

unanimous support is evidence of our continuing bipartisan commitment to supporting the Good Friday Agreement.

We believe the most crucial task now facing the Irish and British Governments and all the political leaders in Northern Ireland is to build momentum for the full implementation of the Agreement.

Inevitably, there will be continuing difficulties to surmount in resolving this deep and longstanding conflict. We believe the implementation of the Agreement offers the best way forward and the best yardstick to judge the policies and actions of those struggling to overcome these difficulties. We do not believe that the goals of the Agreement can be served by inaction or procrastination in implementing its provisions. Those who take political risks for the implementation of the Agreement can be assured of our consistent support.

Following last month's decision by the Assembly to approve the designation of the Northern Ireland Departments and the list of cross-border bodies, and the signing last week by the United Kingdom and Ireland of the historic treaties to set up the institutions, it is vital that this decision be implemented without delay. Progress in all of these areas is, of course, dependent on the establishment of the multi-party Executive, as provided in the Agreement. We are dismayed at the delay in establishing the Executive, and urge it be established as soon as possible. It is the best way to create conditions for progress on other difficult issues, including the problem of decommissioning.

The carnage inflicted on the town of Omagh last August was a grim reminder that, in spite of all that has been achieved, there are those who still do not recognize the futility of violence. The cowardly murder of Rosemary Nelson this week reminds of the urgency of the task at hand. The horror of these actions unites all the people of Ireland and Great Britain, and friends of Ireland everywhere, in a determination that such methods will be totally repudiated and will never succeed. We also condemn, in the strongest terms, the practice of sectarian attacks, punishment beatings, and other acts of violence. These actions are a violation of fundamental human rights, and serve only to promote further division and recrimination. Against this background of irresponsible and unacceptable reliance on violence, we commend all those who, notwithstanding the pressures caused by these attacks, refuse to be diverted from the pursuit of peace and political progress.

We have in the past consistently drawn attention to the importance of developing a police organization in Northern Ireland capable of attracting and sustaining the support of all parts of the community. We welcome the creation of the Patten Commission to propose new arrangements for policing, accountable to and fully representative of the society. A major responsibility rests on the members of the Commission on this vitally important issue. Their mandate from the Agreement should lead to far-reaching change and we look forward to their report later this year.

We attach particular importance to the provisions in the Good Friday Agreement which promote a new respect for human rights. Such respect is essential if the commitment to equality, which lies at the very heart of the undertaking, is to be given practical effect. We are heartened by progress in relation to the Human Rights Commissions and look forward to the development of close cross-border co-operation on this vital issue. We also hope to see early progress on the review of the criminal laws, and the dismantling of emergency legislation.

We are concerned by evidence of the lack of protection for lawyers active on human

rights cases in Northern Ireland, as described by the Special Rapporteur of the UN Commission on Human Rights, and urge an early response to calls for an independent inquiry into the murder of Belfast lawyer Pat Finucane. We will also continue to follow closely the progress of the inquiry into the tragic events of Bloody Sunday in Derry in 1972.

As preparations for this year's marching season begin, we note with concern that, despite efforts to encourage dialogue, the situation at Drumcree remains disturbing. We call on all involved to uphold the decisions of the Parades Commission.

The Friends of Ireland welcome the strong support which President Clinton and both parties in Congress have given to the peace process, and to the full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement, including the continuing support for the International Fund for Ireland. We salute the parties on what has been achieved thus far and believe that with commitment and determination, and a readiness to seek accommodation, the remaining differences can be overcome.

As we prepare to enter the new century, the parties to the Good Friday Agreement have a truly historic opportunity to achieve peace with justice for the benefit of all generations to come. As always, we in the Friends of Ireland stand ready to help in any way we can.

FRIENDS OF IRELAND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

House: Dennis J. Hastert, Richard A. Gephardt, James T. Walsh.

Senate: Edward M. Kennedy, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Christopher J. Dodd, Connie Mack.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The Senator from Nevada.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended for another 10 minutes.

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

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHN BREAUX

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a man who is a Member of this body who has devoted his entire adult life to public service. Today I speak of Senator JOHN BREAUX of Louisiana. I do that today because there are a number of things that have been written since yesterday, when the Medicare Commission made their report. I think lost in the information that has been produced is the fact that Senator BREAUX has spent tireless hours, weeks, and months on this one proposal.

When I came to the Congress in 1982, Senator BREAUX had already been a Member of the House of Representatives for 10 years. He came to the House of Representatives when he was 28 years old. As I said, he has served his entire adult life in public service. Even prior to coming to the House of Representatives, Senator BREAUX had worked on a congressional staff.

Here is a man who could have been a success, as he has been as a Member of

the House of Representatives and the Senate, in anything he wanted to do. He had a fine record as a student. He could have made a lot of money practicing law, but he decided to devote his life to public service. I think too often we lose sight of what people do to contribute to the public good.

In my estimation, no one has contributed to the public good more than Senator John BREAUX in the years he has been a Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate. If there is a difficult problem, JOHN BREAUX has to be called in to work on that problem.

This is an example. He was called to be the Cochairman of the Medicare Commission, a very difficult job, but there was someone needed who understood the finances of this country; and that includes the tax structure of this country, that includes the very difficult health care delivery system we have, not only for those people who are not seniors, but particularly seniors, people who are on Medicare. I think we tend to forget how complex Medicare is and how important it is to the well-being of this country.

Mr. President, I served as a member of a county hospital board when Medicare came into being in the 1960s; 1966 through 1968 I served on that board. Prior to Medicare coming into being, about 40 percent of everyone that entered our hospital who were seniors had no health insurance of any kind. And that is the way it was around the rest of the country.

Today, though, Mr. President, over 99 percent of seniors have health insurance. That is because of Medicare. Senator BREAUX understood this very difficult problem. That is why he was asked to be the Chairman of this Commission.

Of the 17 members of this Commission, 10 of them agreed as to what should be done. I am not going to get into the merits of what the findings of the Commission were other than to say it was very difficult. Ten people agreed to the findings because of the diligent work of Chairman BREAUX.

I repeat, he did not spend hours on this program; he did not spend days—he spent weeks of his time. When other people were doing other things with their constituencies at home or taking a little time off from the rigors of this body, he was devoting his time to working on Medicare.

I mention that because not only was Senator BREAUX called in to be the Chair of the Medicare Commission, he has also done a number of other difficult things. We in the West understand the Wallop-Breaux legislation which established a program for restoring our coastal areas in the country. It set damages for boats that damaged the environment. It is a very important part of the environmental movement that has taken place in this country. Senator BREAUX was at the forefront of that. The legislation is named after him.

When, in 1993, we needed to pass a bill, the Budget Deficit Reduction Act, we needed to pass a bill that would put this country on a sound financial footing, one of the persons that worked on this to make sure that this was able to be accomplished was Senator BREAUX. He worked on the energy part of that legislation. Being from the State of Louisiana, he knew that area as well as anyone.

As a result of his good work on that, enough votes were gathered on the Democratic side of the Congress to pass that legislation. Without his work it could not have happened, and we would not be in the economic situation we are in today where we have reduced a series of 30 to 40 years of yearly deficits to now where we are having a surplus, where we are talking now about what we are going to do with the budget surplus.

A lot of what we are talking about today is the direct result of work in that legislation and other pieces of legislation by Senator BREAUX.

In short, I want to make sure that Senator BREAUX and the people of Louisiana understand our appreciation for the work that he has done with his Medicare Commission and what he has done as a Member of Congress generally.

I have worked as a legislator on the State level, and back here now for going on 17 years. I think JOHN BREAUX is really an example we can all look to. I repeat, if a difficult problem arises, we call upon JOHN BREAUX to be part of the consensus building. Legislation is the art of compromise, the art of consensus building. And no one stands for being a good legislator more than Senator JOHN BREAUX.

As far as the Medicare problem he worked on, as a result of his leadership, it is going to mean a great deal to this country. As Senator BREAUX has said, the battle is not over. He said, "I'm going to keep working on this issue as long as I'm in Congress."

So I again extend my appreciation and applause and recognition to Senator JOHN BREAUX for the good work that he did on this legislation. I do not know of anyone that could have accomplished what he did. It was a masterful piece of work. The people of the State of Nevada and this country should be as appreciative as we are of the work that he has done.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE ACT OF 1999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 257, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 257) to state the policy of the United States regarding the deployment of a

missile defense system capable of defending the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota—North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am from one of those Dakotas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, thank you very much for your generous description.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of a colleague, that the privileges of the floor be granted to the following member of Senator BIDEN's staff: Ms. Joan Wadelton, during the pendency of the National Missile Defense Act, S. 257. And the request is for each day the measure is pending and for rollcall votes thereon.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, thank you.

Mr. President we are now returning to the National Missile Defense Act of 1999, which is a very important policy issue before the Senate. My expectation is we will complete work today. I had noticed two amendments; and I shall not offer the amendments today, to the relief of those who are counting the amendments that are ahead of us.

But I did want to take the floor to at least describe especially the substitute amendment, because while I will not offer it to this bill, this is really a debate about policy. This policy will not mean anything until it is funded.

The real debate will be on the appropriations, it seems to me. What is it we want to buy and pay for? We can talk until we are blue in the face, but if we are not willing in an appropriations process to pay for a policy, it is not going to be deployed.

Let me talk a bit about that. My substitute amendment will be something that I will likely offer during an appropriations debate and will wait until that day for a vote.

The proposition before the Senate offered by my colleague, Senator COCHRAN, is very simple. Yesterday, I was holding something from Senator LOTT and when I was referring to Senator COCHRAN I called him Senator LOTT, for which I apologized. I certainly know the difference, and I respect both of them immensely. Senator COCHRAN has offered a proposal on the floor of the Senate that says it shall be the policy of this country to deploy a national missile defense system as soon as technologically feasible. In other words, notwithstanding other issues, as soon as it is technologically feasible to put a national missile defense system in place, we should do so.

What is this national missile defense system? We had one once, 24 years ago, in my home State. This country built

the only antiballistic missile system that was ever built in the free world. Members ought to see the concrete that was poured, this huge concrete building in northeastern North Dakota, a sparsely populated region of our State, where the ABM, antiballistic missile, system was built. In today's dollars it costs about \$20 billion. It was declared operational 1 day and mothballed the very next day. It produced a lot of good jobs in northeastern North Dakota as a result, a lot of construction, a lot of building.

But what did we get for our money? And was a national ballistic missile defense system feasible 24 years ago? The answer, I suppose, is yes. We had a national ballistic missile site built and declared operational 24 years ago, so it was feasible. It used a different technology. The proposition was if we were attacked by some incoming missile from some hostile power, we would send up these antiballistic missiles with nuclear warheads on our missiles and we would shoot off a nuclear warhead somewhere in the heavens and we would destroy all the incoming missiles. That was the technology then, and we built it—paid a lot of money for it—and it was declared mothballed the day after it was operational.

Now the proposition is that the national missile defense is a different kind of technology. It has the ability to hit a bullet, a speeding bullet, with another bullet. That is the proposition. We have had a lot of tests—a few successful, most unsuccessful. It is a very difficult proposition.

The experts in the Department of Defense tell us that they have spent as much money as they can spend to pursue the technology to build a national missile defense system, but the technology does not yet exist. Now, when the technology does exist, what kind of consideration should exist in terms of its deployment?

Russia has a lot of weaponry; Russia, of course, is the dominant country in what was the old Soviet Union. Their weaponry consists of a great many nuclear warheads on top of intercontinental ballistic missiles and bombers. We need to be concerned about those. As a result of that, we have engaged with the old Soviet Union and now Russia in a regime of arms reductions. Arms control talks resulted in START I and START II. The Russians, we hope, are prepared very soon to adopt START II. We have already done so.

As a result of all of that, yesterday I held up part of the wing of a Russian bomber. Last year, I held up a metal flange from the door of, I believe, an SS-19, an intercontinental ballistic missile that held a nuclear warhead, a missile aimed at the United States. Yesterday, I held up at this desk a wing strut from a Russian bomber; one would have expected in the cold war that the only way you would hold a piece of a Russian bomber in your hand is if somebody shot it down in hostile action. That wasn't the case. I held up