

than half those of MTBE. In addition, a preliminary report by the University notes that existing literature suggests a faster degradation rate for ETBE than MTBE. The Nebraska Ethanol Board and several federal agencies have proposed additional research on the properties of ETBE.

Starting this year, federal Phase II reformulated gasoline, RVG, must deliver a four percent to seven percent reduction in NO_x emissions relative to the 1990 baseline gasoline. ETBE is particularly well suited for meeting this requirement because ETBE can reduce aromatic content in RFG. Automobile NO_x emissions decrease with increasing octane number and with decreasing aromatics content. ETBE fills the bill on both counts.

ETBE's higher octane—110–112 (R+M)/2—enables an RFG blender to substitute ETBE for aromatics, including benzene, as a source of RFG octane. Reducing aromatics content, in turn, reduces emissions of NO_x and toxics, while improving driveability performance.

For U.S. Refiners, this means more reduction—via dilution—in the levels of aromatics, olefin, and sulfur, all of which are undesirable in RFG.

Petroleum use for transportation will remain one of the largest contributors of greenhouse gas emissions in the U.S. Through the year 2020, according to projections by the U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration. In 2020, petroleum will account for 42 percent of greenhouse gas emissions in the U.S., mostly for transportation use, according to the report. Overall, carbon emissions from energy use will increase at an average annual rate of 1.3 percent due to rising energy demand and slow penetration of renewable, DOE said in its Annual Energy Outlook: 2000 report.

Because ETBE is made from renewable ethanol and natural gas feedstock, it is superior in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, because the use of ETBE often replaces aromatics from the gasoline pool, its ability to reduce the harmful pollutants as well as greenhouse gas emissions from gasoline are improved.

As a result of the addition of renewable ethanol, ETBE is an oxygenated fuel. In addition, ETBE has a higher octane rating and lower Reid vapor pressure, RVP, than its competitor, MTBE. ETBE blended gasoline has several benefits:

The oxygen reduces carbon monoxide emissions.

The lower Rvp lessens pollution that forms ozone.

Simply through volumetric displacement, ETBE reduces sulfur, toxic substance and other harmful elements of gasoline.

The high octane rating reduces the need for carcinogenic hydrocarbons used to increase octane such as benzene, which cause cancers.

Due to ethanol's positive energy balance when produced from grain (1 to 1.3) and cellulose (1 to 2), it reduces greenhouse gases.

One of the primary reasons ethanol has difficulty competing in the federal RFG program is that it increases the volatility of gasoline. By turning ethanol into ETBE, this concern is eliminated. ETBE's blending properties are an excellent match for both engine and emissions performance, much better than replacing MTBE with more alkylates.

Another issue with ethanol is transportation. Currently in the U.S., ethanol blended gasoline cannot practically be shipped to markets via pipelines—the most common method of transportation for petroleum products. Gasoline blended with ETBE is compatible with the current gasoline distribution system, can be pipelined and stored with gasoline and will reduce the transportation and storage costs associated with ethanol usage.

ETBE can be blending at volumes of up to 17 vol%, with the possibility of the maximum blending being increased to 22 vol%, while straight ethanol is capped at 10 vol% and MTBE is limited to 15 vol%. This means that blending gasoline with ethanol can stretch our nation's gasoline supply further.

The higher allowable volume of ETBE means:

ETBE blends may prove to be the most cost-effective means of bringing the use of alternative fuels to the market place, consistent with new environmental and energy policy, EPACT, demands being placed on U.S. refiners.

ETBE blends contain more volume derived from renewable, domestic energy sources.

While ethanol plays an important role in the federal RFG program, its use is mostly confined to the few RFG areas in the Midwest. Through ETBE, ethanol use could expand to play a larger role in the RFG program as a whole.

If ETBE could capture only a small portion of the U.S. Gasoline market—for example a percentage of the RFG demand in the Northeast, where little of no ethanol is currently used—the increase in ethanol used in gasoline would be significant.

As much as 350 million gallons of new ethanol demand would be created if just 60 percent of the oxygenates used in the eight states of the Northeastern States for Coordinated Air Use Management, NESCAUM, were to use ETBE.

Along with the increase in ethanol use comes a likely increase in corn demand to produce the ethanol. More than 140 million bushels of corn would be required to meet the aforementioned ETBE demand.

ETBE has been in commercial production in Europe since the early 1990s. While France is the European leader for both the production and consumption of ETBE, other European countries are following. European policy makers prefer ETBE to MTBE because of its overall greenhouse gas reductions that come from its renewable ethanol content. ETBE is preferred over ethanol by European refiners because of better logistics and improved gasoline and drive ability quality.

In addition, more ether demand is expected with the new European cleaner-burning fuel legislation taking effect in 2000 and 2005.

The Clean Fuels Development Coalition is a non-profit organization dedicated to the development of alternative fuels and technologies to improve air quality and reduce U.S. Dependence on imported oil. The broad CFDC membership includes ethanol and ether producers, agricultural interests, automobile manufacturers, state government agencies, and engineering and new technology companies. Since its beginning in 1988, the coalition has become a respected source of information for state, local, and federal policy makers as well as private industry on a range of transportation, energy, and environmental issues.

NOW IS NOT THE TIME TO RE-ENGAGE WITH THE INDONESIAN MILITARY

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, colleagues, I rise today to draw attention to a recent decision by the Administration to reinstate military ties with the government of Indonesia. Despite congressional concerns, the U.S. navy, marines, and coast guard last week began a 10-day joint military exercise known as CARAT, Cooperation Afloat Readiness and Training, with their Indonesian military counterparts. Although

the Administration sees this mission as a routine good-will mission, it is in fact the first time U.S. and Indonesian armed forces have worked together since the United States cut military ties with Indonesia last year. Colleagues, in case you don't recall, we cut those military ties after East Timor was devastated by Indonesian troops. We cut those ties because Indonesian soldiers are reported to have been active participants in a coordinated, massive campaign of murder, rape, and forced displacement in East Timor.

The administration's decision to go forth with a CARAT exercise again this summer is simply indefensible. Given the human rights violations committed by the Indonesian military in East Timor and the lack of accountability for them, and the Indonesian military's continued ties to militias in West Timor, one must ask not only the question why we are so eager to re-engage with this military at all, but why we feel compelled to do so now. Now is not the time to conduct joint exercises with the Indonesian military; now is the time to demand its accountability. To do otherwise is to tacitly condone its conduct.

Conditions continue to deteriorate in East Timorese refugee camps in West Timor and throughout the Indonesian archipelago. Up to 125,000 East Timorese still languish in militia-controlled refugee camps in West Timor almost one year after the people of East Timor voted overwhelmingly for independence from Indonesia. Many of the refugees wish to return home but are afraid to do so. Today refugee camps remain highly militarized, with East Timorese members of the Indonesian military living among civilian refugees. And despite promises by the Indonesian government to disarm and disband militias, there are credible reports of Indonesian military support for militia groups. These same militias have easy access to modern weapons. Earlier this month the U.N. High Commissioner on Refugees had to suspend refugee registration indefinitely due to violent militia assaults on its staff, volunteers and refugees, and though UNHCR has continued its work in other areas, UNHCR and other aid workers continue work under extremely dangerous conditions.

There has also been an upsurge in militia border incursions into East Timor with attacks on U.N. Peacekeepers and civilians. I regret to say that earlier this week a peacekeeper from New Zealand was shot and killed. Militia leaders, the Indonesian military, and the West Timorese press continue to sponsor a mass disinformation campaign alleging horrific conditions in East Timor and abuse by international forces. Further, Indonesia has yet to arrest a single militia leader or member of its military accused of human rights violations in East Timor. Instead of reinitiating joint military exercises and allowing the sale of certain

spare military parts, the Administration should increase its pressure on the government of Indonesia to fulfill past promises to disarm and disband militias in West Timor, and insure today that the Indonesian military is not linked to such militias. Militia leaders must be removed from refugee camps and those accused of human rights violations must be held accountable. Furthermore, Indonesia must make real its pledge to provide international and local relief workers safe and full access to all refugees.

There is currently considerable unrest throughout the Indonesian archipelago. Reports abound about the direct involvement of the Indonesian military in much of the violence. In the past nineteen months thousands of people in Maluku, also known as the Moluccan Islands, have been killed in fighting between Christians and Muslims. It is known that members of the Indonesian military supported and, in some cases, caused the violence. On July 18, Indonesia's Minister of Defense Juwono Sudarsono admitted that there were "some or even many" army members who have become a "major cause of clashes" in Ambon. Credible human rights organizations also report an escalation of violence in West Papua with the Indonesian military actively supporting East Timor-style militias there. Moreover, the Indonesian military has repeatedly broken a cease-fire in the province of Aceh.

Conditions in Indonesia are deteriorating. On Sunday U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan told Indonesia's President Wahid that U.N. peacekeepers may be needed for the archipelago but President Wahid said his government could end the conflict by itself. He did note, however, that Indonesia's overstretched military might need logistical aid from friendly countries such as the United States. I worry that the decision the Administration has made to re-initiate military ties with Indonesia is sending the wrong signal to President Wahid. It should be made very clear to President Wahid that the U.S. will not provide assistance to Indonesia to do what it did before in East Timor.

Although I believe we should support Indonesia, we must recognize that the type of support we provide will directly influence the shape Indonesia takes in the future. The Administration has not only proceeded with the CARAT exercise despite congressional concerns but is moving ahead with "Phase I" of a three phase program of re-engagement with the Indonesian military. This could include the sale of certain spare military parts to Indonesia. Given the deteriorating conditions in Indonesia and the human rights record of Indonesian soldiers, do we really want to do this?

I rise today to urge my colleagues to voice their opposition to the CARAT exercise and to oppose any proposal for strengthening military ties with Indonesia in the near future. Again, I would

like to make very clear that I believe the U.S. should support Indonesia but we must recognize that the type of support we provide now will directly influence the shape Indonesia takes in the future. Resuming a military relationship now not only threatens any future reforms in Indonesia but jeopardizes efforts already made to subjugate the Indonesian military to civilian authority. U.S. policy towards Indonesia should support democratic reform and demand accountability for those responsible for alleged human rights violations in East Timor and elsewhere. I fail to see how the CARAT exercise or lifting the embargo on military sales to Indonesia does either.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I rise to talk about inter-generational issues related to Federal budget spending. We will never have a better time to consider such issues as inter-generational equity than now during a time of large projected surpluses. These large projected surpluses provide us with a great deal more flexibility in choosing among priorities and in determining our legacy to future generations.

Until recently, we were not so lucky. For more than thirty years, the budget projection reports from the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget were a source of growing despair for the American people. As each year went by, CBO and OMB would present worse news: larger deficits, larger national debt levels, and larger net interest payments. As the government's appetite for debt expanded, fewer and fewer dollars were available for private investment.

In the beginning, experts explained that deficits were a good thing because they stimulated economic growth and created jobs. Over time, however, the voices of experts opposed to large deficits grew louder; they argued that deficits caused inflation, increased the cost of private capital, mortgaged away our future—just at the time when we needed to be preparing for the retirement of the large Baby Boom generation. As the opinions of the experts shifted, so did public opinion.

During the 1980s and 1990s, the federal deficit became public enemy number one. Great efforts were made to understand it, to propose solutions to reduce it, and to explain how much better life would be without it. During election season, the air-waves were filled with promises and plans to get rid of the deficit and pay off the national debt. Editorial page writers reached deep into their creative reservoir to coin new phrases and create new metaphors to describe the problem. Books were published. Nonprofit organizations were created. Constitutional amendments were called for. There was even a new political party created on account of the deficit.

In the 1990s—and at great political risk—we finally started taking action to control the size of the deficits and the growth of the national debt. I am proud to have participated in and voted

for three budget acts—in 1990, 1993, and 1997—which have radically altered the fiscal condition of the Federal government and the debate about how the public's hard-earned tax dollars should be spent.

The enactment of these three budget acts—particularly the 1993 and 1997 budget acts—coupled with impressive gains in private sector productivity and economic growth led to a remarkable reversal of our deficit and debt trends. Deficits started shrinking in 1994. We celebrated our first unified budget surplus of \$70 billion in 1998. Over the next 10 years, if we maintain current spending and revenue policies, CBO projects an eye-popping unified budget surplus of \$4.5 trillion. I am proud that we are able to celebrate the fruits of our fiscal restraint because we had the sheer will and political courage to put ourselves on a spending diet.

Today, however, I want to call your attention to what could be called the "unintended consequences" of our fiscal responsibility. Not only have we allowed total Federal spending to dip below 20% of GDP levels not seen since the mid-1970s, but we are also on course to let spending drop to 15.6% of GDP by 2010. We have not seen spending levels this low since the 1950s. At the same time as total spending is declining as a percentage of GDP, the make up of our Federal spending is continuing to shift insignificant ways. An increasingly larger proportion of our spending is used for mandatory spending programs compared to discretionary spending programs. These numbers have important implications for the measurement of inter-generational equity.

Now that we have constrained spending and eliminated our budget deficits, the budget debate has shifted to questions about how to spend the surplus: on debt reduction, on tax cuts, on new discretionary spending programs, on fixing Social Security, or on creating a new Medicare prescription drug benefit?

I favor all of these things to varying degrees, as I suspect most of you do. The trick is to find the right balance among these initiatives. In finding the right balance, I believe one of the most important criterion in determining how to use these surpluses should be measuring inter-generational equity. Not only do we need to assess the amount of money we invest on our seniors versus our children, but we also need to assess the trends of mandatory versus discretionary spending.

Let me start with my own assessment of Federal spending on children and seniors. Today, the Federal government spends substantially more on seniors over the age of 65 than it does on children under the age of 18. For example, in 2000, the Federal government spent roughly \$17,000 per person on programs for the elderly, compared with only \$2,500 per person on programs for children. This means that at the Federal level, we are spending seven times

as much as people over the age of 65 as on children under the age of 18.

Even when we consider that states are the primary funders of primary and secondary education, the combined level of State and Federal spending still shows a dramatic contrast in spending on the old versus the young. At the state and Federal level, we are still spending 2.5 times the amount of money on people over the age of 65 as on children under the age of 18.

Given these discomfiting facts, it might seem logical that most of the current proposals for spending surplus dollars would be for investments in our children. Instead, this Congress has been proposing and voting to spend a major portion of the surpluses on the most politically organized voting bloc in the nation—those over the age of 65.

In the Senate alone, we have either acted on, or are expected to act on, the following proposals which directly benefit seniors only:

Eliminating the Social Security earnings test for workers over the age of 65 (10-year price tag: \$23 billion)

Allowing military retirees to opt out of Medicare and into TriCare or FEHBP (10-year price tag: \$90 billion)

Creating a new universal Medicare prescription drug benefit for seniors (10-year price tag: \$300 billion)

Medicare provider "give-backs" package (10-year price tag: \$40 billion)

Increasing the Federal income tax exemption provided to Social Security beneficiaries (10-year price tag: \$125 billion)

If Congress actually enacted all of these popular provisions into law, spending for seniors over the next 10 years would increase by \$578 billion—an amount equivalent to this year's entire discretionary spending budget.

At the same time as we are proposing, voting in favor of, and enacting legislation to improve benefits and tax cuts for seniors, we will be lucky to get legislation passed that will spend only an additional \$10 billion on children under the age of 18.

Why? The answer is not simply because seniors are politically organized voters and children are not. We also have to look at how most programs for seniors are funded versus programs for children. As the members of the Senate are well aware, most programs for seniors are funded through mandatory/entitlement spending. Spending increases in these programs are not subject to the annual appropriations process and are protected by automatic cost-of-living-adjustments (COLA) each year.

The spending programs that primarily benefit our children, on the other hand, are discretionary, which means they are subject to the annual appropriations process. There are no automatic spending increases when it comes to programs for our kids. Instead, most programs for kids are held victim to politics and spending caps.

As a result, the proportion of Federal government spending on mandatory versus discretionary spending has un-

dergone a dramatic shift. Back in 1965, the Federal government spent the equivalent of 6% of GDP on mandatory entitlement programs like Social Security and 12% of GDP on discretionary funding items like national defense, education, and public infrastructure. Put another way: 35 years ago, one-third of our budget funded entitlement programs and two-thirds of our budget funded discretionary spending programs.

The situation has now reversed. Today, we spend about two-thirds of our budget on entitlement programs and net interest payments and only one-third of our budget on discretionary spending programs.

I am particularly troubled by the decline in spending on discretionary spending initiatives. Although our tight discretionary spending budget caps were a useful tool in the past for eliminating deficits and lowering debt, they are not useful today in helping us assess the discretionary budget needs of the nation. Today, appropriated spending is contained through spending caps that are too tight for today's economic reality. We are left with a discretionary budget that bears little relationship to the needs of the nation and that leaves us little flexibility to solve some of the big problems that still need to be addressed: health care access for the uninsured, education, and research and development in the areas of science and technology.

The downward pressure on discretionary spending will become worse during the retirement of the Baby Boom generation—when the needs of programs on the mandatory spending side will increase dramatically. The coming demographic shift towards more retirees and fewer workers is NOT a "pig in a python" problem as described by some commentators whose economics are usually better than their metaphors. The ratio of workers needed to support each beneficiary does not increase after the baby boomers have become eligible for benefits. It remains the same.

In 10 years, the unprecedented demographic shift toward more retirees will begin. The number of seniors drawing on Medicare and Social Security will nearly double from 39 million to 77 million. The number of workers will grow only slightly from 137 to 145 million. Worse, if we continue to under-invest in the education and training of our youth, we will have no choice but to continue the terrible process of using H-1B visas to solve the problem of a shortage of skilled labor.

One of the least understood concepts regarding Social Security and Medicare is that neither is a contributory system with dedicated accounts for each individual. Both are intergenerational contracts. The generations in the work force agree to be taxed on behalf of eligible beneficiaries in exchange for the understanding that they will receive the same benefit when eligible. Both programs are forms

of social insurance—not welfare—but both are also transfer payment programs. We tax one group of people and transfer the money to another.

The proportion of spending on seniors—and the proportion of mandatory spending—will most surely increase as the baby boomers become eligible for transfer payments. Unless we want to raise taxes substantially or accrue massive amounts of debt, much of the squeeze will be felt by our discretionary spending programs. The spiral of under-investment in our children and in the future work force will continue. Our government will become more and more like an ATM machine.

What should we do about this situation?

I recommend a two step approach. Step one is to honestly assess whether we can "cut our way out of this problem". Do you think public opinion will permit future Congresses to vote for reduction in the growth of Medicare, Social Security, and the long-term care portion of Medicaid? At the moment my answer is a resounding "no". Indeed, as I said earlier, we can currently heading the opposite direction.

Step number two is to consider whether it is time for us to rewrite the social contract. The central question is this: Do the economic and social changes that have occurred since 1965 justify a different kind of safety net? I believe they do. I believe we need to rewrite and modernize the contract between Americans and the Federal government in regards to retirement income and health care.

We should transform the Social Security program so that annual contributions lead all American workers—regardless of income—to accumulate wealth by participating in the growth of the American economy. Whether the investments are made in low risk instruments such as government bonds or in higher risk stock funds, it is a mathematical certainty that fifty years from now a generation of American workers could be heading towards retirement with the security that comes with the ownership of wealth—if we rewrite the contract to allow them to do so.

Not only should we reform Social Security to allow workers to personally invest a portion of their payroll taxes, but we should also make sure those account contributions are progressive so that low and moderate income workers can save even more for their retirements. At the same time, it is important to make the traditional Social Security benefit formula even more progressive so that protections against poverty are even stronger for our low income seniors. Finally, it is important to change the law so that we can keep the promise to all 270 million current and future beneficiaries—and that will mean reforming the program to restore its solvency over the long-term.

In addition to reforming Social Security, we should end the idea of being uninsured in this nation by rewriting

our Federal laws so that eligibility for health insurance occurs simply as a result of being a citizen or a legal resident. We should fold existing programs—Medicare, Medicaid, VA benefits, FEHBP, and the income tax deduction—into a single system. And we should subsidize the purchase of health insurance only for those who need assistance. Enacting a Federal law that guarantees health insurance does not mean we should have socialized medicine. Personally, I favor using the private markets as much as possible—although there will be situations in which only the government can provide health care efficiently.

One final suggestion. With budget projections showing that total Federal spending will fall to 15.6% of GDP by 2010, I urge my colleague to consider setting a goal of putting aside a portion of the surpluses—perhaps an amount equivalent to one-half to one percent of GDP—for additional discretionary investments. Investments that will improve the lives of our children both in the near future and over the long term—investments in education, research and development, and science and technology.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

U.S. STRATEGIC INTERESTS IN ASIA

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, following the recent G-8 meeting in Okinawa and as we move closer to a vote on Permanent Normal Trading Relations with China, I want to briefly remind my colleagues of the importance of having a regional strategy for Asia.

There is a tendency to look at the Korean situation, the relationship between Taiwan and China, our presence in Japan, our presence in Guam, the situation in Indonesia, and so on as independent problems. Or, to just react to one situation at a time, with no overall understanding of how important the regional links and interests that exist are in shaping the outcome of our actions.

If we want to play a role in creating more stable allies in South Korea and Japan, and in ensuring that an ever-changing China is also a non-threatening China, then we must recognize that any action we take in one part of the region will have an impact on perceptions and reality throughout the region.

I do not intend to give a lengthy speech on this right now, instead I just want to draw my colleagues attention to an excellent letter that I received from General Jones, Commandant of the United States Marine Corps. He wrote to discuss just this need for a regional and a long-term perspective as we evaluate our presence in Okinawa.

I agree with him that we cannot shape events in the Asia-Pacific region if we are not physically present.

So, as we engage in debate over what the proper placement and numbers for that presence are, I urge my colleagues

to approach that debate and the debate on China's trade status with an awareness of the interests of the regional powers and an awareness of our national security interests both today and in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from General Jones be printed in the RECORD following this statement.

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

July 21, 2000.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.,
Ranking, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S.
Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BIDEN, As the G-8 Summit approaches, the eyes of the world have turned to the Pacific island of Okinawa. Opponents of U.S. military presence there may seize the opportunity to promote their cause. I am well acquainted with the island, having visited it frequently, and wish to convey to you my sincere belief in its absolute importance to the long-term security of our nation.

Okinawa is strategically located. The American military personnel and assets maintained there are key to preservation of the stability of the Asia-Pacific region and to fulfillment of the U.S.-Japan bilateral security treaty. Okinawa's central location between the East China Sea and Pacific Ocean, astride major trade routes, and close to areas of vital economic, political, and military interest make it an ideal forward base. From it, U.S. forces can favorably shape the environment and respond, when necessary, to contingencies spanning the entire operational continuum—from disaster relief, to peacekeeping, to war—in a matter of hours, vice days or weeks.

We have long endeavored to minimize the impact of our presence. Working hand in hand with our Okinawan hosts and neighbors, we have made significant progress. In 1996, an agreement was reached for the substantial reduction, consolidation, and realignment of U.S. military bases in Okinawa. Movement toward full implementation of the actions mandated by the Special Action Committee on Okinawa Final Report continues and the commitment to reduce the impact of our presence is unabated.

Recent instances of misconduct by a few American service members have galvanized long simmering opposition to our presence. While those incidents are deplorable, they are fortunately uncommon and do not reflect the full nature of our presence.

Often lost in discussions of our presence on Okinawa, are the positive aspects of that presence. We are good neighbors: our personnel are actively involved in an impressive variety of community service work, we are the island's second largest employer of civilians, we infuse over \$1.4 billion dollars into the local economy annually, and most importantly, we are sincerely grateful for the important contributions to attainment of our mission made by the people of Okinawa. We are mindful of our obligation to them.

It is worth remembering that U.S. presence in Okinawa came at great cost. Battle raged on the island for three months in the waning days of World War II and was finally won through the valor, resolve, and sacrifice by what is now known as our greatest generation. Our losses were heavy: twelve thousand killed and thirty-five thousand wounded. Casualties for the Japanese and for Okinawan civilians were even greater. The price for Okinawa was indeed high. Its capture in 1945, however, contributed to the quick resolution of the Pacific War and our presence there in the following half a century has im-

measurably contributed to the protection of U.S., Japanese, and regional interests.

As you well know, challenges to military basing and training are now routine and suitable alternatives to existing sites are sorely limited. Okinawa, in fact, is invaluable. We fully understand the legitimate concerns of the Okinawan people and we will continue to work closely with them to forge mutually satisfactory solutions to the issues that we face. We are now, and will continue to be, good neighbors and custodians for peace in the region.

Very Respectfully,

JAMES L. JONES,
General, Commandant of the Marine Corps.

THE INNOCENCE PROTECTION ACT OF 2000

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, at the beginning of this year, I spoke to the Senate about the breakdown in the administration of capital punishment across the country and suggested some solutions. I noted then that for every 7 people executed, 1 death row inmate has been shown some time after conviction to be innocent of the crime.

Since then, many more fundamental problems have come to light. More court-appointed defense lawyers who have slept through trials in which their client has been convicted and sentenced to death; more cases—43 of the last 131 executions in Texas according to an investigation by the Chicago Tribune—in which lawyers who were disbarred, suspended or otherwise being disciplined for ethical violations have been appointed to represent people on trial for their lives; cases in which prosecutors have called for the death penalty based on the race of the victim; and cases in which potentially dispositive evidence has been destroyed or withheld from death row inmates for years.

We have also heard from the National Committee to Prevent Wrongful Executions, a blue-ribbon panel comprised of supporters and opponents of the death penalty, Democrats and Republicans, including six former State and Federal judges, a former U.S. Attorney, two former State Attorneys General, and a former Director of the FBI. That diverse group of experts has expressed itself to be “united in [its] profound concern that, in recent years, and around the country, procedural safeguards and other assurances of fundamental fairness in the administration of capital punishment have been significantly diminished.”

I have been working with prosecutors, judges and defense counsel, with death penalty supporters and opponents, and with Democrats and Republicans, to craft some basic common-sense reforms. I could not be more pleased that Senators GORDON SMITH, SUSAN COLLINS, JIM JEFFORDS, CARL LEVIN, RUSS FEINGOLD, and others here in the Senate, and Representatives RAY LAHOOD, WILLIAM DELAHUNT, and over 60 other members of both parties in the House have joined me in sponsoring the Innocence Protection Act of 2000.

The two most basic provisions of our bill would encourage the State to at