozen requests have already been granted, and others are pending. I would encourage the Department of Education to expedite those requests.

That speech and that point that I just gave sounds very reminiscent of a point that I made in 1995 about waivers that were being granted on welfare reform and asking that those be sped up so that States could solve the problem. We are at the same point in time with education. Let's let the States have the resources and have them solve the problem.

Kansas schools have used Ed-Flex for many reasons. One school district received a waiver in order to better distribute title I funds to the neediest students. Leavenworth schools requested a waiver to provide an all-day kindergarten class and preschool programs to better serve the needs of children of parents that are at Fort Leavenworth at the military facility. Emporia used an Ed-Flex waiver to implement new literacy programs in an intensive summer school program. That fit the needs and what we had for needs in Emporia. The list goes on.

These are all very different programs that address different needs. But that is just the point. Schools need this flexibility. We need education decisions made in Emporia, in Fort Leavenworth, in Topeka, and in Manhattan—not in Washington for Kansas. We need it made there. And the people there care for the students. They look in their eyes every day. They can say, "We need this program here." What can we tell them in Washington? No. You don't need that program. What you need is something else when we don't even look into the eyes of that same child. People here in the Washington bureaucracy have great desires to help that child, but the person who is right there closest is the one who can best determine what that child needs. This is the sort of program that allows that to take place. Schools need that sort of flexibility.

While Ed-Flex is an important first step, there are other steps that we need to take as well. If we are going to make progress toward improving our schools, we need to give the States and communities far more flexibility and empower them to make decisions with what is best for their schoolchildren. As important as it is to make waivers to Federal regulations available, frankly, I believe it would be better if we would roll back those regulations altogether and provide the resources to Kansas and to the school districts, and say to them, "You figure out how best to educate these students." Believe me. They will come up with the ideas to do it. They will implement them, and they

will get them done without the regulation here.

I don't think anybody in this Chamber, or in this town, should think that somebody in Emporia, KS, doesn't care greatly about how that child is educated and won't do the absolute best they can to make sure that child is educated well.

We need to empower them. We need to empower the parents, the teachers, the school boards, the communities over the government bureaucracy. That is why I will vote in favor of the Ed-Flexibility Act. I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

I say let's not stop here. This is where we started with welfare reform—providing these waivers. Ultimately, when we gave the program to the States and the resources to the State, they cut the welfare dependency in half and had people who were on welfare being thankful that they are now out on the job and they are encouraged about that. Why don't we try that with education, letting the States and the locals decide this? We will get more for every education dollar that we put out there. And, more importantly, our students will be better, and they will achieve higher test scores in the key areas that they are not doing today.

Mr. President, one other point: I think we have finally started down the road of making some real reforms in education, and reforms that I think people have been afraid that we are going to dictate out of Washington. This, to me, is a positive step forward—letting the local school districts start to decide on how they can implement those reforms. We have a lot of bright students across this country who need a system that is as bright as that are to challenge them and help them move forward.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I understand we are in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MACK. I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes. I hope I will not use the full 30 minutes.

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

#### ISRAELI AND PALESTINIAN PEACE BASED UPON SECURITY, FREE- DOM, AND A CHANGE OF HEART

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I very recently traveled to Israel. It had been several years since my last visit, and I expected this year we would bring some

important measures to the Senate floor. The timeline on the Oslo accords expires in May, and Arafat has threatened to unilaterally declare an independent state. The supplemental appropriations for the Wye River accords will soon be before us, and the timetable on the Jerusalem Embassy Act requires that the President report to the Congress why the United States Embassy has not been set up in Israel's capital city, Jerusalem. I learned a great deal during the week and I rise today to share a few simple thoughts regarding what I saw and what went through my mind as the week in Israel unfolded.

Let me begin with the question that is on my mind today: How is it possible to engage in peace negotiations with people who maintain the right to obliterate you, who are filled with hatred toward you, and who harbor the dream of one day destroying your homeland? Peace is a matter of the heart. I believe in the depths of every person's heart is a desire to live in peace. But what I saw, which was the outcome of the Palestinian Authority rule, convinced me that their hearts and minds are set on other goals. The Palestinian leadership does not want peace. They want, first, their own state which they can control with total power. Then they want to use that state to eliminate the State of Israel.

Let's be clear. The peace process, to be meaningful, must be about more than rules and laws and lines on a map. We can reach a short-term agreement on these points, but if the Palestinian leadership fails to abandon incitement of hatred, persecution, and terrorism, then we are all dreaming, only dreaming, and our President's behavior must be labeled foolish appeasement. There will not be peace until hearts and minds are changed, and we must focus our attention on these issues.

Mr. President, many of my colleagues in the Senate and in the House are aware of the promotion of hatred contained in the Palestinian media, and more significantly in the Palestinian schoolbooks. Let me provide some examples.

This is a picture that was taken off of Palestinian Authority-controlled television. It is a picture of a young girl, probably 6 or 7 years old. This is a young girl singing into a microphone. She is on a television show that would be what we would refer to as kind of a Mickey Mouse Club type of show that would be shown to children by the Palestinian Authority. I want to read to you what this little girl is singing. Again, this is a program that was produced by the people who are sitting across the table from you, supposedly negotiating peace. This is what the little girl is singing:

When I wander into the entrance of Jerusalem,

I'll turn into a suicide warrior in battledress,

In battledress. In battledress.

There is no way I can convey to you the emotion of actually seeing that

scene on television. There is no way I can put the emotion into what she was expressing and the emotion that she was expressing as she sang those words. And after her song, she got an ovation from her classmates and from her teacher.

This focuses us on the fundamental difference in approach between the Palestinians and the Israelis. I have a grandson about that age, about the age of that little girl. How would I feel if he were being taught hatred in school? If he were being taught hatred on television, how would I feel? How would you feel if your Government was teaching your children to hate? Could you conclude that they were serious about long-term peace with their neighbors?

I also have some examples from Palestinian textbooks for a third-grade grammar lesson. Here is the task: "Complete the following blank spaces with the appropriate word." And the sentence is, "The Zionist enemy blank civilians with its aircraft." The correct answer is, "The Zionist enemy attacked civilians with its aircraft."

For seventh graders: "Answer the following question: Why do the Jews hate Muslim unity and want to cause division among them? Give an example of the evil attempts of the Jews, from events happening today." These are from Palestinian textbooks today.

One would expect, rather than focus on hatred, if they were serious about peace, they would focus on how the two peoples are working to live side by side. A history book for 12th graders published only last summer teaches: "The clearest examples of racist belief and racial discrimination in the world are Nazism and Zionism."

To see this taking place today is chilling. If you can, think about it in the context of being in Israel and being briefed by a member of the Government with respect to what is happening in what they refer to as the anti-incitement committee, which was set up by the Wye Agreement. To be sitting there and seeing this, I must say to you, was chilling. I found it to be extremely chilling.

While the Government of Israel makes good-faith efforts to come to a peace agreement, the Palestinian Authority teaches children hatred. This causes me to ask, How can peace be obtained when the children are being taught hatred?

Let me share another story. I attended Shabbat dinner at the home of Saul and Wendy Singer in Jerusalem. Saul worked on my staff for 7 years before moving with his wife to Israel. They just had their second child, a girl named Tamar. Wendy told the story of the day she was checking out of the hospital in Jerusalem, 2 days after giving birth. In a very ordinary and matter of fact way, the hospital gave her the necessities for bringing home a newborn baby. In addition to providing for diapers and other things we would expect, she was handed a gas mask for her baby. It is actually a tent which

you put your baby under in case of a chemical weapons attack.

In Israel, this preparation is routine. Everyone in Israel knows to have a gas mask ready. It just becomes a part of the craziness of everyday life. But when you bring home a newborn baby, when you bring home your baby and you get the chemical weapons tent at the hospital, then you realize how unordinary life is in Israel today. You realize that you are really simply struggling for a normal life, hoping for peace and security, praying to God, while actually living in a war zone.

I had another profound meeting during this week. I met one evening privately—secretly—with Arabs who were being persecuted for their Christian faith. I met with about 10 Palestinian Christians. I will tell you just one of their stories, but I will change some of the details to protect the person I am describing.

I remember an energetic man, in his early 40s, at the end of the table. I remember him because he seemed so full of life and love. He had a great smile on his face and displayed a wonderful sense of humor. I say this was memorable because, frankly, after hearing what he had been through, I do not know if I could express the sense of peace and love he did. This is his story.

He had many children and very little money. He converted to Christianity in 1993. He clearly loved God, and he loved to tell people about his conversion. He described to me how in 1997, the Palestinian Authority asked him to come to the police station for questioning. When he arrived, he was immediately arrested and detained on charges of selling land to Jews. He denied this charge, since he was very poor and owned no land. He was beaten. He was hung from the ceiling by his hands for many hours. He showed me what I just said. He showed me how his hands were tied behind his back and then raised from the floor and hung that way for many, many hours.

After 2 weeks, he was transferred to a larger prison where he was held for 8 months without trial. He was released in February 1998, after his family borrowed thousands of dollars to pay off the local authorities. And even though he is free, they are keeping his father in prison. They believe it is for his son's beliefs. He feels his father is being held hostage to prevent him from talking with people about his faith. Needless to say, these Christians met with me at considerable risk. They conveyed to me a message of fear and desperation. But their mere presence in the room with me demonstrated their hope, and it also caused me to ask, how can the people of Israel find peace with the Palestinian Authority while the Palestinian Authority engages in coercion and torture based upon religious beliefs?

I also met with the parents of American children killed by Palestinian terrorists. In this meeting, I was struck by the courage displayed by these families after suffering the tremendous loss

of a child brutally murdered. These families told me of the hopes and dreams they had for their children. I couldn't help thinking about my own. My daughter, Debbie, traveled with me on this trip. She was in the room as these stories of brutality and murder were related. There was scarcely a dry eye in the room.

I am sure Debbie was thinking about her three little boys, ages 14, 11 and 5. We were moved by the comments made by the parents as they described to us what had happened.

I understand that the Palestinian Authority knows a great deal about these murderers, but they are not being punished. Some of them have gone to trial and were sentenced, but we don't know if they remain in prison. I was told that we know some have been released.

There are reports that the Palestinian Authority allows them to leave prison each day and return in the evening—like free room and board more than like prison. I was also presented with stories of the lionization of these murderers in the press and again in the classrooms. Try to imagine how you would feel, try to imagine what would be going through your mind when you are dealing with the grief of the loss of your child. You know who is responsible. You know they know who is responsible. You saw them go on trial. You saw them then released. You have to ask yourself, what are we going through this peace process for?

I would like to mention one story of many that I heard. Mrs. Dosberg sat directly across the table from me. When she told us of the loss of her daughter and son-in-law, the lesson of these murders became so clear—we must fight terror and we cannot back off. Mrs. Dosberg's family, her daughter, American son-in-law, and their 9-month-old daughter attended a wedding in central Israel on June 9, 1996. They decided not to bring their 2-year-old daughter along. Thank God. On the way home from the wedding they were stopped by Palestinian terrorists and killed in a so-called drive-by shooting. Fifty bullets were found to have been used in this murder, and yet, by some miracle, the baby survived. Even with a crime this gross, the Palestinian Authority did not arrest everyone involved or suspected in the shooting. One of those who remained free, it is believed, later took part in the bombing of the Apropos Cafe, killing many others.

Another suspected killer, according to the Israeli Justice Ministry, was under arrest but given permission to come and go as he pleases from prison.

Mohammed Dief, another suspected Palestinian terrorist, took part in the murder of two other Americans, at two different times, according to the mothers with whom I spoke. Mrs. Sharon Weinstock lost her 19-year-old son in a drive-by shooting masterminded by Dief. And only a year later, Mrs. Wachsmann told me of the kidnap-mur-

der of their son, also believed to have been planned by Dief.

I am told Mohammed Dief remains a free man today. The obvious lesson—terrorists kill and those who are not jailed remain free to kill and to kill again thanks to the Palestinian Authority.

How would I feel in their place? I couldn't keep the thought from my mind, as I listened. If I had lost a child and knew that the murderer or accomplices were on the loose, how would I feel? And if I knew the killer remained free to kill other people's children, how would I feel? It is so hard, hard to even consider, but I do know that I left there committed to doing whatever I could to help each of those families.

Once again, I began to better understand the way the Palestinian Authority leadership was approaching peace. How can one find peace with people who do not condemn terrorism? Mr. President, how is it possible to engage in peace negotiations with people who want to teach their children to die in a holy war against you? How is it possible to engage in peace negotiations with people who persecute those of other faiths? How is it possible to engage in peace negotiations with people who keep terrorists on the loose to wreak havoc and evil against you and praise them for heroism?

Today the Israeli people are exhausted by 50 years of violence against their homes and families, of sending their sons and daughters into the army, and they dream of a promised peace now. This is our hope and our dream as well. But we must not get confused. History is replete with examples of compromises which bring terror and destroy dreams.

In the United States, many people seem to think that if we do not confront these obstacles to peace and if we look the other way, then we will be able to come to an agreement. The reality, however, is just the opposite. If we do not acknowledge the attitudes and acts of those at the peace table, then the peace process is already over, and we just won't admit it.

In other words, the surest way to kill the peace process is to avoid confrontation, to fear upsetting a belligerent force and to avoid addressing incitement, violence, persecution and terrorism. The only way to keep the peace process alive is to focus on truth, freedom, security and justice.

Israeli efforts, to date, have sought to keep the peace process alive, improve security during the negotiating process, and obtain reciprocity as a vital element of implementation.

The process remains alive, but terrorism continues and is exalted by many in the Palestinian Authority, and reciprocity does not exist. The United States role has been to seek the middle ground. Unfortunately, this only rewards those willing to go to new extremes.

The middle ground between Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman

Arafat is not halfway between the two. The United States must not engage in moral equivocation. We must not shy away from holding Arafat responsible for acts of violence, incitement and persecution.

The United States must demonstrate principled leadership and end the appeasement that perpetuates the cycle of violence. The peace process can only work when leaders uphold their agreements and answer to the people, and the United States remains a vigilant defender of the principles which bind us to Israel: freedom, democracy, and the rule of law.

What should we do? I believe there are three things. First, we should insist upon the strict adherence to Oslo and the reciprocity codified at Wye. The purpose of the Wye accord was at long last to force the Palestinians to comply with commitments before further territory would be turned over.

So at Wye, Israel agreed only to turn over territory in phases, in which it could verify Palestinian compliance at each and every step. In the first phase, Israel completed its redeployment after the Palestinian Authority completed its tasks. In phase 2, the Palestinians did not meet all their obligations and, therefore, Israel has not yet turned over the additional land. Reciprocity makes no sense unless it is based upon this formulation. Once Israel has ceded territory, it is unlikely it ever could recover it. The Palestinians, on the other hand, can turn on and off their promises. In fact, this is exactly what they have done.

Second, we should stop paying Arafat. Any funds provided to the Palestinian people should continue to go through private voluntary organizations. We should also monitor much more closely the rampant corruption and mismanagement of funds provided currently.

And third, we must aggressively seek the bringing to justice of Palestinian terrorists who killed American citizens. I am told that our Justice Department can do a better job here, that they have a great deal of information on the murderers of the Americans who are free in the Palestinian areas and, indeed, can make some requests for indictments. It is time to do this. Let's put the needs of the American families and other victims' families over the needs of those engaging in or supporting terrorism.

Mr. President, these are very basic principles. I am not discussing today the intricacies of the peace process, U.S. funding, embassies, or any other number of issues we will be discussing this year in the Senate. We need to focus on a more fundamental level first. And I hope that this message will be heard at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

What I mean when I say this is that I hope the President will hear the message. I say this from a standpoint not of arrogance, not of confrontation, and I do not mean it in a political way. I just hope that the President will listen

and take another look at what he and his foreign policy team are trying to force the Israeli Government to do.

There cannot be peace until there is a change of heart. I returned from this trip with a newfound concern for the future of Israel. I saw examples of incitement. I heard examples of persecution and hatred being taught throughout Palestinian society by their leaders. When the people engaged in peace talks return from the negotiating table only to disparage compromise and incite violence, there can be no progress towards peace.

Israel has come a long way since I first began following the fate of this state and the people of Israel. In so many respects, life appears and feels normal. The economy is developing, the standard of living is growing and improving. But just below the surface of this normalcy, Mr. President, Israel still faces a threat to the state's very existence. Israel's survival remains, unfortunately, a very real and central concern 50 years after its independence.

Some people believe, however, that by ignoring this threat, that the peace process can succeed. Mr. President, it will fail. It is clear to me that many in the Palestinian leadership today see the peace process toward the goal of eliminating the State of Israel.

I suggest today that we get back to the basics. Peace is not possible while teaching children to hate and kill. Peace is not possible while persecuting those of other faiths. Peace is not possible while lionizing terrorism. We must stand up for freedom, security, and human dignity. We must stand up to ensure the security of Israel. We must stand up in the Congress, and we must insist that our President stand with us.

Today is the day to end American pressure on Israel to force a peace agreement. Today is the day to remember it is up to the people of Israel to determine their own fate—their own security. We should pressure those who fill children with slogans of hatred and holy war; we should pressure them to change. We should pressure those who torture; we should pressure them to change. We should pressure those who encourage and support terror and murder, and those who rejoice in hatred. That is where the pressure should be.

Now is the time, Mr. President, for a return to our principled stand. The only way to truly attain peace is to support freedom, democracy and justice, and oppose the cycle of hatred. We must face tyranny and oppression where it exists, condemn it, and stand up for peace—real peace based upon security, freedom, and a change of heart.

#### OCEAN SHIPPING REFORM

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, on February 26, 1999, the Federal Maritime Commission (FMC) completed its rulemaking to implement the Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 1998. The regulatory framework for the liner shipping

industry is now in place and ready for the May 1, 1999, start date.

The 1998 Act signals a paradigm shift in the conduct of the ocean liner business and its regulation by the FMC. Where ocean carrier pricing and service options were diluted by the conference system and "me too" requirements, an unprecedented degree of flexibility and choice will result. Where agency oversight once focused on using rigid systems of tariff and contract filing to scrutinize individual transactions, the "big picture" of ensuring the existence of competitive liner service by a healthy ocean carrier industry to facilitate fair and open maritime commerce among our trading partners will become the oversight priority.

Mr. President, as FMC Commissioner Ming Hsu recently told a large gathering of shippers and industry representatives, "This has been not only a long journey, but a long needed journey \* \* \* With the passage of the Ocean Shipping Reform Act and the FMC's new regulations, I believe the maritime industry will be far less shackled by burdensome and needless regulations \* \* \* I believe we can now look forward to an environment which gives you the freedom and flexibility to develop innovative solutions to your ever-changing ocean transportation needs." I couldn't agree more.

The FMC regulatory process bore some resemblance to the legislative process that preceded it. A few early steps started to head off in the wrong direction, but through honest dialogue among the industry and the government parties, the course was corrected and the intent of the 1998 Act was embodied in the regulations. Now the FMC faces the challenge of implementing the new regulations in a manner consistent with Congressional intent.

Mr. President, through the 1998 Act, the Congress directed the FMC to spend less effort attempting to regulate the day-to-day business of ocean carriers and spend more effort on countering truly market distorting activities. This shift is made possible by giving exporters and importers greater opportunity and ability to use the marketplace to satisfy their ocean shipping requirements through less government intervention.

Recent efforts by some countries to protect their domestic maritime industries by imposing restrictive trade practices indicates that this shift in emphasis is well-timed. I am particularly concerned about China's efforts to impose greater regulatory control over the ocean shipping industry as the rest of the world is heading in the opposite direction. While the Maritime Administration seem to be nearing an agreement eliminating unfair practices by Brazil, continued vigilance is required. As we are seeing with Japan's port practices, the problem can remain long after such an agreement is reached.

Mr. President, I should point out that paradigm shifts are often painful, but

enlightening, for involved organizations. To its credit, the FMC met the challenge of promulgating the new regulations by the March 1, 1999 deadline. Now, I recognize that Congress issues many deadlines for the Executive Branch, sometimes with little success. But I want to personally congratulate the FMC for its tremendous effort and responsiveness to complete these regulations on time. Not only did the FMC deliver its rules on time; the FMC's rules are clearly within the intent of Congress. I feel good about that.

I want to express my gratitude to the four FMC Commissioners, Chairman Hal Creel, Ming Hsu, John Moran, and Delmond Won, for their leadership and wisdom during this process. This band of four challenged the staff to think "outside the box" of the previous regulatory system and develop innovative methods to monitor the industry in a less intrusive manner. Also, I want to recognize the efforts of the FMC staff members who worked long and hard to meet Congress' deadline: George Bowers, Florence Carr, Jennifer Devine, Rachel Dickon-Matney, Bruce Dombrowski, Rebecca Fenneman, Vern Hill, Christopher Hughey, Amy Larson, David Miles, Tom Panebianco, Austin Schmitt, Matthew Thomas, Bryant VanBrakle, Ed Walsh, and Ted Zook. Their hard work and sweat will truly benefit this Nation by enabling industry and its customers to prepare for this new era of ocean shipping.

Mr. President, just as it took several years for the legislative process to bear fruit, I urge patience before evaluating the results of this rulemaking. I will continue to monitor the transition process for this fundamental change. The Ocean Shipping Reform Act can't fix international economic imbalances and uncertainties, but it will give the industry and its customers much-needed flexibility to work through many difficult situations.

Mr. President, The health of our Nation's economy depends on a healthy system for international trade, and therefore, a dependable ocean shipping industry. The FMC rules will provide the necessary certainty in a manner consistent with Congressional intent. Again, I salute the FMC for being responsive.

#### GRASSLEY-WYDEN INITIATIVE LETTER

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter sent to all Senators today addressing the procedures governing the use of holds, signed by the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, and myself, be placed in the RECORD. This letter is a result of ongoing negotiations between Senators GRASSLEY and WYDEN, the Democratic leader and myself, beginning early in the 105th Congress, and encourages all Members to make their legislative holds known.

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