four-year moratorium on new individual fishing quota programs. The moratorium on new quota programs expired on September 30, 2000. Now that this ban has expired, we should allow fishery management councils to develop additional fish quota programs. Councils should have the freedom to develop and implement these programs. I am not advocating that Councils be required to implement them, because individual fishing quota programs must be developed on a fisheryby-fishery basis. I do think, however, that individual quota programs should be available as one of the many management tools Councils may draw upon. I must add that all eight Councils have asked for this freedom and have asked for Congress to lift the moratorium.

However, I know that some members want to extend the moratorium. They don't want to allow some fisheries to go ahead with IFQs until there is a national policy in place. I understand and appreciate this perspective. I also recognize members of the environmental community would be more comfortable with such programs if a national policy were already in place. As I said, I support a national policy on these programs, and I look forward to working with my colleagues next year to develop one.

However, I would like to point out that all fishery management plans, including those that rely on quota programs, are required to meet the national standards already in the Act. Let me offer a few examples of these standards. Any fish quota program would have to meet National Standard 4, which prohibits conservation and management measures from discriminating between residents of different This standard also mandates states. that fishing privileges be allocated fairly and equitably, that they are calculated to promote conservation, and that they are carried out so that no entity shall have an excessive share. Any fish quota program would also have to meet National Standard 8, which requires such measures to take into account the importance of fishery resources to fishing communities. They would also have to meet National Standard 9, which requires measures to minimize bycatch, and National Standard 10, which addresses safety.

In addition, the Act requires all individual fishing quota programs approved on or after October 1, 2000, to meet several additional criteria. For example, these programs must be subject to review based on any future national policy and such revision may require reallocation of quota. These programs must also be effectively managed and enforced, which may require reliance on observers and/or cost-recovery fees. In addition, these criteria address the most contentious aspect of individual quota programs: the initial allocation of quota. The Act requires programs to ensure a fair initial allocation of quota, to prevent excessive control over quota, and to include a mechanism for entry-level fishermen, small vessel owners and crew members to access quota. I think all of these examples illustrate that some elements integral to a national policy on individual fishing quota programs are already included in the Act. I believe we are much closer to having a national policy in place than some people may believe.

Unfortunately, it appears likely that the moratorium will be extended. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to consider several caveats to this extension. First, I ask that the moratorium be extended for only 8 months. This will take the moratorium off the appropriations cycle. Placing the moratorium on the yearly appropriations cycle creates a precedent that is easy to repeat every year. Taking the moratorium off the appropriations cycle will increase the urgency for Congress to develop a national policy within the months ahead.

Second, I ask for an exception to the moratorium for fixed-gear sablefish along the West Coast. This fishery is ready for fishermen to be allowed to consolidate permits, which is technically considered an IFQ. In fact, the fishery has been ready to do so since 1994. We should not make these fishermen wait any longer. They deserve to be freed from a 9-day race for fish, and fishermen who want to get out of the fishery should be compensated for their investments. I ask for your support for this exception.

Third, I support asking NMFS to gather input from the eight regional Councils on a national policy for individual fishing quotas. It is appropriate and important for Congress to have this input before we finalize a national policy on quota programs.

Most important, however, I ask for the commitment of my colleagues to deal with this issue next year, during the first session of the 107th Congress. It is not fair to punish those few fisheries that are ready to move forward with quota programs just because other fisheries are not. We have already had four years to resolve these issues, to no avail. If my colleagues believe this issue must be addressed within the broader context of Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act reauthorization, I understand and I hope they will consider this Senator ready and willing to move forward with that challenge. I support Senator SNOWE's and Senator KERRY's efforts to hold more hearings on reauthorization, and I offer to help them in any way I can to ensure it happens.

Let's commit ourselves to have a productive, comprehensive dialogue on a national policy. Let's commit to reaching a consensus that will allow our Councils and fisheries to pursue this innovative, effective solution that can work for fishing families, fisheries, conservation and consumers.

## RELIEF NEEDED FROM RISING PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to review where we stand, near the conclusion of the 106th Congress, on the subject of prescription drugs. Few issues have caught the public's attention more than this one, and few are more deserving of our attention.

We live at a time when we can clearly discern remarkable benefits from all manner of drugs. It is nothing short of miraculous when we consider the relative ease and success of today's treatment of common disorders, as compared with that of only two or three

generations ago.

When World War II began, for example, penicillin and other similar antibiotics were known only to a small number of scientists. At the conclusion of the War in 1945, penicillin was widely available, used not only for battle wounds but for infectious diseases in the general public as well. Patients with high blood pressure or high cholesterol levels were, at best, only partially and inadequately treated in the 1940's and 1950's. Now success is the rule, rather than the exception. Calvin Coolidge's son died in 1924 as a result of a blister and a skin infection after playing tennis at the White House. An infection like that today would be treated as simple, outpatient therapy.

While these examples are noteworthy and provide us with a valuable perspective of times gone by, the hard, cold fact is that many of these modern miracles are still out of the reach of too many American citizens. They simply cannot afford the drugs that might so often prove lifesaving, because of either no insurance or lack of drug cov-

erage within their insurance.

Why is this? Because, astronomical prices have come hand-in-hand with the great improvements in drug therapy. Spending for prescription drugs in the United States doubled between 1990 and 1998. In each of the five years between 1993 and 1998, prescription drug spending increased by an average of 12.4 percent. In 1999, the increase was 19 percent. We could go into all the reasons, but the fact remains that prescription drug prices are high and getting higher.

Many millions of Americans, both Medicare age and younger have either inadequate or no prescription drug insurance at all. A by-product of no coverage is that these patients wind up paying the highest rates of anyone—an average of 15 percent more than those with insurance. Many of these uninsureds, including the seniors often called The Greatest Generation" are not filling prescriptions because of their cost—choosing between food and medicine. Or they split pills in half to make them go farther. This is shameful. These are very real every day prob-

lems that beg for help.
So, given the fact of these well documented problems, what is the track record of this Congress in helping the citizens in my home state of South Dakota and the citizens of the United

States? What do I tell my constituents back in Sioux Falls, or Custer, or Milbank when they ask me why nothing has been done to help them? I wish I could tell them that help is on the way. I wish I could tell them that the majority leadership heard their voices and scheduled the hearings and called for the votes. But, that just is not the

Early in this Congress, I introduced, along with Senator Kennedy, the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors of Act of 1999". This bill would provide Medicare beneficiaries access to prescription drugs at the same low prices that drug manufacturers offer their most favored customers, such as large insurance companies, HMO's, and the Federal Government. Without cost to the taxpayers, my proposal could save seniors approximately 40 percent on their drug bills, yet we did not see a vote on this floor.

Similarly, in May of this year, I introduced the Generic Pharmaceutical Access and Choice for Consumers Act". This bill encourages the broader use of generics in Federal health programs, a straight-forward common sense approach, yet we did not see a vote on this floor.

Other measures that could have made a tremendous difference to millions of Americans also languished. This Congress should have passed a voluntary universal Medicare drug benefit plan. It did not.

This Congress should have addressed rising drug prices. It did not.

This Congress should have passed a truly strong and effective drug reimportation plan. It did not.

This Congress should have passed a generic drug access plan. It did not.

Mr. President, let me conclude by stating that these problems will not go away. Nor will my commitment for their resolution on behalf of the people of South Dakota and Americans across this country. The hope that this Congress will seriously address prescription drug costs and provide comprehensive Medicare drug coverage yet this year is all but an aspiration at this point. That being said, in a few months we will commence the 107th Congress. I will continue to do all that I can to work with my colleagues and urge the earliest possible discussions regarding prescription drugs in committee rooms and on the floor of the Senate. I believe this is the wish of most of the members in this body, as well as the wish and hope of the American people.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNITION OF RHODE B. (R.B.) CAUSEY, SR. AS ARKANSAS' 2000 PRIME TIME AWARD RECIPIENT

• Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, in October, the Special Committee on Aging joined Green Thumb to recognize the enormous contributions that this year's Green Thumb "Prime Time Award" recipients are making to their community and our country.

The Senior Community Service Employment Program is one of the best kept secrets in the country. This program is an innovative and cost-effective federal initiative that allows our nation's seniors to remain productive and independent by contributing their talent and services to their communities.

Some of Arkansas' finest employment programs for seniors are sponsored by Green Thumb, and I am pleased to recognize Arkansas' 2000 Prime Time Award recipient, Rhode B. (R.B.) Causey, Sr.

R.B., now 96 years old, grew up in a family of 13 children and sold business supplies and office machines during the Depression. These experiences, coupled with his ingenuity, persistence, and strong work ethic, prepared R.B. to branch out on his own in 1952 and open a business supply company. Today, R.B. and his son own and operate the R.B. Causey Company in Little Rock.

As if going in to work every day wasn't enough to keep him busy, R.B. also manages his own farm where he produces soybean and rice crops. The farm is also home to his extensive beekeeping hobby.

R.B.'s recipe for success: "Don't give up, stay involved, do something." provides a great example to all of us about the importance of staying active in our "golden years."

I am fortunate to know R.B. and other Arkansas senior workers who are so vibrant and enthusiastic about their jobs. I only hope that when I am 75, 80, or 85 I will have half of their energy and zest for life!

America's senior population has great value. They have earned our nation's respect and support. Green Thumb and other senior employment programs allow communities to continue to reap the wisdom of our nation's talented seniors citizens.

## TRIBUTE TO MS. JUDY ENGLAND-JOSEPH

• Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Ms. Judy England-Joseph who retired from the General Accounting Office, GAO, this past March. Her departure from federal service is a great loss to the federal government as well as to all offices in the Senate. Judy was a superlative federal employee with a record of honesty and integrity as well as a commitment to a job well done.

Ms. England-Joseph had been with GAO since 1975 working on a number of important federal issues in the fields of personnel and compensation, human resources, and energy, to name a few. However, I think most of my colleagues would agree that Judy's most outstanding contributions came as the Director of Housing and Community Development Issues at GAO. As Director, she had the primary responsibility for overseeing for the Congress the audit and evaluation of all programs and activities at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Small Business Administration, and

the Federal Emergency Management Agency, including those concerning housing, community and economic development, and federal disaster responsibilities

As Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies and the Committee on Small Business, I found Judy to be an invaluable resource for objective and timely information that was critical to fulfilling my responsibilities. Judy not only testified numerous times my appropriations before committee and the Committee on Small Business, but also personally met with me and my staff to discuss pressing issues and provide us with the critical information needed to make policy decisions. Judy was more than a resource to my committees; I also viewed her as a teammate and partner who shared my goal of making government truly accountable and as efficient as possible.

To say that we miss Judy would be an understatement. Judy epitomized public service. Her energy was boundless, her knowledge of policy issues was rarely matched, and her commitment to doing the right thing underlined her approach to her job and responsibilities.

I am honored to have worked with Judy and commend her for the years of service she provided to the Congress and the American Taxpayer.•

## DAVID BROWER

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today, I note with sadness the passing of David Brower, a great conservationist who died last month at his home in Berkeley, California. David Brower worked for more than half a century to preserve and protect the American landscape he loved so well. He served our nation in war and peacetime as a soldier, writer, and activist, and enriched the lives of many Americans.

Born in Berkeley in 1912, young David Brower learned to appreciate nature by guiding his blind mother on walks through the Berkeley hills. In the 1930s, he worked at Yosemite National Park and became a skilled mountaineer. During World War II he trained troops in climbing techniques, wrote the Army's alpine manual, and fought in northern Italy.

After the war he returned to California and volunteered at the Sierra Club, which was then a hiking organization with little involvement in public policy. After writing the first Sierra Club Manual, he became the club's first executive director in 1952. Under his leadership, the club's membership grew from 7,000 to 70,000 as it became the nation's leading environmental organization. After leading the Sierra Club for 17 years, Mr. Brower went on to found the Friends of the Earth and the Earth Island Institute, and he helped to establish the League of Conservation Voters.