

requires significant costs for administration.

In the coming months, it is my intention to explore legislative options to encourage the investment of additional private capital into the cleanup and redevelopment of our Nation's brownfield sites. It is my intention and desire to work on this matter in a bipartisan fashion with my good friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, let me thank the good Senator from Montana and take a moment to echo his remarks. I strongly supported the Brownfield Revitalization Act and applaud the strides that it is making toward remediating brownfield sites across our Nation.

In Iowa, as in many other States, we are challenged with our share of brownfields in places like Des Moines, Cedar Rapids and Sioux City. The cleanup and redevelopment of brownfield sites can help reduce health risks, protect the environment, revitalize surrounding communities, preserve open space and create jobs by reintroducing properties into the stream of commerce that have languished for years.

Philosophically, I support efforts to encourage private markets to help solve problems such as those presented by our Nation's brownfield sites. Given the size and scope of the brownfield problem in this country, I believe it behooves us to look for additional, innovative and low-cost solutions to help encourage investment in the remediation and redevelopment of these sites.

I understand that current law may discourage tax-exempt investors from contributing capital to the remediation and revitalization of brownfield sites. Let me say to my good friend and colleague from Montana that I will gladly work with him to explore legislative options to help bring additional private capital to bear on solving our Nation's brownfield problem.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Iowa. As we have worked together as chairmen and as ranking members of the Senate Finance Committee, I have always found him to approach issues in a fair and even-handed manner. Let me express my sincere appreciation to him for the many bipartisan efforts that we have worked on together, particularly the Brownfields Revitalization and Environmental Restoration Act that passed 99-0 in the Senate. I look forward to working with him on this and many other issues in the months and years to come.

CHIEF JUDGE LAWRENCE BASKIR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the United States Court of Federal Claims is the only federal court where the President may appoint and dismiss the chief judge. Although this power has been available since the Court of Federal Claims was established in 1982, President George W. Bush is the first

President to use this power to remove a sitting judge. That is a regrettable decision because of the integrity and outstanding judicial record of the former incumbent, Chief Judge Lawrence Baskir. His absence is already being felt in the slower pace of important procedural reforms that Chief Judge Baskir had launched to improve the fairness and efficiency of the Court of Federal Claims.

Former Chief Judge Baskir was appointed in July, 2000 by President Clinton after the retirement of the previous incumbent chief judge, who had been appointed by President Regan. In his short, two-year tenure, Chief Judge Baskir had accomplished much in boosting public awareness of and respect for the work of this important, but little-known federal court.

The Court hears cases brought against the federal government by American citizens. It is especially important that litigants can rely on its objectivity and integrity. Some may say that because its original complement of judges was appointed by President Reagan and George Bush, Sr., its work had more of a political cast to it. Chief Judge Baskir worked hard to correct that impression, and he was scrupulous in every way in seeking to avoid even the appearance of any political involvement.

Among the ways he sought to reinforce the integrity of the Court was to ensure that incoming cases, some of which were highly charged with politics, were assigned automatically, "off the wheel," and not directed to any particular, pre-determined judge. Just prior to his removal from the bench, the Court's new procedural rules took effect, rules for which he had pressed for two years. The rules, which are critical for the administration of justice and are the procedures for litigating cases in the Court, had not been revised in 10 years. Because Court rules define the parties' rights and obligations, they can give unfair advantage to one side or another. Their content is always contentious, and previous efforts to revise them had collapsed in deadlock. Chief Judge Baskir guided the revisions through with great success.

He reorganized the Clerk's Office, putting an end to delays in document handling, and instituted a "same day" rule for recording court filings. He brought the Court's electronic data systems into the 21st Century and created both internal and external web pages. He converted the main courtroom into a state of the art electronic courtroom, where attorneys can connect their own computers to the Court system, and have access to their own records and data and exhibits.

He also helped modernize the Court's alternative dispute settlement resolution, or ADR procedures. Resolving legal disputes through ADR can be a useful alternative to long litigation in certain circumstances. ADR is an important procedural option at the Court

of Federal Claims, where citizens, often with very limited resources, are suing the federal government with its unlimited resources. ADR can serve in such instances to help level the playing field.

For example, he instituted a pilot ADR process in which incoming cases are assigned to an ADR judge at the same time they are assigned to a trial judge. This program is unique in the federal system, and has been chosen by the Federal Judicial Center as a model to examine and analyze for possible application in other federal courts.

Chief Judge Baskir made sure that ordinary citizens got fair treatment when they sued the federal government. Knowing of the large number of pro se plaintiffs, or people representing themselves, going up against the Justice Department, including parents with heartbreaking cases involving young children, he revised the system of handling these cases, and in the process referred more than 700 pro se plaintiffs to attorneys participating in the Court's vaccine program. Believing in the duty of members of the legal profession to contribute a portion of their time without charge for the good of the public, he also helped launch a pro bono program within the Court for both judges and legal clerks, and among the attorneys who are members of the Court's bar.

Many of these accomplishments would be impressive for a chief judicial administrative official whose tenure lasted a full term. This record is all the more impressive for having been achieved by a Chief Judge whose term lasted a mere 22 months. He achieved much because he brought an extensive legal and administrative background to the position, including service as Acting General Counsel of the U.S. Army, as staff director and chief counsel of a major U.S. Senate subcommittee, and as director and chief administrative officer of a major Presidential program under President Ford.

I commend Chief Judge Baskir on all that he accomplished as Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims. I thank him for his service to our Nation.

WHY SLOVENIA SHOULD BE INVITED TO JOIN NATO

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the expansion of NATO is a forgone conclusion. Formal invitations are expected at the Prague Summit next week for three to nine new member countries to join. In fact, NATO enlargement represents a logical extension of the first serious American intervention in European geopolitics; namely, the famous Fourteen Points of President Woodrow Wilson, which provided substantial assistance and encouragement to the nations of Central Europe in their long-deferred aspirations to gain political independence and international recognition. History has shown that the substantial disengagement of America

from European politics between World War I and World War II, especially in Central Europe, left many newly independent nations in that region vulnerable to Russian and German hegemony.

As my colleagues know, NATO was originally created to confront the threat of Soviet expansion and to counterbalance the Warsaw Pact. Accordingly, when the cold war ended NATO's continued existence was questioned because it had fulfilled its original purpose. Rather than disband, however, NATO's 16 member countries, led by the United States, have sought to redefine the organization to meet the needs and challenges of a new era. NATO member states more recently have taken on new tasks, such as intervening and bringing to an end warfare in the Balkans. Since the September 11 attacks, NATO has also joined the battlefield in the struggle against terrorism. Through it all, NATO has looked to uphold the goals and principles it was conceived to defend: democracy, security cooperation, stability, and peaceful problem-solving throughout Europe and North America.

Critics of NATO expansion commonly cite article 5 of the NATO charter which declares an attack on any one member is an attack on all and obligates the signatories to assist the victim, as an unwise commitment with great potential to entwine the U.S. in foreign military conflicts in which U.S. security and vital national interests are not at stake. I joined those who were concerned, in the immediate aftermath of the cold war, that seeking NATO membership would require cash-strapped emerging democracies in Southern and Eastern Europe to spend too much of their national budgets on increased defense spending at the expense of meeting pressing shortfalls in education, health care, and other basic social needs.

Nevertheless, NATO enlargement is and has been the policy of our last three Presidents—Republicans and Democrats alike—and seems to have solid bipartisan support in the Congress. In Warsaw last year, President Bush expressed his proenlargement views saying, “all of Europe's new democracies, from the Baltic to the Black Sea and all that lie between, should have the same chance for security and freedom, and the same chance to join the institutions of Europe, as Europe's old democracies.” At the upcoming NATO Summit in Prague, this alliance will once again invite more countries to join NATO, and I believe strongly that the Republic of Slovenia should be at the top of the list for multiple reasons.

First, since Slovenia declared its independence in June 1991, the Slovenian people have made great strides towards becoming a stable parliamentary democracy. The Government of Slovenia is a tolerant one, granting its citizens complete religious freedom and many of the same civil liberties that we enjoy. It also respects the

human rights of its citizens and an independent judiciary reinforces respect for the rule of law. An ombudsman deals with human rights problems, including citizenship cases. Minorities generally are treated fairly in practice as well as in law.

Second, with a rich industrial history, a traditional openness to the world, and sound macroeconomic policies, Slovenia is among the most successful countries in transitioning from socialism to a market economy. It boasts a stable growth in GDP, which now exceeds the equivalent of \$16,000 in purchasing power parity relative to this small country's per gross domestic product. Slovenia also ranks among the countries with the lowest degree of investor risk. The level of privatization achieved and many other measures have improved the competitiveness of the Slovene economy and the profitability of companies doing business with the European Union. Among the more than 144,000 registered companies in Slovenia, the greatest number are engaged in trade and commerce, followed by industry, services, real estate, construction, transport and communications. Following independence, small business flowered and now more than 90 percent of Slovenia's companies are classified as small business enterprises.

Third, Slovenia offers the alliance a new partner to help stabilize and pacify the historically and currently unstable “powder-keg” region of the Balkans as well as Western and Central Europe. NATO operations in the Balkans have already proven the value of temporary bases, land, air and sea; transshipment facilities, transit concessions, airspace, road, and rail links, sea transport; access to national strategic intelligence, joint exercises in specific conditions, linguistic and other forms of civilian-military cooperation and medical services and Slovenia in NATO will help greatly in this regard. Slovenia also assumed many of these responsibilities already when NATO went to war with Serbia. Looking ahead, Slovenia's inclusion will further strengthen NATO's southern flank by bridging current NATO territory from Italy to Hungary and eventually perhaps its extension to Romania and Bulgaria.

Fourth, Slovenian and U.S. Armed Forces have been developing ever-closer working ties through collaborative database and curricula development activities. Although this collaboration has not occurred under NATO auspices, it has helped lay a solid foundation for Slovenia becoming a full-fledged NATO member. For instance, after the September 11 attacks on America, the Government of Slovenia promptly offered intelligence aid to the U.S. in various forms and joined the antiterrorist coalition with full public consensus. Shortly thereafter, the National Assembly of Slovenia adopted the Declaration on the Joint Fight against Terrorism. Since then, the U.S. has deepened our involvement with

Slovenia on other fronts as well. For example, the U.S. this fiscal year contributed an additional \$14 million to the Slovenian-led, International Trust for De-mining and Mine Victims Assistance, ITF, which has become the premier demining program in southern Europe.

Fifth, the Slovenian armed forces have made significant strides in modernizing and reforming their operations and equipment. The Government of Slovenia recently adopted a policy to transform the military from the present conscript army towards fully-professional armed forces. This fundamental change should accelerate the establishment of the main reaction forces of the brigade-size needed in order to be totally interchangeable and compatible with NATO tactics, logistics and equipment. A large part of the 10th Battalion of this force is currently deployed under the NATO flag in Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Kosovo. Furthermore, Slovenia has invested greatly in the education and training of its military officers and troops, so that today there are about the same percentage of English-speaking troops in the Slovenian Army as one would find in current NATO member's armed forces. In fact, many top officers, more than 200, have trained in the American military education institutes. According to both domestic and foreign estimates, the Slovenian Government has allocated \$320 million for implementing these basic defense reforms. In 1996, the National Assembly of Slovenia enacted a law mandating that all military purchases and acquisitions be in accordance with NATO standards for interoperability. In short, the Government of Slovenia has already done much of what is required and remains very committed to achieving 100 percent NATO compatibility and fielding well-trained, effective armed forces.

Parenthetically, let me also say at this point that I don't think requiring 2 percent of GDP in defense spending is necessarily a good indicator of maximizing the contribution of so-called mini-member states in NATO. Some NATO member countries actually count military pensions toward fulfilling this requirement, but how do such military expenditures actually contribute to the deterrence and effectiveness of NATO armed forces? To me, it would make more sense to identify specialized roles for the armed forces of mini-member states to optimize their respective contributions to the overall increased strength and versatility of NATO.

Finally, Slovenia's sociopolitical development already mirrors West European standards. Not surprisingly therefore, political debate in Slovenia now centers on health care, environment, education, social welfare, and budget discipline. Since Slovenia's population is demographically old, the pensioners issue is now hotly discussed. While there is political consensus about the necessity for pension reform, sharp differences persist about the role the

[illegible]