

with so much acid rain, the fragile mountain soil can no longer soak up the pollutant nitrogen oxide. And that means the nitrogen oxide is flowing into Adirondack lakes at a more rapid rate than previously believed.

Moynihan and the rest of the state's congressional delegation are proposing a 50-percent cut in emissions beyond what's called for under the credit allowance program. They would do so by halving the amount of sulfur dioxide that can be produced through the purchase of one pollution credit. Before congressional leaders are willing to consider the measure further, however, they want to know the potential costs of the legislation. Fair enough. The Adirondack Council says the study will show the costs won't be astronomical to the utilities, pointing out they were greatly off base on their projections of how much the original allowance program would cost their businesses.

The Office of Management and Budget could shed light on this important matter. But the only way that will happen is if President Clinton shows sufficient political courage to order the study to be released. He should do so immediately.

[From the Albany, New York, Times Union, Oct. 4, 2000]

ACID RAIN BOTTOM LINE—A NEW EPA STUDY SHOWS JUST HOW AFFORDABLE IT IS TO FIGHT POLLUTION

How much would it cost to keep Adirondack lakes from dying from acid rain? How much to spare thousands of Americans who suffer respiratory illnesses caused by the smokestack pollutants that contribute to acid rain? New York Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan put those questions to the Environmental Protection Agency two years ago, as he and Rep. Sherwood Boehlert, R-Utica, struggled to push through strict new federal limits on emissions of nitrogen and sulfur that drift from power plants in the Mid-west and South and descend on the Northeast, causing health problems in populated areas and killings trees and aquatic life in the Adirondacks and other pristine regions.

Now, after an unjustified delay by the Clinton administration that some critics are attributing to election-year politics, the EPA report is finally public, thanks to a subpoena issued by the House Government Reform Committee. And the price tag turns out to be so affordable that any further delay in reducing smokestack pollution is indefensible. The bottom line: \$1. That is how little the average household monthly utility bill would rise if the Moynihan-Boehlert bill were law.

But time is running short, Congress has only a few days left to conclude its business this year, and there are no encouraging signs that lawmakers will give the Moynihan-Boehlert bill the prompt attention it deserves.

But they should. The EPA report not only makes a convincing case for stricter pollution controls, but it also spells out the benefits that the nation—not just the Northeast—stands to reap in return. In a cost-benefit analysis sought by Mr. Moynihan, the EPA pegs the benefits of reducing acid rain at \$60 billion, compared with \$5 billion that power plants would have to pay to meet the tighter emissions standards. That's a \$55 billion payback, as represented in savings on treating chronic bronchitis, reducing emergency room visits for asthma and eliminating 1.5 billion days of lost work each year because of respiratory illnesses. There would be scenic improvements as well as the atmosphere cleared over national treasures like the Adirondacks and the Shenandoah and Great Smoky Mountains national parks.

In the Adirondacks, the struggle is a life-and-death one. A recent Times Union series

found that without sharp new curbs on acid rain, half of the Adirondack lakes will no longer be able to support aquatic life in 40 years. Already it is too late to save some ponds and lakes that have been contaminated by nitrogen oxide. The pattern will continue unless prompt action is taken. As our series noted, state leaders and the New York congressional delegation have made a strong bipartisan effort to combat the problem. Now it is Congress' turn. No one state can stop acid rain on its own. But Congress can, and should, provide the necessary federal remedy. The EPA has just given 55 billion reasons to act now.

RAIL SERVICE ISSUES

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to discuss a subject of great importance to our nation and its economy, that is rail transportation.

Earlier today, a few of my colleagues expressed views alleging a failure by this Congress for not passing legislation to regulatorily address rail service and shipper problems. As Chairman of the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, I want to set the record straight concerning the work of the Committee to address service and shipper problems.

Since becoming Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, the Committee has held no less than six hearings during which rail service and shipper issues were addressed. Three were field hearings, one each in Montana, North Dakota, and Kansas. Three hearings were conducted here in the Senate at which the topic of rail service dominated the testimony and members' questioning. I also have publicly stated a willingness for the Committee to hold even more hearings.

Further, Senator HUTCHISON, the Chairman of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee, and I requested the Surface Transportation Board (STB) to conduct a comprehensive analysis of rail service and competitive issues. The STB is the federal agency which oversees rail service and other matters. The Board's findings are extremely important and they were widely discussed during our Committee hearings last year. In addition, earlier this year the Board announced it would conduct a proceeding to change its merger guidelines in recognition of the drastically changed rail industry dynamic that has transformed since the rail deregulation movement of the late 1970's and the 1980's. The Board announced its new guidelines proposal earlier this week and will be taking comments on the proposal through November 17.

Three very diverse bills concerning the STB's authorities have been introduced in the Senate and another bill was submitted in the House. However, to date no consensus on a legislative approach has been achieved. I have had the privilege to serve in Congress nearly twenty years and during that time I have learned that significant legislation is always the product of careful analysis and bipartisan compromise.

Pending rail legislation and the STB's future will be no exception.

My colleagues from North Dakota and West Virginia referred to a letter with 277 signatures seeking rail regulatory changes. I am in receipt of that letter. But I am also in receipt of literally hundreds of letters—letters from Governors, rail shippers, and others—strongly opposing any rail reregulatory efforts.

To allege the Senate Commerce Committee doesn't take the issue of rail service seriously is a gross misstatement. The fact is, and I will repeat it, there is no consensus. A bill supported by only five members is not a solution, but it does allow those sponsors to sound high and mighty about their good intentions.

In order to pass a bill and send it to the President, we clearly have a long way to go. But I remain optimistic, and as a deregulator, stand ready to support any proposal that fairly and safely balances the needs of shippers and carriers.

POLICE REFORM IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday, an op-ed on police reform in Northern Ireland written by my friend and colleague Senator KENNEDY appeared in the Washington Post. In that op-ed Senator KENNEDY very concisely and eloquently stated why it is so important that meaningful police reform happens in Northern Ireland. As all of our colleagues know full well, Senator KENNEDY has worked tirelessly to promote peace and reconciliation in Northern Ireland for many years. It has been an honor to work closely with him in that effort and I commend him for his leadership on this issue. Needless to say I agree completely with him that the recommendations of the Patten Commission must be fully implemented, to ensure a genuine new beginning for a police force in Northern Ireland that will be acceptable to the Catholic community.

I hope and pray that those who are currently playing a role in the legislative process in the British Parliament take time to reflect upon the thoughts expressed in this very important op-ed. I would ask unanimous consent that a copy of Senator KENNEDY's article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I would urge all of our colleagues to take a moment to read it when they have the opportunity to do so.

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

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 2000]

A POLICE FOR ALL IN N. IRELAND

(By Edward M. Kennedy)

This month Britain's House of Lords will have the opportunity to improve the flawed legislation approved by the House of Commons in July to reform the police force in Northern Ireland and give it the support and respect it needs from the Catholic community.

The case for reform is clear. The current force—the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC)—is 93 percent Protestant. The vast majority of Catholics, who make up more than 40 percent of the population in Northern Ireland, do not support it because it does not represent them or protect them and has too often failed them.

Many Catholics believe the RUC has been involved in a long-standing "shoot-to-kill" policy. Questions continue about collusion of the RUC with Protestant paramilitaries in the murder of Patrick Finucane, a defense attorney shot dead in front of his wife and children in 1989. In 1997 RUC officers stood by as Robert Hamill, a young Catholic, was kicked to death by 30 Protestants shouting "kill him" and ethnic slurs. The RUC was shamefully inactive when death threats were made against another defense attorney, Rosemary Nelson, who was later murdered when her car was blown up as she drove to work last year. Many other examples could be cited to demonstrate why Catholics distrust the police.

Northern Ireland's 1998 Good Friday agreement presented a historic opportunity to change all that—to reform the police service and make it representative of the entire community. Under the agreement, an independent eight-member international commission was established, led by a former chairman of the British Conservative Party, Christopher Patten. Its mission was to propose an alternative and create a community-oriented, human rights-based police service that Catholics and Protestants alike would be prepared to join. In September 1999, the Patten Commission published its unanimous report containing 175 recommendations for change.

The assertion has been made that in the current legislation, the British government will implement 95 percent of the Patten's recommendations. But quantity does not measure quality. In fact, the most significant reforms recommended by the commission are not adequately implemented in the legislation.

The commission's task was to balance the desires of each community against what is necessary to create a fair and representative police force. The recommendations of the Patten Commission reflected those compromises. Patten is the compromise. It must not be diluted.

Unfortunately, the British government has done just that. It has made unwise concessions to those of the Protestant majority who still view the police as "theirs," and to the police themselves, who have always resisted reform. If the new police service is to succeed, it must represent and be accepted by the community it serves. Catholics must be convinced they should support and join it. Otherwise, the entire Good Friday agreement is in jeopardy.

As the legislation is considered by the House of Lords, the British government should propose changes to implement fully the Patten recommendations. Among the most obvious:

Name, badge and flag: As Patten recommended, to attract Catholics, the police force should have a neutral name and symbols. The legislation should ensure that the proposed name change to the neutral "Police Service of Northern Ireland" is made for all purposes, not just some purposes. The badge should be free of any association with Great Britain or Ireland, and the British flag should no longer fly above police buildings.

Oversight Commissioner: Patten recommended the appointment of an oversight commissioner to supervise the implementation of its recommendations. Thomas Constantine, former New York State police chief and former head of the U.S. Drug Enforcement

Administration, was recently named oversight commissioner. He should be free to comment on the adequacy of British decisions in implementing the Patten Report—not just oversee the changes made by the government.

Accountability: Patten recommended a new policing board to hold the police accountable and an ombudsman to investigate complaints against and wrongdoing by the police. Restrictions on the board's power to initiate inquiries and investigate past complaints should be eliminated, as should the British government's power to interfere in its work. The ombudsman should be able to investigate police policies and practices—not just report on them.

On June 15 British Secretary of State for Northern Ireland Peter Mandelson wrote, "I remain absolutely determined to implement the Patten recommendations and to achieve the effective and representative policing service—accepted in every part of Northern Ireland—that his report aims to secure." This determination has yet to be convincingly demonstrated.

Full implementation of the recommendations of the Patten Commission is essential to guarantee fair law enforcement and to create a new police service that will have and deserve the trust of all the people of Northern Ireland. It will be a tragedy if this opportunity to achieve a new beginning is lost.

The writer is a Democratic senator from Massachusetts.

PIERRE ELLIOT TRUDEAU

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is often said that Canada and the U.S. share the longest undefended border in the world. While this is repeated so often it has become a cliché, like all clichés, there is a fundamental truth in it. In this case, the fundamental truth is a striking geopolitical reality which Americans do not always appreciate. The peace we enjoy in North America is largely a function of this border.

With our neighbor to the north, we share a border of approximately 4,000 miles, a border that runs through New England and the Great Lakes, through the great forests, plains, and mountains, and along the Alaskan frontier of this rich North American continent. Mutually respected sovereignty is the fundamental basis of peaceful international discourse. But I will add that an undefended border makes for the warmest of relations, and the greatest of respect.

Last Thursday, Canada lost perhaps its best known Prime Minister of recent times, when Pierre Elliott Trudeau died, at the age of 80. For the past week, our neighbors to the north have been in mourning, and I stand today to pay my respects to the family of former Prime Minister Trudeau and to all the citizens of the country he served with singular dedication.

Mr. Trudeau and I did not share a common political tradition, nor did we share a political ideology. This does not diminish my respect for the man and his work one bit. I note, with appreciation, that one of Mr. Trudeau's mottos was "reason before passion," a principle I certainly believe conservative lawmakers would share.

I admired former Prime Minister Trudeau for his dedication to his country, to the rule of law, and to the betterment of the world. In his moving tribute at his father's funeral earlier this week, Justin Trudeau said, "My father's fundamental belief never came from a textbook, it stemmed from his deep love and faith in all Canadians."

Pierre Trudeau led Canada at a tumultuous time in its history and in the history of the world. In 1970, he was confronted with a terrorist, separatist threat from Quebecois extremists. Prime Minister Trudeau—who, in Canadian history, was at the time, only its third of Quebecois descent himself—was a dedicated federalist and, even more fundamentally, dedicated to the rule of law. He faced down the terrorists, and since then issues of separatism have been dealt with at the ballot box. While he successfully defended the rule of law, Canadians recognize the advances he instituted to preserve Canada's unique cultural diversity.

Mr. Trudeau had a different view of geopolitics than did most of the American administrations with which he dealt. It is said that he succeeded, at times, in aggravating U.S. presidents from Nixon to Reagan.

Some of this had to do, in my opinion, with the nature of the relationship between our countries. While Canada is the second largest political land-mass in the world, its population is small, approximately one-tenth of ours, and its economy is dwarfed by ours. In fact, the former Prime Minister famously said once: "Living next to you is in some ways like sleeping with an elephant. No matter how friendly and even-tempered is the beast, one is affected by every twitch and grunt."

While Mr. Trudeau held substantively different views on the world than many American leaders, he demonstrated that policy disputes can exist and nations remain civilized and respectful. And that is how I think of former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau.

In closing, I wish to note another story his son, Justin, told at his father's funeral this week. He recounted how, as a child, his father took him one day for lunch at the cafeteria in Ottawa's Parliament. There, young Justin saw a political rival of his father and made a childish crack about him to his dad. His father sternly rebuked him and, according to his son, said "You never attack the person. You may be in total disagreement with the person; however, you shouldn't denigrate him." That day, Pierre Trudeau taught his son, who is now a teacher, that "having different opinions from those of another person should in no way stop you from holding them in the greatest respect possible as people."

That is the principle of a civilized man, and the practice of a civilized nation. As the world bids adieu to Pierre Trudeau, I extend my deepest condolences to his family and to all the good citizens of our great neighbor Canada.