

"Judge Paez has bipartisan support." "Judge Paez is not an 'activist', nor is he 'anti-business.'" Judge Paez has outstanding judicial temperament and is not 'antireligion.'" Judge Paez has not acted "unethically." "Judge Paez has committed to follow the law on the death penalty," and to follow the law generally.

I hope when we look at this man and his qualifications, he will receive an overwhelming vote. He is qualified for the Ninth Circuit.

Judge Paez is a graduate of Brigham Young University and he received his law degree from the University of California at Berkeley in 1972. He has received the highest rating given by the American Bar Association to Federal judicial nominees, which is well qualified.

It is important to note his nomination swept through here earlier when he was confirmed to the trial court on the Federal judicial level. He served with distinction after we, the Senate, approved his nomination. He has done that for 5 years, where he has served, as I have indicated, as a U.S. District Judge for the Central District of California. He has presided over numerous trials. Prior to being a Federal district court judge, he had a distinguished career as a State court judge. He served as a California State judge for 13 years. He is somebody who has been active in charitable and community affairs. He is a family man. His mother and father and 10 brothers and sisters live in another Western State, the State of Utah.

As I have indicated, Judge Paez has bipartisan support from, for example, JAMES ROGAN, a Republican Congressman from California, and a former judge himself; he supports Judge Paez. He has support from Los Angeles district attorney, Gil Garcetti; Los Angeles County Sheriff, Sherman Block; Los Angeles Police Protective League; National Association of Police Organizations; former California judge and president of the Los Angeles Bar Association, Sheldon Sloan; Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs, President Pete Brodie; Los Angeles County Police Chiefs' Association. It goes on and on. It is a shame we have not worked and gotten this nomination approved earlier. I hope, as I have indicated, this will not become related to some extraneous issue. It should be decided on its merits.

Mr. President, I recognize that my friend from Alaska, the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, is going to speak on the Ninth Circuit. I have some familiarity with it because the chief judge in the Ninth Circuit is from Nevada, Procter Hug. We are proud of the fact that he is the chief judge of the Ninth Circuit. He also has rave reviews. He is a graduate of Stanford University School of Law. He has administered the Ninth Circuit very well. I hope those who feel there should be something done about the Ninth Circuit would look at what we have already done. This has become an

issue. As a result of that, there was a commission appointed, led by former Supreme Court Justice Byron "Whizzer" White. They made a decision on what should be done with the Ninth Circuit, and that it should be kept intact and be administered differently.

So I hope the committee of jurisdiction which will review the Ninth Circuit matters will take into consideration what has already been done, and that there will be hearings held as to what should be done, if anything, with the Ninth Circuit.

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I think it is important this week that we move forward with the Export Administration Act. This is something that is more than 10 years overdue. We must move forward on that. We are talking about being friendly in the Senate to the high-tech industry. There is nothing we could do that would be more friendly to the high-tech industry today than passing the Export Administration Act. If we are going to continue to be the leader in the high-tech industry in the world, we have to pass this act immediately. If not, we are going to have these businesses move offshore. That is, in effect, what this Export Administration Act does.

I commend Chairman GRAMM of Texas. He indicated he would do what he could to move this forward. He has kept his word. This is being held up by just a few of the chairmen of committees. It should not be. This is not a partisan issue. We should move forward, recognizing we are no longer in a cold war, that defense issues can be resolved very easily, and this is something we should finish before we take our break next week.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the Senator from Alaska, Senator DORGAN be recognized, in keeping with the previous order entered for 20 minutes.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2184

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise this morning to introduce a bill, which I send to the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill for the first time.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2184) to amend chapter 3, title 28, United States Code to divide the Ninth Judicial Circuit of the United States into two circuits, and for other purposes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. Under the rule, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

(The remarks of Mr. MURKOWSKI and Mr. HATCH pertaining to the introduction of S. 2184 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from North Dakota is recognized for up to 20 minutes.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I came back from North Dakota on a late flight last evening on Northwest Airlines, flying North Dakota to Washington, DC. When one is traveling all day and up late, one gets up in the morning and it takes a while to adjust to find a good mood. My morning wasn't enhanced when I saw USA Today and saw the headline, once again, that Mr. Greenspan digs in his heels on rate hikes.

Mr. Greenspan goes to Congress and decides he will tell the American people they should brace themselves, he will increase their taxes in the form of higher interest rates. That did not exactly make my day this morning.

I will make a couple of comments about what Mr. Greenspan and the Federal Reserve Board are doing.

March 7, Wall Street Journal:

The U.S. work force was much more efficient in the fourth quarter than initially thought, push labor costs sharply lower.

Nonfarm productivity grew at a 6.4% rate in the last three months of 1999, the fastest pace in seven years and well above the government's initial estimate of 5%, the Labor Department said Tuesday. The increase caused the biggest decline in unit labor costs in seven years—a drop of 2.5% that was more than double the 1% reduction the government estimated.

The surge in productivity, which was in line with expectations, generally would suggest that the risk of inflation remains low despite feverish economic growth. Because workers are producing more goods and services per hour, employers can afford to pay higher wages without having to pass on additional costs to consumers.

I wonder if Mr. Greenspan has seen this information, or does he just disregard it. It does not matter what the facts are. They are intent on increasing interest rates at the Federal Reserve Board.

How about this. Mr. Greenspan says he fears demand is still too strong, even after reports last week that job growth has slowed in February, unemployment rose, and sales for new homes dropped sharply at the beginning of the year. He says our country is growing too fast and too many people are working, and so he has decided he wants, once again, to increase interest rates.

What does increasing interest rates mean? I will tell you what it means. If he, as some expect, increases interest rates another full 1 percent, which will double it from where rates were about a year ago, it means that every North Dakota farm family will pay about \$1,500 more per year in interest costs. Typical nonfarm households in North Dakota will pay about \$700 more a year in added costs.

There will be no debate in this Chamber about this issue. This is the Federal Reserve Board saying: We are going to tax the American people with higher interest rates. Why? Because we decide we are going to do it.

Who are they? I do this as a public service. These are the members of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors and the regional Federal Reserve Bank presidents. This is a chart showing who they are and from where they come. They all wear gray suits. They all come from the same area. They all think the same. I even put their salaries on the chart. I do this so we can put some faces to this public policy because they want to close their doors, make decisions about interest rates, and impose higher interest rates on every American at a time when it is unjustified.

My children used to go through a book called "Where's Waldo?" At night they would lay on the bed and search through those large pages trying to find Waldo. My son especially always claimed to find Waldo even when he had not sighted Waldo. I think my son knows something that Mr. Greenspan knows. Mr. Greenspan has been searching for inflation forever, even as inflation has gone down, way down, and he continues to increase interest rates with no justification at all.

Where is Waldo? Where is inflation, I say to Mr. Greenspan? Where is the justification for deciding that family farmers in desperate trouble already should pay about \$750 a year more in interest charges under your current interest rate increases that have already been put into effect by you, and \$1,500 a year total in additional interest charges if you do as many analysts expect and increase interest rates another 1 percent over the coming year?

Mr. Greenspan is a public servant. I admire him for his public service, but I profoundly disagree with that monetary policy. Perhaps he will discover what most Americans know: Productivity has increased dramatically, inflation is down, and this economy can least afford, in my judgment, the increased interest rates that Mr. Greenspan is now proposing.

I had asked for time this morning to speak on another subject. I thought if I was coming to the floor, I should at least make a comment about what Mr. Greenspan is talking.

I ask unanimous consent to speak on another subject under a separate heading.

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

ARMS CONTROL

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wish to talk about the issue of arms control this morning. There are many issues that we consider in this country. We have the deafening sounds of Democracy as the American people and politicians discuss, debate, and describe many, many issues. Both candidates

and crowds these days are generously discussing issues ranging from abortion to economic growth to defense policy, and so on. But there is dead silence on the subject of the spread of nuclear weapons and the threat it poses to every single person on this Earth and especially the threat it imposes to our children.

Let me describe where we are with nuclear weapons. In 1985, the Soviet Union had 11,500 nuclear warheads on long range missiles. Defense analysts predicted that would go up to 18,000 or 20,000 nuclear warheads by the mid-1990s. These numbers do not even mean much. What is a thousand nuclear warheads? Each Soviet warhead had about 20 or 30 times the power of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima.

Instead of the 20,000 warheads many predicted, Russia has only about 5,000 warheads today. Why do they have 5,000 warheads? Because they have gotten rid of about 6,000 of the nuclear warheads they used to have. The Soviet stockpile, now the Russian stockpile, has been cut by the equivalent of 175,000 Hiroshima bombs. How did that happen? Because of arms control agreements. We agreed to reduce our nuclear weapons and they agreed to reduce theirs.

I will describe what has happened. We have something called the Nunn-Lugar program, named after our colleagues, former Senator Nunn and Senator Lugar. They said a good way to reduce the threat is by helping a potential adversary destroy his weapons while we reduce our own weapons. As a result the Nunn-Lugar program has reduced the threat to the United States by eliminating 4,900 Russian nuclear warheads, 471 intercontinental ballistic missiles, 12 ballistic missile submarines, and 354 ICBM silos.

For example, this is a picture of a Typhoon submarine owned by the Russians. It carries 20 missiles with 10 warheads on each missile. That is 200 nuclear weapons that can be fired from this Typhoon-class submarine. This submarine is twice the length of a football field and a third larger than the Trident submarine, the largest U.S. submarine.

What is going to happen to this submarine? It is going to be dismantled, and we are going to help pay for the dismantling of this submarine under the Nunn-Lugar program. We are going to reduce the threat by taking a Typhoon-class submarine and destroying it. This is a picture of what it looks like today. This is what it will look like later this year. You can see what once was a submarine carrying 200 nuclear warheads aimed at U.S. targets is now a shell being taken apart and turned into scrap metal.

This picture shows the elimination of intercontinental ballistic missiles. They pull them from the ground and take off the warhead, and then cut the missile to pieces.

This is a picture of an ICBM silo, the last piece of metal being removed. The

dirt is then piled over and sunflowers are planted. This is in the Ukraine. Is that progress? You bet your life it is progress. A silo in which a missile once rested aimed at the United States of America with multiple warheads with nuclear explosive power is now eliminated. The Ukraine is free of nuclear weapons because of the Nunn-Lugar program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to show this piece of a wing strut from a Soviet bomber.

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

Mr. DORGAN. How did I get this? Did we shoot the bomber down? No. This bomber was sawed up. The wings were sawed off as a result of an arms control agreement that we have with the Russians by which we reduced our delivery systems and nuclear weapons and they reduced theirs. Their submarines are dismantled, their intercontinental ballistic missiles are dismantled, and their bombers have had the wings sawed off.

This is a picture of the heavy bomber elimination, TU-95.

That is what is happening with arms control. It is, in my judgment, exciting and breathtaking.

What is expected to happen in the future? Under START III, we are expected to go to 2,500 nuclear weapons. Think of that—2,500 nuclear weapons. What is one nuclear weapon? In most cases, the yield of a nuclear weapon is many times the yield of the one used in Hiroshima. Mr. President, 2,500 weapons on each side if we get to that—we are not there.

What has the Senate done with respect to arms control treaties? The U.S. Senate over the years has done a great deal. We passed START I, START II, the 1988 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty—a whole series of arms control initiatives. We have funded the Nuclear Cities Program to employ scientists in Russia who know how to make nuclear bombs so they are not hired by the Iranians, the North Koreans, and others. We funded the Nunn-Lugar program. We have done a lot of things.

The fact is, there is no discussion anymore about arms control in this Senate. In fact, all the discussion is about deploying a national missile defense system, abrogating the ABM Treaty, and making a full retreat on issues on which we were making significant progress. We need to change that.

In addition to that, last year, after languishing for 2 years without even a hearing, the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty was defeated by the Senate. The President just asked General Shalikashvili to head a task force to see if everybody can work together toward a common goal and resolve the concerns many Senators have about the treaty.

Does anybody really believe it is in our interest or anybody's interest to begin testing once again nuclear weapons? What a huge step backwards. My