

ceremony. I told him that this man came to this country as an immigrant boy of 8 with one little possession, that he still has, had amassed this great fortune, and he had just given the Library of Congress \$60 million.

The driver of the subway said: He came here with nothing? I said: That is right. And he has just given this great gift to the Library? And I said: That is right. And he said: That man is truly blessed.

That is my feeling about John Kluge. He is a truly blessed man.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleague for his wonderful comments about John Kluge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes in morning business.

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

VICE PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I went to Danville, KY, last evening, and I thought both JOE LIEBERMAN and DICK CHENEY did an admirable job in presenting their respective points of view during the Vice Presidential debate.

It will be understandable if I express a certain amount of parochial pride in the performance of my colleague and friend from Connecticut, JOE LIEBERMAN, who I thought did a magnificent job in laying out in civil, polite, and in a courteous way, the differences between the two teams, the two parties, and the candidates for the Presidency of the United States of America.

I think all Americans benefited last night as a result of the very eloquent, precise, thoughtful, and clear presentations. So it seems fitting for me to take a minute to commend them both, particularly my colleague from Connecticut. When young people around the country are thinking about politics and wonder whether good examples are out there, it is my hope that they might be shown by their history teachers, the Vice Presidential debate of the year 2000. Indeed, it was a wonderful example of how people of significant differences of opinion and points of view can have a worthwhile, informative discussion and debate of critical issues that face the future of our Nation.

I commend both, particularly my good friend and colleague from Connecticut. There is a collective sense of pride over the junior Senator from Connecticut. I may not call him "junior" Senator much longer, but I want to tell my colleagues how very proud I was of his performance.

WORK REMAINS

Mr. DODD. I want to say briefly before the time runs out, I have great admiration for the work Senator STEVENS has done as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. It is a tough job. We all know how hard he works and how

hard he tries to work out the differences in the spending bills. I have great respect for him and the work he has done as chairman of that committee.

That said, I also would be remiss if I did not mention that there are several important matters, generally speaking, that we have not addressed. We are about to wrap up, to finish over the next few days, with maybe one or two votes left, I am told.

I am saddened that, despite the efforts of Senator STEVENS, the leaders, and others, the Senate has thus far failed to act on several other important matters, including the 39 million seniors who will go without prescription drug benefits under Medicare. That is a great loss. We could have done it this year, and we didn't.

More than 11 million working families will not get the benefit of an increase in the minimum wage. That is a great loss for those people. Mr. President, 53 million children go to school every day in this country, and for the first time in 35 years we were not able to pass the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to try to improve the quality of schools, reduce class sizes, and come up with good afterschool programs.

So, 53 million children lose, 11 million working people don't get an increase in the minimum wage, and 39 million seniors fail to get prescription drug benefits. I think it is a sad day indeed. We could have passed these measures, and we didn't. I am deeply saddened by it, as I think the American people are as well.

While I commend Senator STEVENS and members of the Appropriations Committee, including my colleague from Nevada, HARRY REID, and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, who have worked tirelessly to get the appropriations work done, the fact of the matter is, a great deal of America's business has gone unattended.

Mr. President, I regret that the leadership of this Congress has failed thus far to act on these and other crucial priorities. If we can find two weeks to debate renaming National Airport, if we can spend many days debating whether to provide estate tax relief to the 44,000 most affluent Americans, then I would hope that in these waning days of this Congress we could find the time to consider the needs of America's children, seniors, and working families.

I yield the floor.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 3059

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I come back to try to resolve this issue. Before I ask for another unanimous consent agreement with some different language, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Transportation.

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

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, DC, October 6, 2000.

Hon. JOHN MCCAIN,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science,
and Transportation,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate my views regarding the penalty structure for Department of Transportation regulatory agencies such as the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). I expressed these views in testimony on the Firestone tire recall before the full committee on September 12, 2000.

The Administration supports a three-tiered approach to the enforcement of health and safety statutes: (1) administrative penalties; (2) judicially enforced civil penalties; and (3) in the case of egregious circumstances, criminal penalties for those who knowingly and willfully violate the law. We welcome the opportunity to work with the Congress to properly structure this approach.

Most important, however, is expeditious action on comprehensive legislation that will strengthen NHTSA's ability to address life-threatening motor vehicle safety defects. I will work with you in any way I can to help shape legislation that the Congress can approve and the President can sign into law.

Sincerely,

RODNEY E. SLATER.

Mr. MCCAIN. I will read a portion of the letter:

I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate my views regarding the penalty structure for Department of Transportation regulatory agencies such as the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). I expressed these views in testimony on the Firestone tire recall before the full committee on September 12, 2000.

and the last paragraph:

Most important, however, is expeditious action on comprehensive legislation that will strengthen NHTSA's ability to address life-threatening motor vehicle safety defects. I will work with you in any way I can to help shape legislation that the Congress can approve and the President can sign into law.

I repeat for my colleagues what the Secretary of Transportation says:

Most important, however, is expeditious action on comprehensive legislation that will strengthen NHTSA's ability to address life-threatening motor vehicle safety defects.

This legislation passed through the committee with the help of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a member of that committee, a valued member of that committee. This legislation passed through the Commerce Committee with the support of the majority leader of the Senate, a valued member of that committee.

Although I don't agree with the Transportation appropriations bill, I am not interested in blocking it. I am interested in trying to get action on this legislation before Congress adjourns.

I ask the Senator from Alaska if it would be acceptable if I modified the unanimous consent agreement to say that the majority leader, after consultation with the Democrat leader, would set a specific time and date for this legislation to be considered, and

only relevant amendments to the bill be in order of S. 3059.

It seems to me we could then achieve the goal of having a time and date where we could address this issue, we could move forward with the important appropriations bill, which understandably the Senator from Alaska has as his highest priority, which is also understandable given the fact that he is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

I ask the Senator from Alaska if he would consider—and I will ask now—I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, after consultation with the Democrat leader, could set a specific time and date for the consideration to S. 3059 and that only relevant amendments to the bill be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS. Reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that there is a process underway right now to see if it is possible to get such an agreement that the Senator from Arizona mentioned.

I have inquired, since the last exchange we had on the floor—and I am a person who has voted for this bill in committee, but the problem is there are objections on both sides of the aisle, I am informed, to a unanimous consent agreement which would be necessary to carry out the Senator's current unanimous consent agreement.

The difficulty is, there are some Members who are not members of the committee, our Commerce Committee, who have not had time to study that. They have informed the staff on both sides of the Senate, both Democratic and Republican, as I understand, that there are reservations. I cannot call them holds because they have not seen the bill yet; that is, as I understand it, the bill will come over from the House. It will be the House bill we would consider. It is just a very difficult position for me to be in, but as a representative of the leadership in this matter right now, I am constrained to say I am forced to object to the bill I support. I do object to that request.

I urge the Senator from Arizona to be part of this process of trying to clear that bill. I will join him. I have been trying to work on that since our last exchange, to see if we can clear bringing up that bill. But there are reservations on both sides of the aisle to that bill, and I am constrained to be in the position, and I am in the position, to say: I object to the request of the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Several Senators addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield so I can make a statement?

Mr. MCCAIN. Before the Senator from Alaska leaves the floor, I would like to respond.

Mr. REID. I wanted to respond before he leaves also. I will just take a brief moment.

I say to my friend from Alaska, we are not objecting to this request.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, you are. We had a statement you are objecting.

Mr. MCCAIN. Claiming the floor, it is clear on that side of the aisle there is no objection to this unanimous consent request.

I don't understand the comment of the Senator from Alaska about nobody has read the bill and no one understands the bill. We passed it 2 weeks ago out of the committee, No. 1. No. 2, this is not a low visibility issue. No. 3, we want to pass this bill through the Senate. The House will be passing the bill and we will go through the normal procedures.

I want to say again to the Senator from Alaska, on an issue of this importance—he said Members on both sides have reservations or objections; clearly, it is on this side of the aisle—come down with relevant amendments. We can reach time agreements and go through the normal process. But to block consideration at any time between now and when we leave is a clear message, I say in all due respect to the Senator from Alaska, that there is an intention to block consideration of the passage of this bill.

I can understand the objection of the Senator from Alaska to me holding up the consideration of the Transportation appropriations bill. I can fully understand that. I cannot understand why the leadership would not agree to taking up this bill with relevant amendments sometime between now and when we go out.

So, with all due respect to the Senator from Alaska, I don't get it. I do not understand why, when there is no objection on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. STEVENS. No, no; if the Senator will yield, Mr. President, I will state categorically I am informed there is an objection on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I respectfully say there is no objection on this side of the aisle.

Mr. MCCAIN. With all due respect to the Senator from Alaska, you have to respect the statement of the leader of the other side of the aisle.

Mr. REID. The Senator from Arizona made a unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Nevada for a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. The Senator from Arizona made a request, a unanimous consent request, to move forward with relevant amendments. We have no objection.

Mr. MCCAIN. I think it is abundantly clear, I say to the Senator from Alaska, there is no objection to moving forward on that side of the aisle. The problem is on this side of the aisle.

Why in the world can't we come to an agreement, when the Secretary of Transportation says:

Most important, however, is expeditious action on comprehensive legislation that will strengthen NHTSA's ability to address life-threatening motor vehicle safety defects.

We are talking about a life-threatening situation here.

So all I can say is it is clear the problem seems to be on this side of the aisle. I am asking the Senator from Alaska, who represents the leadership, to agree to this unanimous consent request, which I think is eminently reasonable. So I guess, Mr. President, I will ask again, if I could get the attention of the Senator from Alaska, since it is clear there is no objection to this unanimous consent request from the other side of the aisle—and I am not trying to impede the progress of the Transportation appropriations bill. We are only trying to get addressed the issue that there are life-threatening motor vehicle safety defects—if we at least could have some agreement. If there are objections to the legislation, then those objections, it seems to me, could be articulated in the form of relevant amendments.

So, again, I don't understand the explanation of the Senator from Alaska. The bill was passed 2 weeks ago. This is a very high visibility issue. We would take it up and pass it. The House is going to pass this legislation next Tuesday, according to all news reports. We could pass it, go to conference, and get this legislation to the President of the United States unless it is blocked on this side of the aisle—on this side of the aisle. This is a bill that passed 20-0 with the support of the majority leader, with the support of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THOMAS. This passed 2 weeks ago, Senator. Why hasn't it come up before this and not at the very end?

Mr. MCCAIN. I have been urging it, I respond to my colleague. Since the day after we passed it, I have been begging the leadership every day to bring up this bill for consideration. This has been blocked.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MCCAIN. I appreciate the question of the Senator from Wyoming because we have been trying to do everything we can to bring this bill up. That is why—because I have been stymied in these efforts—I had to come to the floor this morning to try to force some action on it since there was no response from our leadership, on this side, because of holds on the bill and objections to it.

I again ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, establish a specific time and date for consideration of S. 3059, and that only relevant amendments to the bill be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Reserving my right to object, I ask the Senator through the Chair a question. Is that a unanimous consent agreement that involves

bringing the bill before the Senate without the ability of any Member of the Senate to object at that time to its consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. As I understand it, the Senator is saying he would like to have the Senate agree that the two leaders can bring a bill before the Senate for consideration that has not yet been passed by the House, and no Member would be able to object to consideration at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I respond quickly to the Senator from Alaska? This is not a House bill; this is a Senate bill I am asking to have considered on the floor of the Senate as we regularly do with legislation in the Senate.

Mr. STEVENS. I apologize, Mr. President. From the prior conversation, I understood the House had brought its bill out of committee. I understood we were going to await that bill.

In any event, I want to say it again, as one who has voted for the bill, I am in the position of representing the leader.

Mr. President, I sought to become leader of the Senate once. I lost by two votes. I understand what it means not to be leader, but I also understand what it means to be leader. The leader has asked me to object on his behalf, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I just say again, and I want to clarify for the benefit of the Senator from Alaska, this is a Senate bill. It was passed through the Commerce Committee by a vote of 20-0. Yesterday, the House, by a vote of 42-0, passed through their committee similar legislation, although not the same legislation. They announced they would be passing their legislation next Tuesday.

What I am seeking is for us to be able to pass the Senate bill and go to conference, as is normal.

I should not do this, but I want to make another commitment to the Senator from Alaska because of the time constraints, and that is, if there are 50 relevant amendments filed and it looks as if the bill is going to be filibustered to death and we are not going to be able to pass it, then I will ask that the legislation be withdrawn at that time because I understand the time constraints under which the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is operating.

All I am asking is it be brought up with relevant amendments, as it will be passed by the House next Tuesday, and conferees will be appointed, as is normal, and we will go to conference and report out legislation hopefully that can be passed before we go out of session.

I say again to the Senator from Alaska, one, we passed it 2 weeks ago; two,

the House has acted in their committee, and they will be passing the bill next Tuesday. Right now we have no assurance of any kind that we can in any way take up this bill at any time. So when the Senator from Alaska objects on behalf of the leadership to consideration at any time that would be in keeping with the majority leader's schedule, then it is clear the effect is to kill the legislation, and we are talking about, as the Secretary of Transportation says, "Most important, however, is expeditious action on comprehensive legislation that will strengthen NHTSA's ability to address life-threatening motor vehicle safety defects."

I ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee if he will do the following: If we can just go into a quorum call for 10 minutes and see if the leadership will allow this unanimous consent request to move forward. I am not interested in embarrassing the leadership. In fact, I am interested in not embarrassing the leadership because if there is no objection on the other side of the aisle and there is an objection on this side of the aisle to taking up the legislation at any time, that is really not good. That is not a good thing to happen. I speak as a Member on this side of the aisle. Mr. President, 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. BIDEN. 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. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed in morning business to speak about Yugoslavia for up to 10 minutes. If that causes problems for anyone, I will withhold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, to assure everyone, if the conference report comes over, I will immediately cease and desist so we can proceed with the regular business of the Senate.

REVOLUTION IN SERBIA

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, we have had many debates on the floor of the Senate, genuinely heartfelt debates about the role of the United States of America in the world and the use of American force in the world.

We have had a split in this body between the parties, and within the parties, about whether or not it is appropriate for the United States to take a leadership role in Europe, including, on occasion, the use of force to promote our national interest and that of our allies.

There are several political cancers that exist in various parts of the world. And the one remaining cancer on the continent of Europe—the primary one—is Slobodan Milosevic.

I suggest that we all take a lesson from what is going on now in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia—in Serbia. Many of us, Democrat and Republican, have argued—myself; Senator MCCAIN; Senator LIEBERMAN; Senator Dole, when he was here—that the United States had an obligation, in its own self-interest and in the interest of our allies, and in the interest of humanity, to intervene, to stop the genocide and the ethnic cleansing that was being perpetrated by Slobodan Milosevic's vile nationalism.

I have been arguing for some time now that, absent our involvement in that region of the world, there would be chaos in, if not the heart, then the belly of Europe, and that if we acted with dispatch—swiftly and with resolve, and a willingness not to back away—Slobodan Milosevic, as with most thugs, would be stopped and would be eliminated.

Some have said on this floor, and some will say in the various Presidential and Senatorial and House campaigns that are going on, that we did not have an exit strategy when we committed American forces in Kosovo or American forces in Bosnia. Some will say that we have not succeeded because all is not tranquil, and if we were to withdraw American forces, things would revert to the chaos that existed before, and that this serves as proof that what we had done had not worked. The press and others declared early on in the bombing campaign in Kosovo—3 days into the 70-some day campaign—that it was a failure.

I am told, time and again, by some of my colleagues on the floor and I have read some pundits who state that, in fact, the American people are not patient, that they want instant results.

I say this. The end of Slobodan Milosevic is evidence of a number of things. One, our involvement was not only positive and good and successful, it was absolutely necessary. Without the leadership of the United States of America, I respectfully suggest our European allies would not have been as aggressive, they would not have been as united, and they would not have been as resolved.

Second, I hope we take a lesson from this as well to demonstrate that the American people have a great deal more patience and wisdom than we give them credit for. I have not heard, nor have I heard anyone else tell me that, while they have been home in the last 4 years, they have been told, as they walked from the grocery store, or to the drugstore, or home, that it is urgent we withdraw American forces from the Balkans.

Quite frankly, the opposite has occurred. The American people intuitively knew this was a place where wars have started before, this was a place where if chaos reigned it could not be contained, this was a place where a man such as Slobodan Milosevic could do nothing but ultimately harm the interest of Europe