As Thomas Jefferson wrote, ''Information is the currency of democracy.'' Our democracy is stronger if all citizens have equal access to at least that type of currency, and that is something which Members on both sides of the aisle can celebrate and join in.

This bipartisan resolution is an important step in informing and empowering American citizens. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this legislation to make available useful Congressional information to the American people.

NONPROLIFERATION REPORT CARD

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a recent report released by The Russia Task Force entitled ''A Report Card on the Department of Energy's Nonproliferation Programs with Russia.'' This bipartisan Task Force was co-chaired by Lloyd Cutler and Howard Baker. The report concludes that proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or weapons-usable material is ''the most urgent unmet national security threat for the United States today.''

This conclusion restates similar conclusions of other reports and analyses done over the past several years. The book Avoiding Nuclear Anarchy published in 1996 drew a similar conclusion. A January 2000 Center for Strategic and International Study report, ''Managing the Global Nuclear Materials Threat'' provided a concise analysis and numerous policy recommendations of this ''most devastating security threat.''

The U.S. response has not been and still is not commensurate to the threat.

The Cooperative Threat Reduction programs have achieved much and contributed greatly to U.S. security. Still there is always room for innovative approaches to remaining issues and faster progress.

The Department of Energy programs—from Materials Protection, Control and Accounting to the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention—have also enhanced U.S. security. But their work is not even close to complete, and a ''clear and present danger'' looms.

I have repeatedly suggested that we have a very simple choice: we can either spend money to reduce the threat or spend more money in the future to defend ourselves. I am a strong believer that threat reduction is now underfunded and is the first-best approach in this case.

The report estimated the cost at $30 billion to be provided not only from the U.S. budget, but also by Russia and other countries. The national security benefits to U.S. citizens from securing 80,000 nuclear weapons and potential nuclear weapons would constitute the highest return on investment of any current national security program.

How do we get there? One recommendation of the report is the dire need for a White House-level nonproliferation czar. Not just the Department of Energy and the Defense Department are involved in Russia. We have a number of federal agencies chipping away at specific, isolated aspects of the problem.

But we do not have a coherent, integrated agenda. Overlaps and shortfalls exist. But no one person—with budgetary responsibility and requisite authority—can view the spectrum and identify the gaps, remedy inter-agency turf battles and bring the necessary coordination to get the job done efficiently and quickly.

A nonproliferation czar should be given access to the President and the necessary budgetary powers. This person should be charged with formulating a cohesive strategy. This would allow us to coordinate and streamline our efforts. This person would identify which programs are ripe for more resources and which ones are already adequate to address the immediate need.

The Nunn-Lugar-Domenici legislation enacted in 1996 required that such a nonproliferation czar be put in place. Also, Section 3174 of the FY2001 Defense Authorization bill expressed again Congressional will to have one person accountable for our nonproliferation efforts. The Clinton Administration refused to adhere to the statute and repeatedly ignored other Congressional attempts to address the coordination problem. Other Commissions have also recommended this remedy in the past to no avail. I am hopeful that the national security team within the new Administration will see the merits of this recommendation and act on it soon.

The Task Force also offered several other important insights and recommendations. These included:

The threat today arises from Russia's weakened ability to secure its nuclear arsenal. Contributing factors include, delays in paying those who guard nuclear facilities, breakdown in command structures and inadequate budgets for stockpile protection.

I would go even further than that. I believe that it's the economics that drives many of the threats and areas of potential conflict that the U.S. faces with Russia today. They sell nuclear technologies to Iran not because they like the Iranians and want to snub the Americans. The Russians are also aware that Iran could present a threat should it acquire the requisite nuclear and ballistic missile capabilities. However, the Russian decision is driven by economics—not by ideology, not by historical ties, but by necessity. If we don't attempt to address the underlying economics of the situation, cooperation with Iran may continue and many other programs may eventually fail.

The President should develop a strategic plan, consulting Congress and cooperating with the Russian Federation, to secure all weapons-usable material located in Russia, and to prevent the outflow of weapons of mass destruction-related scientific expertise.

We can only move so fast as the Russians allow. We can only achieve sufficient transparency and get access so long as Russia agrees. However, I believe several existing programs, such as the Plutonium Disposition Agreement, have demonstrated that a serious U.S. commitment, especially in financial terms, is exactly the appropriate incentive to get action.

Repeatedly, however, our nonproliferation programs with Russia are in a Catch-22 situation. Congress will not adequately fund them until they demonstrate success. A trickle at the tap is insufficient to persuade Russians of the seriousness of our intent. So, the U.S. programs stumble along unable to achieve the gains necessary because the Russians are reticent to play ball. And, in turn, Congress becomes even more leery of providing any funding at all in light of the meager gains. It's in our immediate national security interest to remedy this situation.

The plan should review existing programs, identifying specific goals and measurable objectives for each program, as well as providing criteria for success and an exit strategy.

It would be reasonable to propose that one plan be geared toward addressing the fundamental linkages between economic and social instability in Russia and specific proliferation threats. Without addressing the relationship of Russians' economic situation to a decaying nuclear command and control infrastructure, threats of diversion from within, rather than from outside, the weapons complex, and many other tight relationships, we will fail to prevent proliferation.

The report envisions an 8–10 year time-frame. At that point, Russia will hopefully be in a position to take over any remaining work.

In the next decade we could eliminate the greatest security challenge we currently face. Inaction will only drive up costs to defend ourselves against unknowables that we could have squelched had we had greater foresight.

I believe President Bush and his team have foresight. President Bush repeatedly mentioned the importance of these programs as an integral part of his national security strategy.

To quote our new National Security Advisor, Condoleezza Rice:

American security is threatened less by Russia's strength than by its weakness and incoherence. This suggests immediate attention to the safety and security of Moscow's nuclear forces and stockpile.

I believe this recent report reiterates this clear fact and sets forth several very important policy recommendations for tackling this challenge. I look forward to working with the new Administration to ensure that a decade from now we have protected U.S. citizens from this proliferation threat and secured a more peaceful future.

RETIREMENT OF THE HONORABLE BUD SHUSTER

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition today to honor my

colleague, Congressman Bud Shuster, who retired from Congress last week after serving fifteen terms in the United States House of Representatives. I am grateful to have had the opportunity to serve with Congressman Shuster since 1981, when I first came to the United States Senate. Bud Shuster has worked tirelessly on behalf of his constituents in the 9th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, the entire state, and the nation.

During his time in office, Congressman Shuster consistently reached across party lines to work with his colleagues on the other side of the aisle to pass some of the most important public works bills in our nation's history. Over the years he built up a remarkable level of clout in Congress, affording him a great deal of success in enacting his legislative priorities.

The name Bud Shuster is synonymous with transportation, and I have worked closely with Congressman Shuster on a number of transportation challenges facing Pennsylvania and the nation, including the ISTEA and TEA–21 highway authorization bills, the effort to take the highway trust fund off-budget, and the AIR–21 airport authorization bill. As Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, he brought a level of insight and tenacity into infrastructure, highways and airports that was really remarkable. Congressman Shuster's expertise in the field of transportation and public works projects was second to none, and I valued his advice and counsel on a number of issues over the years.

Few may know that Congressman Shuster graduated Phi Beta Kappa from the University of Pittsburgh, holds an MBA from Duquesne University and a Ph.D. in business from the American University. While these academic accomplishments have suited him well in his role as a legislator, they have also served him in his role as an accomplished author, penning two acclaimed novels about life in small-town Pennsylvania.

Bud Shuster's legislative skill and almost thirty years of dedicated service to his constituency will be sorely missed in Pennsylvania and in America. We will be hard pressed to replace such a distinguished public servant and I wish him the best of luck in his future.

IN MEMORY OF ALAN CRANSTON

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, it is an honor for me to pay tribute to my former Senate colleague Alan Cranston. With Senator Cranston's passing, we lost a gifted leader, a shrewd politician and a dedicated reformer. It seemed significant that Senator Cranston passed away on New Year's Eve 2000 because his life encompassed, literally, the 20th century. He was born the year World War I began, grew up during the Depression, covered the rise of fascism in Europe as a foreign correspondent and led the fight for a nuclear arms freeze during the Cold War. He called luminaries of the age among his friends, most notably Albert Einstein. Alan Cranston arrived in the Senate shortly after I did and we served together for 24 years until his retirement in 1993. We even hit the Presidential campaign trail together, both running for the White House on the Democratic ticket in 1984.

Those of us who served with Senator Cranston will remember the tally sheets he carried around to count votes. We will also remember the talent he had for carefully preserving his own liberal ideologies while working effectively with those on the opposite end of the political spectrum. He may have offended some with his push for disarmament, but more often than not he disarmed them with his own friendly manner. Senator Cranston left an indelible mark on environmental, civil rights and global security policy. His legacies are the Global Security Institute, his accomplishments as a U.S. Senator and his dedication to the people of California. He will be missed, but a political giant like Alan Cranston will not be forgotten.

RURAL AMERICA NEEDS COMPETITION

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, on Monday, January 22, introduced S. 142, the Rural America Needs Competition to Help Every Rancher Act, legislation to prohibit meatpackers from owning livestock prior to slaughter. My bill enjoys bipartisan support from Republican Senators CHUCK GRASSLEY of Iowa and CRAIG THOMAS of Wyoming. Senator TOM DASCHLE cosponsored my bill, as well. We believe this proposal will help restore a competitive bidding process to the cash slaughter-livestock marketplace by strengthening the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921.

The growing, unabated trend of agribusiness consolidation and concentration—a problem really sweeping across this entire nation—is one of the prime concerns of South Dakota family farmers and ranchers. However, concern about meatpacker concentration is not new in the United States. Newspaper cartoons in the 1880s depicted companies that forced the pooling of livestock prior to any purchase agreement as counterproductive ''beef trusts,'' engaging in discriminatory pricing behavior. In 1917, President Woodrow Wilson directed the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to investigate meatpackers to determine if they were leveraging too much power over the marketplace.

As a result, the FTC released a report in 1919 stating that the ''Big 5'' meatpackers at that time (Armour, Swift, Morris, Wilson, and Cudahy) dominated the market with ''monopolistic control of the American meat industry.'' The FTC also found these meatpackers owned stockyards, rail car lines, cold storage plants, and other essential facilities for distributing food. These findings led to the Packers Consent Decree of 1920 which prohibited the Big 5 packers from engaging in retail sales of meat and forced them to divest of ownership interests in stockyards and rail lines. Subsequently, Congress enacted the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 which prohibited meatpackers from engaging in unfair, discriminatory, and deceptive pricing practices.

Unfortunately—veiled behind what some mistakenly describe as inevitability—the meatpacking industry is once again crusading to take free enterprise and market access away from independent livestock producers. On January 1, 2001, Tyson Foods declared its intention to acquire IBP, and the Justice Department recently accepted Tyson's assertion that the deal poses no antitrust violation. I am very disappointed with the Justice Department's decision, and believe their inaction on this matter makes it imperative for Congress to act.

I recently met with executives of Tyson and IBP to discuss the ramifications of this merger. The CEO of Tyson made a provocative promise that Tyson will not replicate its current practice of owning livestock—they now own swine and poultry—after buying IBP. Essentially, Tyson alleges they will not own cattle before slaughter. Yet, it has been reported that Tyson would only make that promise for ten years into the future, and the company has declined to comment on what purchasing practices a merged Tyson-IBP would utilize after that time.

While this may be a short-term panacea to satisfy Federal agencies and elected officials, livestock producers—particularly cattle ranchers—are in business for the long-term. Ten years can go by awful quickly in the cattle business. Moreover, I believe—as do most South Dakotans—that doing and saying are two very different things. Indeed, Lee Swenson, President of the National Farmers Union, has called upon Tyson to issue a written commitment to the Securities and Exchange Commission that Tyson won't go into the cattle owning business.

Consequently, my bill to forbid packer ownership of livestock restores healthy competition to the cash marketplace and ensures that Tyson and other vertical integrators won't engage in packer ownership. Agricultural concentration is not inevitable, it is sweeping the rural landscape because of the choices we make. Given the Justice Department's reluctance to address this merger, Congress must take some responsibility to recommend ways to strengthen our competition and anti-trust laws. I believe S. 142 is one step Congress can take.

Last year, several major farm organizations endorsed my bipartisan effort to prohibit meatpackers from owning livestock prior to slaughter. I would like to thank them for their support. These grassroots groups include the