

Federal Government. We are very heavy in resources—oil, gas, coal. We are the largest producer of coal in the United States. We need to be able to increase our efforts in the area of energy, at the same time protecting the environment. We can do that. We have to increase the opportunity for access to things such as Yellowstone Park and at the same time keep the principle of the parks there, to protect the resource. We can do those things with some more flexibility, I believe.

Obviously, we need to strengthen the military. We have had a time, a peaceful time, with a tendency to not emphasize the military as much as I think we should. Our best opportunity for peace in the future is to have a strong military and to keep it that way, to have national preparedness. Certainly we need to do that.

We need more emphasis on opportunity for everyone to do well in this country. Opportunity is what we need to seek.

We need to strengthen the economy. Hopefully in some of our tax activities we can leave more dollars in the private sector, to be invested to create jobs. These are the things I think will be paramount for us.

Will there be differences in view? Of course. I hope we have moved to a situation where we will be less partisan in our approaches, where we recognize there finally has to be a solution. But will we agree on everything? Of course not. We have different ideas. We represent different areas of the country. But in large we represent the United States and we need to understand that there are things we need to accomplish.

I think there will be agreement on general topics such as education, health care, and military. At the same time, of course, there will be disagreements on the details of how those things are implemented—but that is OK. That is the system. We all have different views. We all have different reasons to be putting forward our views. They are legitimate. And the system does work.

I suspect we will certainly be looking at education, we will be looking at strengthening the military, we will be looking at Social Security to ensure young people paying into their first job will have the opportunity to reap benefits 40 years from now. I think that is our obligation.

Energy has been a problem for some time, but it was not recognized, of course, until we started having blackouts in California and started having increases in gasoline and natural gas prices. Now, it is a problem that more people recognize as a problem.

I hope in our tax relief efforts we also have some tax simplification so we do not have to go through all these things with every little tax reduction being oriented at affecting behavior. That really is not the purpose of taxes. Taxes are to raise the amount of revenues necessary to conduct the Government, not necessarily to direct everyone's behavior.

Education is a legitimate concern. The first responsibility, of course, for education is that of the States and local governments. We want to keep it that way. The Federal Government's contribution is about 7 percent of the total expenditures. So we need to assist and to make sure there are opportunities available for all children everywhere, but we need to have local control and we need to have flexibility. And, of course, we need accountability, not only for the Federal Government's contribution but to all taxpayers to ensure those dollars are being used to produce the kind of product each of us wants.

Sometimes we find ourselves with an excessive amount of paperwork. I hear about it quite often since my wife is a special education teacher and spends a good deal of her time on paperwork, which detracts a little from her other work.

I believe a powerful military is our best hope for the future. We need modern equipment. We also need to reorganize the military. As times change, things are different than they were 50 years ago. Of course when you have no draft in place, it is voluntarily, we need to make it attractive, not only for people to come but hopefully for people to stay. What we have now is people come to the military, they are trained to fly airplanes or be mechanics or whatever but then leave to go to more attractive places in the private sector. We will need to go to that. I think one of the alternatives is to allow young people to have individual accounts that can be invested in the private sector to create a much higher return to ensure there will be benefits. I understand that is not something everybody agrees to. Certainly we all agree we should be setting aside those dollars that come in for Social Security for Social Security and not spend them on other things. So I am sure we can do a great deal there.

In energy, we have gone a long time without a real energy policy, a policy that will direct where the resources go, how we encourage production of domestic resources and not allow ourselves to become a total captive of OPEC and foreign nations. That is not only oil and gas, but we have various ways of producing energy, of course, hydro, wind, and nuclear—things that can be used. With a policy of that kind, certainly we can do some things.

We are also now looking at some short-term problems. California has a real problem. Regardless of how they got there, they have one, and there is some peeling off of that in other places. So hopefully we will have a longer term policy in addition to that and certainly be able to do something on the short term.

So I think we have a great opportunity as always to serve this country. That is why we are here. I hope we can agree upon the role of the Federal Government and how we strengthen that and how we finance that and how we will be able to leave people's money in

their hands. How we do that will turn a lot on how we work together here and work with the administration during these next at least 2 years.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, let me congratulate the Presiding Officer, my new colleague from the State of Nebraska, for his eloquence and leadership and his direction as he presides over this body. I want him to know—and I think I speak on behalf of all of us—we appreciate his being here and presiding.

(The remarks of Mr. HAGEL pertaining to introduction of S. 22 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. The Senate is in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators have 10 minutes.

THE SENATE AGENDA

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, Democrats have introduced some of our legislation. George W. Bush is now President Bush. His administration is coming in. We will have votes on nominees.

I think the important word here is civility. I also point out—not that I am opposed to civility—I think when people in the country—in Minnesota, Nebraska, and around the Nation—say they want us to be bipartisan, what they are not saying is, we don't want any debate. People expect debate on issues and they expect us to have differences that make a difference, especially in their lives.

But I think what people are saying is two things: No. 1, we want to have civility, we want to see civility; and the second thing that people are saying is we want you to govern at the center. But, colleagues, they are not talking about the center that I think pundits in D.C. talk about, or too many of us talk about. I think what people are talking about is not the usual labels but, rather, we want you, Democrats and Republicans, to govern at the center of our lives. That is what people are talking about, the center of their lives.

So if, in fact, we have legislation on the floor and have amendments and debate about amendments that deal with making sure people are able to have a standard of living where they can support their families and give their children the care they need and deserve, we are governing at the center of their lives. If we are talking about legislation that provides more resources to enable States and school districts to do a better job of providing the best education for all the children in this country, we are governing at the center of people's lives.

If we are going to speak, as the President did with considerable eloquence, about leaving no child behind, let us make sure this is not symbolic politics. This cannot be done on a tin cup budget. If we want to leave no child behind, the best thing we can do is make a real investment in early childhood development so these children, when they come to kindergarten, are ready to learn. They are not already way behind.

If we are going to talk about governing at the center of people's lives then we are going to have to talk about the health insecurity that so many Americans experience. I am not talking just about elderly people who cannot pay prescription drug bills. I am also talking about people toward the end of their lives who are worried they are going to go to a nursing home and then lose everything before they get any help.

What about how people can stay at home and live in dignity as long as possible? I am talking about, not just the 42, 43, 44 million people who have no health insurance at all, but the people who are underinsured. I am talking about people who are paying more in copays and deductibles than they can afford to pay. I am also speaking about the people who right now have plans but plans that do not provide anywhere near as good coverage as we have.

It would seem to me that what is good enough for Senators and Representatives should be good enough for the people we represent. If we are going to talk about jobs and decent wages, economic development and economic growth—which is critically important, whatever ways we can contribute to that—and education and affordable child care and affordable health care, then we are governing at the center of people's lives and I think there can be real bipartisanship.

But I also want to point out I don't see how we do it with a \$1.3 trillion tax cut over the next 10 years. I don't see how we do it if that tax cut is all the way at the level of \$1.3 trillion. I certainly do not see how we do it if it is too targeted to people at the top of the income ladder. I ask my colleagues this question: How can we give all the speeches and talk about the children and talk about education and talk about health care and talk about veterans and talk about our commitment to all these issues and all these people

and at the same time have no revenue? You cannot do both.

Let's have some balance here. Let's have some tax cuts that are targeted at middle-income working families and let's also not rob ourselves of the capacity to make the investments in the very areas we say we care so much about.

I also say to colleagues that I think Speaker Gingrich found this out: Don't assume there can be an assault on basic environmental protections and protections at the workplace, health and safety protections, and that will go without a fight. There will be a real fight on those issues. I hope we can find middle ground, but I do not believe it is an agenda that speaks to the center of people's lives because the vast majority of people in our country believe we are all strangers and guests on this land and we should make the environment better; we should leave it better.

I also believe we will have a healthy debate—again with civility—over the question of whether or not there is such a thing as a workable star wars, a workable missile defense which ultimately could cost hundreds of billions of dollars. This was, at first glance, a good idea, starting in the late 1950s. But every time we look at it and realize the ways offensive weaponry overwhelms defensive weaponry, and we consider the danger of chemical and biological warfare being brought in by suitcases, there is no evidence this is technologically feasible, much less the way this puts the arms control regime in jeopardy.

So I say to my colleagues on the first day: I look forward to the debate. I look forward to passionate politics. I look forward to politics focused on people's lives. I look forward to civil debate, civil politics. I think we can have that. But I believe so much has changed in the country, so much is at stake, the Senate is 50-50—we can agree on some important legislation that will help people. Let's move forward. Then when we do not agree, there will be major, major debate on the floor of the Senate.

For my part, I look forward to working with my Republican colleagues whenever we can and wherever we can and to be honest. With a twinkle in my eye, I just as much look forward to the debate and disagreement. As a Senator from Minnesota, I am in profound disagreement with the direction on some things I think the President is going to go forward with. But that is what the Senate is all about, to have debate, to do your best for people, and I look forward to the Senate functioning at its very best. I hope we can make amendments on the floor to legislation that should not be closed off again. We can start early in the morning, work late at night, we can do the work and then I think the Senate will be at its best as a institution and give all of us a chance to be good Senators.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHINSON. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mrs. HUTCHINSON relating to the introduction of S. 11 and S. 140 are found in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PROTECTING HUMAN RIGHTS IN COLOMBIA

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the brave and persistent efforts of the Association of the Families of the Detained and Disappeared on behalf of human rights in Colombia.

One of the most pressing human rights emergencies in our hemisphere has been taking place in Colombia, where the government, paramilitary groups, and guerrillas remain locked in fierce struggles. Thousands of innocent civilians have been caught in the crossfire, and human rights abuses have been rampant. Throughout Colombia, members of ASFADDES have responded to this crisis by seeking justice for their relatives who have been killed or disappeared.

Members of ASFADDES ask that cases of forced disappearances be properly investigated and prosecuted. They have worked for the last twelve years to make forced disappearances an official crime in Colombia, and a law was finally passed last year to do so, because of their work and dedication.

Because of their calls for justice, members of ASFADDES are at tremendous personal risk. Since 1993, their members have received numerous threats. According to ASFADDES, members have been harassed, and have been the subject of intelligence-gathering by Colombian police and military personnel.

The members are under particular threat, because they are one of the few organizations to bring cases against members of Colombia's security forces at the local, national, and international levels—including the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights—often raising the issue of collusion between Colombia's security forces and the paramilitary. ASFADDES is the only nation-wide organization in Colombia that represents families of human rights victims. Attacks are carried out against the staff of the organization and against the family members who seek the organization's help.

Regrettably, serious acts of violence against members increased in 2000.