

do have to take into consideration that we do have a large number of Senators who would not be present for a vote.

So I am taking this opportunity to publicly admonish the Senate as a whole. Last week, I had Senators who said, well, we shouldn't vote on Tuesday morning. I had some Senators say we can't be here at Thursday noon. If it continues at this pace, we will have votes stacked in sequence on Wednesday afternoon at 3 o'clock, which would suit me fine, but I don't think it is a very good way to do business. I do intend to have votes on Fridays so we can complete our work. It is not that I necessarily want them; it is because we have to have them in order to complete our work. So I hope Senators will plan on being here on Mondays and Fridays because we do assure them that there will be no votes before 5 and no votes after 12. But I was very disappointed in what the whip check looked like for today.

SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I do want to note that for the first time in history, within the last month, the Senate leadership has selected our first woman to be the Senate legal counsel, and she is Pat Bryan. She has served at the Justice Department and at the White House in the past. She is highly capable, and we are delighted to have her joining the Senate in this very important position. But my reason for wanting to comment this morning is to talk a moment about the position and to talk about her predecessor who served as legal counsel.

Among the officers of the Senate, one of the least known is the Senate Legal Counsel. There is a reason for that.

The Legal Counsel usually works out of the limelight, away from publicity, serving the Senate with a certain anonymity that is appropriate for the very important responsibilities of the office.

The Office of the Legal Counsel is, in effect, the Senate's own law firm. Its staff handles any litigation concerning the Senate or its Members acting in their official capacity.

The Senate Legal Counsel also advises the Senate, not about legislation, but about legal matters of all sorts. The most recent and most dramatic instance, of course, was the impeachment trial of President Clinton.

Throughout that extraordinary experience, our Legal Counsel, Thomas B. Griffith, played a crucial role in shaping our procedures.

He assured the legal propriety of everything we did, keeping us, along with the Parliamentarian, true to the Senate's rules and precedents.

The meticulousness he brought to our labors was characteristic of Tom's work, as was the unflappable demeanor and unwavering courtesy he showed throughout the impeachment ordeal.

With gratitude for Tom's service to the Senate for the last four years, and yet with deep regret at the prospect of

losing him, I must report that he will be rejoining his former law firm of Wiley, Rein, and Fielding.

It is customary on occasions like this to say that we all wish him well. In this case, that is an understatement.

We wish Tom the best, as he deserves, for that is what he has given to the Senate.

One example of his dedication should suffice. Tom lives quite a distance away from Washington, considerably outside the Beltway even, in Lovettsville, Virginia.

During the weeks of the impeachment proceedings, Tom left his family there and moved closer to the Capitol, to be always available to us here, spending perhaps one day a week with Susan and the children.

I want all of them—Chelsea, Megan, Robbie, Erin, Torre, and Tanne—to know that, during those weeks when they must have sorely missed their dad, he was serving his country in a very important way.

That kind of selfless service has always been a part of Tom's life, from his days as a missionary in Zimbabwe with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints through his activities with the Federalist Society.

His example of integrity and commitment to the highest ideals of the law has brought honor to the Senate. He leaves us now with our affection and our enduring gratitude.

WELCOME TO THE NEW SENATE PAGES

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I take note that we have a new group of pages that are joining us today. We look forward to having their presence and their assistance as we carry out our duties on behalf of the American people. They will be playing an important role in how the Senate conducts itself. We are delighted to have them here and we welcome them aboard.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

FLAG DAY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today is Flag Day. Utahns, and indeed Americans all across our great country, revere the flag as the unique symbol of the United States and of the principles, ideals, and values for which our country stands. Who can forget the majestic image of the Marines raising Old Glory on the island of Iwo Jima during World War II or of school children pledging their allegiance to the American flag?

Over the years, the love and devotion our diverse people have for the American flag has been reflected in the actions of our legislatures. During the Civil War, for example, Congress awarded the Medal of Honor to Union soldiers who rescued the flag from falling into rebel hands.

During World War I, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws adopted the Uniform Flag Act that numerous state legislatures adopted to prohibit flag desecration.

Congress declared the "Star Spangled Banner" to be our national anthem.

In 1949, Congress expressed the love the American people for their flag by establishing June 14 as Flag Day. Congress also adopted "The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag" and the manner of its recitation which millions of school children observe each school day.

In 1968, Congress adopted a federal statute to prohibit flag desecration. More recently, Congress designated John Philip Sousa's "The Stars and Stripes Forever" as the national march.

As with numerous societal interests that affect free speech, legislatures of 48 States and the federal government and the courts also have long respected society's interest in protecting the flag by balancing this interest against the individual's interest in conveying a message through the means of destruction of the flag instead of through the means of oral or written speech.

The Supreme Court continues to strike the balance in favor of society's interests in public safety, national security, protection from obscenity, libel, and the protection of children even though these interests can and do implicate the First Amendment.

In the 1989 case of *Texas v. Johnson*, however, the Supreme Court abandoned the traditional balance in favor of society's interest in protecting the flag and adopted an absolute protection for the individual's interest in communicating through the means of physically destroying the American flag.

Congress responded to the Johnson decision with a statutory attempt to restore balanced protection to the physical integrity of the American flag—the Flag Protection Act of 1989. However, in the 1990 case of *United States v. Eichman*, the Supreme Court relied on the new rule it created in Johnson to reject statutory protection of the flag.

The recent reintroduction of another flag protection statute, which has been introduced in prior Congresses, is also clearly unenforceable under the Johnson and Eichman precedents. Even Professor Lawrence Tribe, a defender of the statute struck down in Eichman, has stated that the reintroduced statute cannot be upheld under the new rule of Johnson and Eichman.

Moreover, in the 1992 case of *R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul*, the Supreme Court clearly stated that it will no longer uphold statutory protection of the flag from desecration. Accordingly, the only realistic way to restore traditional balanced protection for the flag is with a constitutional amendment.

In March of this year, Senator CLELAND and I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 14, a constitutional amendment to protect the American flag.

This amendment restores balanced protection to the flag by allowing Congress to prohibit only the physical desecration of the flag, while retaining the full existing freedoms for oral and written speech.

Thus, a would-be flag burner would still be able to convey his particular message by speaking at a rally, writing to a newspaper, and voting at the ballot box. He would not, however, be able to burn a flag or to stuff a flag into a toilet, as has been done since the Johnson and Eichman decisions.

Nearly 80 percent of the American people and 49 state legislatures support the constitutional amendment to restore balanced protection to the American flag. By sending this amendment to the States for ratification, Congress would help restore traditional balanced protection for the flag while protecting the robust freedom of expression that Americans enjoyed when the Marines raised the flag over Iwo Jima and when Congress created Flag Day.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of S. 1186, the fiscal year 2000 energy and water development appropriations bill, Bob Perret, a fellow in my office, and Sue Fry, a detailee from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers serving with the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee, be provided floor privileges.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 1186, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1186) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. 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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all first-degree amendments in order to S. 1186 must be filed at the desk by 5 this evening.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry: What is the subject matter before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering S. 1186.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is the energy and water appropriations bill.

Mr. President, I understand—is this correct—Senator REID has procured a unanimous consent agreement that all amendments will be filed to this bill by 5 this afternoon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

Let me thank Senator REID very much for doing that. We have all been working to try to make sure that as this week fills up with other kinds of votes, on everything from Y2K to the lockbox and other things, we be given ample opportunity to get this bill passed.

We worked very hard under the leadership and direction of our chairman, Senator TED STEVENS, chairman of the full committee, to get this bill ready and to get it out here as soon as possible. This will be the second full Appropriations Committee bill that will be before the Senate. If it passes in the next few days, we will be on some kind of a record in terms of our ability to get a large number of the appropriation bills done in a very timely manner.

For that, I am grateful to the chairman and ranking member of the full committee for the amount of resources that were given to this committee. I will begin with an explanation of how we tried to respond to the allocation of resources.

First of all, this is an interesting bill, interesting in the sense that it is not very rational in that you have two things mixed that are about as far apart in the spectrum of prioritizing and need as you could get. All of the nuclear weapons research and development for all of our bombs and all of our safeguards and all of our great research is in this bill. That has been and is still defense work. It is work for the defense of our country. We get money for this because it is a defense function. When we had the walls up wherein you could not spend defense money for anything else, the money that came into this bill

for that purpose came right out of the defense total.

There is another piece of this bill that has to do with water and water resources, not as they relate to anything nuclear, just water and water resources, various inland waterways, various dams, various dikes, Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, those kinds of activities, and a myriad of flood protection projects, because the Federal Government, over time, has been a major player with the States in a matching program with reference to flood protection.

Then sitting kind of in the middle but aligned with those water projects are things that the Department of Energy does that are not defense oriented. We call those the nondefense energy projects, research of various types that is not necessarily or even required to be related to the defense activities I have just described.

So in a very real sense, it is kind of comprehensive and a mix of various funding requirements of our country that do not mesh.

We started from the beginning saying there are certain resources that come to this committee from the full Appropriations Committee that are clearly for the purposes of the defense of our Nation. We have taken those resources and said that all of the resources we are getting from the Appropriations Committee which have historically been for defense will be used for defense only. To the best of our ability, we have not used any defense money; that is, defense nuclear money, and defense having safe weapons, the nuclear stockpile, the stewardship stockpile—we have used defense money for that—we have not in any case taken some of that money or any of that money and used it for water projects or used it for nondefense Department of Energy work.

I would like to keep it that way. I have no power of the Budget Committee or points of order to keep it that way, because we, in compromising, when we put the 5-year Balanced Budget Act together, bipartisan, and executive branch with the President, had walls between defense and nondefense for 3 years, and then it was discretionary for the last 2. We are in the last 2 now.

I have, nonetheless, with the assistance of my ranking member, kept defense money for defense programs and not put it into nondefense domestic energy programs or in water projects.

On nondefense energy projects—I will just mention one—there is an amendment pending to do more with solar and renewable energy. That is not a defense activity. We have done the best we could, but we have not used any defense money for that. I hope when we see the amendment, since one is going to be forthcoming, that they followed that pattern and have not taken it out of the defense activities, because with what we know about the world, with what we know about Russia and the