

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Tennessee for my objection. I was engaged in a discussion and did not hear what he was asking for. I understand it had been worked out and was ready to go. We were not clear on exactly what was happening.

The Senator from Tennessee wishes to reclaim the floor, and I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON. I didn't hear the majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. I was explaining why I objected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I ask for the bill's second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will remain at the desk.

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield the floor.

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1291, H.R. 3591, H.R. 4051, AND H.R. 4251

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I understand there are four bills at the desk due for their second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1291) to prohibit the imposition of access charges on Internet service providers, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 3591) to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan in recognition of their service to the Nation.

A bill (H.R. 4051) to establish a grant program that provides incentives for States to enact mandatory minimum sentences for certain firearm offenses, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 4251) to amend the North Korea Threat Reduction Act of 1999 to enhance Congressional oversight of nuclear transfers to North Korea, and for other purposes.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings on these bills at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be placed on the calendar.

#### PROVIDING FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the adjournment resolution just received from the House, that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 336) was agreed to, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 336

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House ad-*

journs on the legislative day of Thursday, May 25, 2000, or Friday, May 26, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 6, 2000, for morning-hour debate, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, May 25, 2000, Friday, May 26, 2000, Saturday, May 27, 2000, or Sunday, May 28, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, June 5, 2000, or Tuesday, June 6, 2000, as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or at such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we had talked over the period of, I guess, 2 or 3 weeks about trying to come to an agreement so we could go back to the very important bill, S. 2, the Education Opportunities Act of 2000. We still have pending on that bill, I believe, two amendments for debate, and I don't know if we have the time agreement for a final vote. We do not, but we have Senators JEFFORDS, STEVENS, DOMENICI, and others—and maybe Senator KENNEDY is on that amendment—plus a second Kennedy amendment. What we have been trying to do is agree to another grouping of amendments after that but preferably to go ahead and get agreement on a list of very important amendments on both sides of the aisle that are related to elementary and secondary education and have votes on those amendments and then come to a conclusion.

I wanted to see if we could make any progress in that regard and, hopefully, we can get agreement on this. If not, we will keep working to see if we can find a way to reach an agreement.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of S. 2, the Educational Opportunities Act of 2000, the Stevens amendment No. 3139 remain the pending amendment, and that the education-related amendments which follow be the only first-degree amendments in order to be offered; that they be subject to relevant second-degree amendments; that debate on all amendments, whether first or second degree, be limited to 1 hour equally divided; and following the conclusion of debate on or in relation to the first-degree amendments listed, the bill be read the third time, and the Senate proceed to a vote on final passage.

I also ask consent that when the Senate receives the House companion measure, it proceed immediately to its consideration; that all after the enacting clause be stricken, the text of the Senate bill be inserted, the bill advanced to third reading and passed; that the Senate then insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, all without any intervening action or debate, and that S. 2 be indefinitely postponed.

The remaining first-degree amendments in order to be offered to S. 2—and I note again these will be 1 hour each equally divided—are:

An amendment by Senator JEFFORDS relating to high schools; an amendment by Senator STEVENS involving physical education programs; an amendment by Senator BINGAMAN regarding accounting accountability; an amendment by Senator SANTORUM which calls for full funding for IDEA; the Kennedy amendment regarding teacher quality; a Hutchison amendment regarding single-sex schools; an amendment by Senator DODD involving 21st century schools; an amendment by Senator GREGG involving 21st century schools; an amendment by Senators HARKIN and BINGAMAN concerning school construction grant programs; an amendment by Senator VOINOVICH regarding IDEA funding options; an amendment by Senator WELLSTONE regarding fairness and accuracy in testing; an amendment by Senator GRAMS involving alternative testing; an amendment by Senator REED involving parental involvement; an amendment by Senator KYL which would deal with parental opt-out for bilingual education; an amendment by Senator MIKULSKI involving community technology centers; an amendment by Senator ASHCROFT involving IDEA discipline—an amendment, I might add, he has been trying to get in the order for several weeks now, and we have not been able to get it agreed to in the order, and I must say that at one point he could have insisted on it but was agreeable to setting it aside with the understanding he would get a shot at it later on—a relevant amendment by Senator LOTT; a relevant amendment by Senator DASCHLE; a relevant managers' amendment by Senator JEFFORDS; and a relevant managers' amendment by Senator KENNEDY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me simply respond to the distinguished majority leader.

As he knows, in past debates on ESEA, there have been an average of 22 Republican amendments that have been considered, an average. In some cases, that number has exceeded 30 amendments. The average number of

amendments in total considered during the ESEA debate has been 37 amendments.

I have no objection at all to the amendment suggested by the distinguished majority leader.

I note with interest that the school safety amendment offered by Senator LAUTENBERG was not on his list.

I would ask that the Senate resume consideration of the ESEA bill, and following the two amendments previously ordered, the Senate consider the following first-degree amendments subject to relevant second-degree amendments, and they be considered in alternating fashion as the sponsors become available: Senator SANTORUM, Senator BINGAMAN, Senator HUTCHISON, Senator DODD, Senator GREGG, Senator HARKIN, Senator VOINOVICH, Senator MIKULSKI, Senator STEVENS, Senator WELLSTONE, Senator GRAMS, Senator REED, Senator KYL, and Senator LAUTENBERG.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, are all those amendments on this list that I read, plus Senator LAUTENBERG? Is there an additional Wellstone amendment in that list?

Mr. DASCHLE. I guess I would have to consult with the majority leader in greater detail to know whether each of these amendments is exactly referenced in his unanimous consent list. As I understand it, this is the list that our two sides have been building upon in reaching some agreement on proceeding to the next block of amendments. Obviously, there are other amendments we would want to consider. But this is a block of amendments for which there would be no opposition to addressing as the next block on this side.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, would that list include the other language I had in my unanimous consent request that would take us to a conclusion? I believe I understood the minority leader was saying that it would not. Is that accurate?

Mr. DASCHLE. The majority leader is correct. We will be in a position—and could be in a position in the not too distant future—to agree ultimately to a finite list of amendments. I was not aware that the distinguished leader would be interested in pursuing this this afternoon. This is the first I heard of it. But we would be prepared at some point certainly during the time these amendments are being considered to offer perhaps a final list that would bring us to closure on the bill. I would be happy to work with the majority leader over the recess in an effort to finalize that list, and proceed with that goal in mind.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would object to the request at this time. But I am encouraged that we could get together and work to try to find a way to develop a list that would complete this very important education bill and bring it to final passage.

I think we should pursue this to see if we can develop the list. I don't know how long it would be.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the leader yield for a question?

Mr. LOTT. I will in just a moment.

It sounded as if we had around 20 amendments, and it sounded as if the minority leader added three or four that were not on our list. We are talking about as many as 24 amendments. We have taken up six. That would put us at 30. I don't think that is necessarily an excessive list on something that is this important.

But the point is, if we could at least pursue some finite list that would get us to a conclusion, I would certainly like to do that.

I would be glad to yield to Senator KENNEDY.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if I could ask the majority leader, since probably the first priority of American families—even beyond having small class sizes, well-trained teachers, modern schools and computers, digital divide, afterschool programs, and safety and security in the schools—is the reduced opportunity for children to be able to have access to guns prior to going to school, it is not going to make much difference if we have small class sizes and guns are in the school.

I am asking the majority leader if he is unwilling to permit a vote on the Senate floor of the Lautenberg amendment, which is really directed towards safety and security in the schools, as part of the measure. I think this is enormously important because we want to see the conclusion of the debate on ESEA. But I think it is important for Members to know whether we are going to be denied an opportunity to deal with what is the most important concern of parents; that is, safety and security in schools.

I am wondering what the position of the majority leader is on that issue.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I might respond, this is about elementary and secondary education. Obviously, there is a lot we need to do to be of assistance to administrators, teachers, parents, and children at the elementary and secondary education level. Certainly, the local and State officials need to do more. We need to improve the quality of our schools, they need to be child centered, and they need to be safe and drug free. But I think it is about elementary and secondary education, and amendments should be germane to this area.

I think it is a far stretch to say that a Lautenberg amendment which has to do with gun shows relates to elementary and secondary education. I think we should be sensitive to that area. We should do what we can to provide safety for children, and to make sure children don't get guns, have access to them, or make use of them.

But I also think one of the things we can do that I supported, and which is in the juvenile justice bill that we passed earlier, and was in the making for 3

years—that included assistance for schools and dealing with these safety problems—for instance, funds would be available for metal detectors. A lot of schools are now doing that. They have a greater need for assistance. That is why I wanted to get the juvenile justice bill through. While I still plan to urge the juvenile justice conference report be completed, and it be brought back to the Senate, that is the place where this issue or these issues should be dealt with.

The direct answer to the Senator's question is it is not germane, and I think it would be a major problem with elementary and secondary education legislation. Certainly, I would object to it.

Mr. KENNEDY. If I could briefly follow up, in 1994, the Senator from Texas, Mr. GRAMM, offered an amendment cosponsored by the Republican leader. There was no objection from that side of the aisle to that measure at that particular time. I don't know how the Senator voted at that time, or whether he indicated it was appropriate to bring it up at that time. But it was noted as the gun amendment. The Senate has addressed the gun issues. It was brought up by the Senator from Texas and was cosponsored by the majority leader at that time. I believe the Senator from Mississippi voted for it at that time.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, without knowing exactly which Gramm amendment the Senator is speaking of, the way he described it, I probably voted for it and was supportive of it. But one of the problems I have, as suggested earlier, is that I understand, for instance, it leaves out the Ashcroft amendment. He has been very cooperative, to use that famous word, in not insisting that he be included in the earlier groupings. He at one point actually could have, within his rights, actually forced us to vote on it, and he didn't do it.

I would want to talk to both sides about including the Ashcroft amendment. It doesn't include the two managers' amendments, or the two leaders' amendments, which I think surely we would be willing to do. And it doesn't bring the bill to third reading. I think we need to talk about those issues, and I hope we can do that.

Mr. President, if I could proceed, I had indicated earlier this year that we would go to the Defense authorization bill. I believe it was this week. For a variety of reasons, we weren't able to go to Defense authorization. Of course, the way we usually do these bills is we go to the Defense authorization and complete that, and then go to the Defense appropriations bill and complete both of them.

Earlier there were objections to taking up the Agriculture appropriations bill. I might say now that I understand why it has not been completed by the House. We thought the House would act on Agriculture appropriations this week. They did not do that. We have in

the past quite often gone to appropriations bills in the Senate and took them up to the third reading but without actually completing them and waiting for the House to act.

Senator DASCHLE has indicated there are some points within the Agriculture bill in the Senate with which they have problems, and they want to have, I guess, an option to remove provisions of the Agriculture appropriations bill using rule XVI.

It is obviously very important. Even though we took the emergency agriculture portion, \$7.1 billion, out of the Agriculture appropriations bill and put it in the crop insurance bill that just passed, it still has some disaster money in it and some emergency moneys, I believe, for North Carolina and other areas. I hope we can find a way to get an agreement to go to that bill or to the DOD appropriations bill.

There we are. We have been unable to get an agreement to go to DOD authorization. We have not yet been able to work out something on Agriculture or Defense. However, hopefully during this recess we can look at the importance of these issues and see if we can get an agreement of how to proceed on one or two of these.

I think we are close to getting agreement on the e-commerce digital signature bill and also very close on bankruptcy, and therefore perhaps those two could be combined along with the satellite loan bill. That may be available early in the week we come back. I hope it will be because I think there are only two or three points outstanding on the three of them.

For now, I ask consent that the Senate turn to the DOD authorization bill, S. 2549, and only DOD-related amendments be in order during the pendency of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I object. I simply again indicate my reason for objecting is not because I don't want to go to DOD authorization. I would love very much to work with our majority leader in attempting to proceed to that bill. I have no problem with calling it up and permitting the full Senate to work its will.

Again, he has proposed that it be done with only relevant amendments. I remind the majority leader, Senator HUTCHINSON offered a forced abortions in China amendment to DOD authorization just 2 years ago, and there have been many Republican nonrelevant amendments offered.

I assume I am protecting the rights of Members on both sides of the aisle in insisting we have the opportunity to offer amendments, and I will work with the majority leader to see that we can take up this bill and work through his concern about amendments.

Until we can work that out, I object to moving to it.

Mr. LOTT. We had talked, Mr. President, about seeing if we could come to an agreement on how to proceed to the

Defense appropriations bill, realizing that the authorizers want to get their bill done because, among other things, it does authorize and make some changes in law. It is not just about spending. It does have some very important language in it with regard to health benefits for our military personnel and their families and retirees. So there is a need to get the authorization bill done, and we need to find a way to get it done.

Another way to proceed would be to take up the Department of Defense appropriations bill. I know Senator STEVENS talked to Senator BYRD and Senator DASCHLE about going ahead to that, even though the House has not acted, on the assumption that the House will act on that the week we return and we would probably be able to take up that House bill or it would be here before we complete it. However, it is hard to say now if that will be accomplished or not. We don't know that the House will have it done by Tuesday of next week or Wednesday of the week we come back.

I ask consent that we go to the Defense appropriations bill which was reported out of the Appropriations Committee on May 18 by unanimous vote of all the members of the Appropriations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I object again for two reasons: First, the bill is not here; and, second, because we have not taken up the authorization bill and our colleagues have indicated that is a very important matter. We always attempt to deal with the authorization requirements prior to the time we deal with the appropriations requirements. This unanimous consent request does not allow for that.

I ask the majority leader what is wrong with taking up the one appropriations bill that has been sent here by the House. I note that on May 22 the Transportation appropriations bill was received from the House. It is pending in the Senate.

I won't ask unanimous consent, but I ask the majority leader whether his intention would be to take up the one House-passed bill that is here. Clearly, we would have no objections to doing that. It is important we make the most use of our time. Because the House-passed appropriations bill having to do with transportation is already here, I am curious as to why we have chosen not to take it up until now and why we wouldn't take it up just as soon as we come back.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I certainly agree. I think we should take it up as soon as we can. It has come over from the House, but it has not been reported, I don't believe, from the subcommittee or the full committee here.

I asked the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator SHELBY, why that is the case—and, by the way, immediately urged him to do it as quickly as he can—and I understand it was be-

cause Senator LAUTENBERG of New Jersey had wanted another hearing at the subcommittee level before they marked it up, and that they were going to need, in the next few days, to get it done.

Hopefully, they will report that bill out by Wednesday or Thursday of the week we return and we will be able to go to that; either if we got it Thursday, we could do it Thursday or Friday, or we could go do it the first thing next week. I am pushing the committee to act on it. I don't know what the outstanding issue is, but I understand they wanted to have one more committee hearing for some reason.

Let me provide a little incentive to all sides to work together on the Defense appropriations bill. I will not now move to proceed to it, but I will move to proceed to that bill when we reconvene after the recess, and have a vote, if necessary, on proceeding to the Defense appropriations bill.

But over the next 10 days, we have time to work between the authorizers and the appropriators and everybody who has a concern about that bill, and hopefully something can be worked out so we can proceed on the authorization bill, and then, of course, immediately go to the appropriations bill after that.

If we cannot get something worked out over the recess period or agree on some sort of schedule, I will have no alternative at that point but to move to proceed to the DOD appropriations bill. I prefer to have something we have worked out between the authorizers and the appropriators and the Democratic leadership and the Republican leadership so we can make good use of our time.

We do have 4 weeks in the month of June when we come back. We have a lot of work we need to do. We need to move at least half a dozen appropriations bills during the month of June. We need to take a look at the House-passed China trade status bill, see how much time we would need on the floor, and try to get some idea of what amendments might be offered.

It would not be my intent to try to limit amendments on the China permanent trade status bill. I think we should say right from the beginning if we add any new material to it, any new amendments or language, it would have to go back to conference with the House and then vote again in the House and Senate. That may be OK, but I want to take a little time when we come back and see if we can work through the time that would be required, when would be the first time to take it up, and what amendments might be in the offing from both sides of the aisle. Our staffs will be working on that during the recess. Plus, we could have other issues.

I mentioned the conference report and other bills that are pending, so we are going to have to have a full month in June. I also remind my colleagues that in July—I was looking at the calendar last night and was really a little

bit chagrined to realize we only will have 3 weeks between the Fourth of July recess and the conventions in August.

I had really thought we would have four; if we could do five or six appropriations bills in that window. So we really are under pressure, with the 7 weeks we have in the summer, to move 11 appropriations bills. That is going to be a monumental task, and it is going to take work with each other on both sides of the aisle. I know that. We cannot move it without everybody giving it a shot. But it makes it awfully hard for us to be doing other issues, other than the China trade bill, which we hope to get worked in there at some point.

With that, I think we have talked enough about schedule. I hope we can come to some agreements over the next 10 days as to exactly how we will proceed the first week we are back.

I yield the floor.

#### COMMEMORATING FREE ELECTIONS IN CROATIA

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, today I join with my colleagues, Senators FEINGOLD, HUTCHISON, ABRAHAM, and LIEBERMAN, who will introduce a resolution congratulating the people of Croatia on their successful parliamentary and presidential elections, the peaceful transition of power, and new initiatives for reform. In addition to congratulating the people of Croatia, the resolution expresses U.S. support for their progress and encourages Croatian participation in the NATO Partnership for Peace. One day, I hope that we will be expressing our support for Croatia, and other nations with similar democratic inclination, as members of NATO itself.

The Balkan nations embracing democracy must be supported at every opportunity available because the government could so easily have taken the other path. The leaders of Croatia could have chosen to repress popular involvement and other fundamental rights of democracy, but instead have chosen the harder but correct path of working through discourse, debate, and democracy. Because we have also been through these trials as a nation, I hope that the American people will watch closely the progress of the Croatian people and will support their path to freedom, stability, and peace.

The most important benefit to come out of this election will be the resolution of Croatia's domestic difficulties. Through the successful election, the Croatian people have taken the reins of control. In addition to the power instilled by this self-determination, the Croatian people are now spurred to take up the mission of reform that should further improve their government. Among the stated goals of President Mesic are the reintroduction of Serbian refugees to the homes they left behind, reform of the privatization system that has faced serious corruption

allegations, and support for the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. These improvements would certainly go far to legitimize the new Administration in the view of the international community, but more importantly, in the eyes of the Croatian people. President Mesic's continued efforts on these fronts will show its people that their new government takes seriously the need for honesty and accountability.

As the government wins the support of its people, I am also encouraged by the efforts of the new Administration to get involved with the European community. In such a volatile region, a nation uniting the many groups will be the key to fostering a stable political and economic atmosphere. Part of the victory of democracy in Croatia has been the new spirit of regional harmony that I hope will spread to its neighbors. Peace in the Balkan nations will only come with honest attempts to live with differences, and Croatia will be a leader in the efforts for peace there.

In addition to better conditions in the Balkans, democracy will encourage the involvement of other foreign nations. Just two weeks ago, Croatian President Stipe Mesic met with French President Jacques Chirac to discuss an agreement on stabilization and association, as well as the Croatian entrance to the NATO Partnership for Peace. The resolution I am supporting today suggests U.S. support for the addition of Croatia in the partnership, and I am happy to inform my colleagues that the nations of NATO have announced that Croatia will become a full member of the Partnership for Peace program today. This is truly a great accomplishment, and it affirms the commitment of all NATO allies to help Croatia in its chosen path.

In addition to my appreciation for the democratic and international progress of the Croatian people, I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the work of the Croatian American Association in bringing this subject to my attention and to the attention of the American people. The Croatian American community has worked tirelessly to create bonds of friendship between our two nations, and I hope that as Croatia becomes more democratic and involved in worldwide political affairs that we, as Americans, will continue to support them.

I hope that this resolution will be an additional bond between two nations that democratic tenets have already joined.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The majority leader.

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 3244

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I understand H.R. 3244 is at the desk. I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3244) to combat trafficking of persons, especially into the sex trade, slavery, and slavery-like conditions in the United States.

Mr. LOTT. I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

#### AUTHORIZING THE 2000 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN TO BE RUN THROUGH THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of H. Con. Res. 280, and that the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 280) authorizing the 2000 District Of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to be run through the Capitol Grounds.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements appear in the RECORD.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 280) was agreed to.

#### NATIONAL MOMENT OF REMEMBRANCE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H. Con. Res. 302, and the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 302) calling on the people of the United States to observe a National Moment of Remembrance to honor the men and women of the United States who died in pursuit of freedom and peace.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I rise to offer my support for passage of H. Con. Res. 302, a resolution proclaiming a National Moment of Remembrance.

As we gather with family and friends in observance of Memorial Day, I urge all Americans to take time to reflect upon the day's true meaning. Whether we attend a public observance, mark a grave, or simply bow our heads in quiet reflection, all Americans should remember to honor those who by serving,