

will support this Act's approach with the early receipt facility.

I appreciate that Senator MURKOWSKI has included Title III in the new bill with my proposal to create a new DOE Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel Research. This new Office would organize a research program to explore new, improved national strategies for spent nuclear fuel.

Spent fuel has immense energy potential—that we are simply tossing away with our focus only on a permanent repository. We could be recycling that spent fuel back into civilian fuel and extracting additional energy. We could follow the examples of France, the U.K., and Japan in reprocessing the fuel to not only extract more energy, but also to reduce the volume and toxicity of the final waste forms.

Now I am well aware that reprocessing is not viewed as economically desirable now, because of today's very low uranium prices. Furthermore, it must only be done with careful attention to proliferation issues. But I submit that the U.S. should be prepared for a future evaluation that may determine that we are too hasty today to treat this spent fuel as waste, and that instead we should have been viewing it as an energy resource for future generations.

We do not have the knowledge today to make that decision. Title III establishes a research program to evaluate options to provide real data for such a future decision.

This research program would have other benefits. We may want to reduce the toxicity of materials in any repository to address public concerns. Or we may find we need another repository in the future, and want to incorporate advanced technologies into the final waste products at that time. We could, for example, decide that we want to maximize the storage potential of a future repository, and that would require some treatment of the spent fuel before final disposition.

Title III requires that a range of advanced approaches for spent fuel be studied with the new Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel Research. As we do this, I will encourage the Department to seek international cooperation. I know, based on personal contacts, that France, Russia, and Japan are eager to join with us in an international study of spent fuel options.

Title III requires that we focus on research programs that minimize proliferation and health risks from the spent fuel. And it requires that we study the economic implications of each technology.

With Title III, the United States will be prepared, some years in the future, to make the most intelligent decision regarding the future of nuclear energy as one of our major power sources. Maybe at that time, we'll have other better energy alternatives and decide that we can move away from nuclear power. Or we may find that we need nuclear energy to continue and even ex-

pand its current contribution to our nation's power grid. In any case, this research will provide the framework to guide Congress in these future decisions.

I want to specifically discuss one of the compromises that Senator MURKOWSKI has developed in his Manager's Amendment. In my view, his largest compromise involves the choice between the Environmental Protection Agency or the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to set the radiation-protection standards for Yucca Mountain and for the "early release facility."

The NRC has the technical expertise to set these standards. Furthermore, the NRC is a non-political organization, in sharp contrast to the political nature of the EPA. We need unbiased technical knowledge in setting these standards, there should be no place for politics at all. The EPA has proposed a draft standard already, that has been widely criticized for its inconsistency and lack of scientific rigor—events that do not enhance their credibility for this role.

I appreciate, however, the care that Senator MURKOWSKI has demonstrated in providing the ultimate authority to the EPA. His new language requires both the NRC and the National Academy of Sciences to comment on the EPA's draft standard. And he provides a period of time, until mid-2001, for the EPA to assess concerns with their standard and issue a valid standard.

These additions have the effect of providing a strong role for both the NRC and NAS to share their scientific knowledge with the EPA and help guide the EPA toward a credible standard.

The NRC should be complimented for their courageous stand against the EPA in this issue. Their issuance of a scientifically appropriate standard stands in stark contrast to the first effort from the EPA. Thanks to the actions of the NRC, the EPA can be guided toward reasonable standards.

Certainly my preference is to have the NRC issue the final standard. But I appreciate the effort that Senator MURKOWSKI has expended in seeking compromise in this difficult area.

By following the procedures in the Manager's Amendment, we can allow the EPA to set the final standard, guided by the inputs from the NRC and NAS. Thus, I will support the Manager's Amendment.

I thank Senator MURKOWSKI for his superb leadership in preparing this new act. We need to pass this Manager's Amendment with a veto-proof majority, to ensure that we finally attain some movement in the nation's ability to deal with high level nuclear waste.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, during today's debate on the nuclear waste legislation, I want to take my first opportunity to Call the Bankroll in the new year.

As we all know, nuclear waste has been a very contentious issue in past years.

I'm not here today to recap the arguments on either side, but instead to offer the public and my colleagues a picture of the money that has been spent by interests on both sides of the issue.

Of course the Nuclear Energy Institute is the chief lobbyist on behalf of companies that operate nuclear power plants in the U.S., and has led the fight for the nuclear waste legislation, in its various forms, that is now before us.

NEI gave more than \$135,000 in soft money to the parties and more than \$70,000 in PAC money to candidates in the 1998 election cycle.

In addition to NEI, a number of utilities which operate nuclear plants were also significant PAC and soft money donors in the '98 cycle, including:

Commonwealth Edison, which gave \$110,000 in soft money and more than \$106,000 in PAC money, and Florida Power and Light, which gave nearly \$300,000 in soft money to the parties and more than \$182,000 in PAC money to candidates.

Many of these donors didn't waste any time before donating in the current cycle either—NEI already reported donating more than \$66,000 in soft money, and Commonwealth Edison already reported \$90,000 in soft money donations in 1999.

On the other side of this fight is a coalition of environmental groups that has opposed this bill in its various forms, writing to members of the Senate last September to urge us to protect our country and our environment by voting against the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1999.

Among these groups is the Sierra Club, which gave more than \$236,000 in PAC money to candidates in the '98 cycle, and Friends of the Earth, which gave just under \$4,000 during that same period.

I also think it's important here to make a larger point that reaches well beyond the nuclear waste debate—that interests can exercise their clout not just through PAC and soft money donations but through yet another loophole in the law—phony issue ads.

Now it is very difficult to determine how much money is spent on phony issue ads. They are not reported under current law, and they should be. Nonetheless, some estimates have been made by news organizations and independent analysts. The Sierra Club spent an estimated \$1.5 million on issue ads in the '98 election cycle, and the Nuclear Energy Institute reportedly spent \$600,000 on issue ads in just two Senate races in the last cycle.

Now I can't say that even this is a complete picture of all the interests

lobbying on this bill, but it does give my colleagues and the public some idea of what interests are trying to influence the passage—or the defeat—of this bill, and a picture of the huge sums of money they are using to pursue their goals.

#### RECOGNITION OF SEATTLE'S LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, as many of my colleagues know, I had the pleasure—or displeasure—of being in Seattle during the now infamous World Trade Organization meeting last fall, shortly after Congress adjourned for the year. The images broadcast via the airwaves portrayed a negative image of Seattle and a narrow view of the debate in this country surrounding free trade. The spectacle of the "Battle in Seattle" that most of us saw on the evening news also did not accurately represent the full experience that law enforcement officers on the street endured. These officers suffered through appalling work conditions largely attributable to poor planning by public officials responsible for such preparation. In spite of these conditions, the incidents of confrontation and violence were kept to a surprising minimum. These fine men and women in law enforcement deserve recognition for their vigilance, their restraint, and their dedication.

Officers, wearing 60-70 pounds of tear gas drenched equipment, were forced to stand the line with minimal rest, no bathroom facilities, and little food—for shifts of 16 to 17 hours. Given the fact that officers endured a continual barrage of insults and projectiles from out-of-control protestors, I am surprised that there were not more instances where frustration and exhaustion temporarily superceded discipline and training. It is a credit to the men and women of the Seattle Police Department, the King County Sheriff's Office, the Washington State Patrol, and the many officers from other localities, that their restraint kept a bad situation from becoming much, much worse.

As with any confrontational event involving thousands of people, mistakes were made by both sides. It is clear, however, that the law enforcement officers involved with the WTO in Seattle overwhelmingly exhibited professionalism and conduct above and beyond the call of duty—for that they should be commended. To the officers who, against great odds, did everything they could to preserve peace and order, I offer my sincere thanks.

#### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, February 8, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,694,611,209,189.87 (Five trillion, six hundred ninety-four billion, six hundred eleven million, two hundred nine thousand, one hundred eighty-nine dollars and eighty-seven cents).

One year ago, February 8, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,585,153,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred eighty-five billion, one hundred fifty-three million).

Five years ago, February 8, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,805,605,000,000 (Four trillion, eight hundred five billion, six hundred five million).

Ten years ago, February 8, 1990, the Federal debt stood at \$2,984,058,000,000 (Two trillion, nine hundred eighty-four billion, fifty-eight million).

Fifteen years ago, February 8, 1985, the Federal debt stood at \$1,679,171,000,000 (One trillion, six hundred seventy-nine billion, one hundred seventy-one million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,015,440,209,189.87 (Four trillion, fifteen billion, four hundred forty million, two hundred nine thousand, one hundred eighty-nine dollars and eighty-seven cents) during the past 15 years.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

##### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting a treaty and sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### REPORT TO THE CONGRESS CONCERNING EMIGRATION LAWS AND POLICIES OF ALBANIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 85

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

##### *To the Congress of the United States:*

I am submitting an updated report to the Congress concerning the emigration laws and policies of Albania. The report indicates continued Albanian compliance with U.S. and international standards in the area of emigration. In fact, Albania has imposed no emigration restrictions, including exit visa requirements, on its population since 1991.

On December 5, 1997, I determined and reported to the Congress that Albania was not in violation of paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of subsections 402(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 or paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of subsection 409(a) of that Act. That action allowed for the continuation of normal trade relations (NTR) status for Albania and certain other activities without the requirement of an annual waiver. This

semiannual report is submitted as required by law pursuant to the determination of December 5, 1997.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 9, 2000.

#### REPORT TO THE CONGRESS ON THREE RESCISSIONS OF BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 86

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, to the Committees on the Budget, Appropriations, Energy and Natural Resources, and Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

##### *To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report three rescissions of budget authority, totaling \$128 million, and two deferrals of budget authority, totaling \$1.6 million.

The proposed rescissions affect the programs of the Department of Energy and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The proposed deferrals affect programs of the Department of State and International Assistance Programs.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 9, 2000.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:34 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1451) to establish the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission Act.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 632. An act to provide assistance for poison prevention and to stabilize the funding of regional poison control centers.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 702(b) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-120), the Minority Leader has appointed the following member to the National Commission for the Review of the National Reconnaissance Office: Mr. Tony Beilenson of Maryland.

The message also announced that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 629(b) the Speaker has reappointed the following member on the part of the House to the Board of the Federal Judicial Center for a 5-year term: Ms. Laurie E. Michael of Virginia.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412) the Speaker has appointed the following member on the part of the House to the board of Directors of the National Urban Air Toxics Research Center to fill the existing vacancy thereon: Mr. Thomas F. Burks II of Texas.