

release our businesses from the drag of an obsolete bureaucracy as they pursue further innovations. The result will be a nation and a people that is more prosperous, more free and more able to spend time on more rewarding pursuits.

I want to thank my colleagues in the Senate for their support and urge the House to support this important legislation.

COMMERCIAL SPACE ACT OF 1998

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I would like to engage the Chairman in a colloquy regarding a provision of the Commercial Space Act of 1998. It is my understanding that Section 202(b)(6) of the Land Remote Sensing Policy Act of 1992, which requires any company receiving a license to operate a remote sensing system to "notify the Secretary [of Commerce] of any agreement the licensee intends to enter with a foreign nation," is amended by the Commercial Space Act of 1998 by inserting the words "significant or substantial" after "Secretary of any." This is intended to limit the agreements which are reported to the Department of Commerce. As you know, the Congress has acted in the past to limit imagery of Israel. I would like to clarify that any agreement or contract permitting any imaging of Israel using commercially available, satellite-based remote sensing technology would fall under the definition of "significant or substantial." Is this the Chairman's understanding?

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator. It is certainly my intention that any agreement permitting the imaging of Israel using commercially available, satellite-based remote sensing technology will continue to be reported to the United States government for review. The Congress has indicated that it viewed imaging of Israel to be a significant matter, and the intent of this legislation is to make sure that any agreement that could lead to imaging Israel will be reported.

Mr. KYL. I thank the Senator.

ALLEVIATING INTERNATIONAL FAMINE WITH AMERICAN SURPLUS

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President. Today I address an issue of extreme importance to both citizens of the United States, and people around the globe.

It is not often that we have the opportunity to help those in other countries and Americans at the same time. I believe that one of these occasions presents itself now.

In every area of the world, there are men, women and children in desperate need of food. Some of them are refugees from wars and other forms of political violence. Some of them are displaced because droughts or floods have interfered with their ability to grow food and destroyed their homes. Others are simply too poor to be able to afford

the tools and seeds necessary to plant crops.

This year has been particularly difficult in a variety of places. Most recently, hurricane Georges has ravaged the Caribbean. Nations such as Haiti, where the population is barely able to feed itself, and the Dominican Republic have been heavily damaged by the storm's onslaught.

Countries in Eastern Europe are experiencing food shortages. Winter is coming to Kosovo, where the Serbian Special Police and Yugoslavian army continue a terrorist policy that has destroyed more than three hundred villages, and driven more than 300,000 ethnic Albanians from their homes, with an estimated 50,000 forced into forests and mountains. With good reason, these people are afraid to return to the villages which have been destroyed and vandalized by the Serbian army. They have left the only means they have of supporting themselves behind. As a result, if we in the international community do not help them, they will not be able to feed themselves.

Russia faces a sharp decrease in agricultural production, due to drought and other poor weather conditions. Approximately twenty-five percent of farmland was damaged. Consequently, this year's harvest will be Russia's worst in four decades. Collective farms have harvested only a little over half the amount of grain in this year's harvest as they did in 1997. The potato crop, one of Russia's staples, is down significantly due to potato blight.

The Asian economic crisis is having a significant impact on the ability of those states to feed themselves. Indonesia, with its current financial turmoil is in need of food. Asian countries which normally import American commodities are unable to do so this year, exacerbating our farmers' woes.

The situation in North Korea remains grave. Floods, droughts and other natural disasters in the past four years have left many without the ability to feed themselves. Malnutrition and related diseases are common throughout the land. One million people have died in North Korea over the past two years.

Due to climactic conditions and political unrest, there are many in need in Africa. In Sudan alone, experts have indicated that as many as 2.6 million people may go hungry. Mozambique is facing a food crisis which will affect 300,000 people until April of next year. In the northern portions of Sierra Leone, thousands of internally displaced people will face hunger, if not starvation, unless they are provided with aid.

Here in the United States we face a challenge of a different sort. Far from suffering from a lack of food, American farmers are producing an abundance. Unfortunately, U.S. agricultural exports are expected to decline 4.6 percent from projected 1998 levels, mainly because of the collapse of global markets.

One third of the family farmers in this country may go out of business in the next several years, with net farm income projected to decrease by \$7.5 billion in 1998. We have the food. All we are lacking is strong markets to buy what we are producing.

Common sense tells us that it is time to bring together our oversupply of domestic agricultural products and the growing international need for food aid. One way to do that is to increase shipments of U.S. agricultural products to countries in need.

In July of this year, the President took steps to do just that, creating the Food Aid Initiative. This initiative directs the Department of Agriculture to purchase 80 million bushels of grain for distribution to poor countries overseas. The Secretary of Agriculture announced the first disbursement of wheat and wheat flour under the Initiative to the World Food Program on September 15th. I applaud the Administration's creation of this Initiative. The potential of this program in combination with other U.S. food assistance programs to provide relief to hungry people is great, and I support the President's efforts.

However, we can and should do more. To begin with, the list of countries that the administration has targeted through the Initiative should be expanded. Last week I wrote to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman and Brian Atwood, the Administrator of the Agency of International Development. In those letters, I indicated among other things, that threatened food shortages in Kosovo and Russia must not go unaddressed.

Not only must we be sure that more countries are being given much needed food, we must be assured that those who are hungry are actually receiving the food. Unfortunately, in some instances, access to food donations is prevented by people in needy nations who either want the food themselves, wish to profit from victims of famine or wish to control the needy population by denying them life's most basic necessities.

In addition to donating to more countries, we should donate more food. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, in the United States today there is a surplus of 6.3 million metric tons or 233 million bushels of wheat. There are several programs through which we can help solve both our domestic and our international problems.

The first is the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, commonly referred to as P.L. 480, Food for Peace. This legislation contains three food aid titles. Title One's objective is to make it easier for lesser developed countries to buy American commodities. To this end, commodities are sold to certain countries for US dollars on concessional credit terms.

Title Two is the Emergency and Private Assistance Programs. This is

where the bulk of our humanitarian donations in the form of food aid come from. This year Title Two was funded at the level that the president requested. Unfortunately, given the number of humanitarian disasters that we are currently facing, this may not be enough. It is my hope that the President will ask for more money for this program.

Title Three is the Food for Development Program, under which government to government grants are provided to support the long-term development efforts of those countries that are attempting improve their economic outlooks.

The second program through which we can help address the domestic and overseas challenges we are facing is Section 416(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949. Through Section 416(b), commodities held by the Commodities Credit Corporation can be donated overseas. This is the program through which the President ordered the purchase of \$250 million of wheat in July.

The Food for Progress Act of 1985 is the third program the United States can utilize to address both the American farm crises and dire international need. Food for Progress provides commodities either purchased with funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation, or through P.L. 480 or Section 416(b), as donations to countries that are committing to the increase of free enterprise practices in their agricultural sectors.

I strongly support an aggressive funding of these programs, and have urged the administration to be aggressive in its requests to the Congress as it evaluates the increasing needs overseas and the opportunity to assist our farmers here at home. If we diligently pursue all of our options through current law, I believe that we can help alleviate two very significant and pressing problems. The overabundance of agricultural commodities plaguing American farmers, and the lack of food for starving millions abroad.

I urge my colleagues in Congress consider the full range of resources and programs at our disposal to help end the dilemma facing the farmers of our nation. Implementing a solution to this problem will require that we use all of the creativity and energy that we have. Every day brings us closer to real crises not only in our farm economy, but also in countries important to our national interest.

Such aid is not only clearly in our interest. It would reflect our highest values by preventing the widespread hunger and suffering of men, women and children who had no hand in the tragedies that have befallen their countries.

Again, I urge my colleagues to give this issue prompt and serious attention. I thank the chair and yield the floor.

EDWARD PFEIFER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, recently a publication from St. Michael's Col-

lege in Winooski Park, Colchester, VT, profiled Professor Edward Pfeifer. Dr. Pfeifer is referred to as "Historian Ed Pfeifer, '43." I have always thought of Ed Pfeifer as the special mentor I had in college and the man who did so much to shape my thinking and my life after college.

He was the kind of professor who not only helped you learn, but taught you to want to learn. He would find students he could mentor and introduce them to the joys of learning. Fortunately, I was one of those students and I have benefited from his help every day since.

Ed and his wife, Joan, are now retired in Vermont. One of the great pleasures Marcelle and I have is when we end up in the same place with them, ranging from events at St. Michael's, to meeting in the grocery store near our own home in Vermont.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from St. Michael's Founders Hall, September 1998, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From St. Michael's Founders Hall, Sept., 1998]

HISTORIAN ED PFEIFER '43
(By Buff Lindau)

Nine-year old Eileen Gadue had to write an essay explaining why she needed a new trunk to take her sneakers, swim suit, tennis racket, and other belongings to summer camp. She didn't know it, but she had Ed Pfeifer to thank.

Eileen's parents, Mark and Marjorie Gadue '79, of Colchester, Vt., were both students of SMC Emeritus Professor of History Edward Pfeifer '43 in the 1970's. They have shaped their lives and their children's lives on Pfeifer's patient insistence on developing ideas, supporting those ideas, researching to back them, and working carefully with language to clarify and defend the ideas.

After the fifth draft of her essay and repeated discussions with Dad, Eileen got the new trunk.

"He taught us life skills and we teach our kids as we learned from him," said Marjorie. "He was someone who made a real difference." All his students say that Dr. Pfeifer taught reading, thinking, debating, clear defending of ideas, and taught with a hard to define skill that included quiet patience, kindness, and intellectual rigor.

Mark Gadue graduated as a history major from Saint Michael's in 1979 and almost headed to get his Ph.D., but entered the family dry cleaning business instead.

Pfeifer students Gary Kulik '67, Joseph Constance '76, Francis MacDonnell '81, Gayle Brunelle '81, and Jonathan Bean '84 were inspired to aim for the professorial ranks as a result of their experience in Pfeifer's classroom. "I took a number of years off after college, but he influenced me to go back to graduate school and I am ultimately following in his footsteps," said Bean, who was unanimously voted in May to receive early tenure as a history professor at Southern Illinois University. Bean, who took at least 10 courses with Pfeifer, models his teaching on Pfeifer's style of methodically eliciting student response. Bean is the author of *Beyond the Broker State: Federal Policies Toward Small Business, 1936-1961*.

Pfeifer says it was his goal to get a response from students about the historical

material they were studying, "something that was their own comment that reflected their own evaluation." But the magic of Pfeifer as a teacher resides in the method and manner he brought to the classroom to get the students engaged, to elicit their response.

To Fran MacDonnell, a teacher who earned his master's in history at Marquette and his Ph.D. at Harvard, "Dr. Pfeifer is in the handful of teachers that you admire and like to imitate and that you owe a lot to. "He had three, one-year appointments teaching history at Yale University, and now he and his wife live in Lexington, Va., where she teaches and he finishes his second book—a study of white southerners who fought in the Union Army during the Civil War. (His first book is titled *Insidious Foes: The Axis Fifth Column and the American Home Front*.) "I can think of no greater legacy than the one Ed Pfeifer gave his students—I mean Professor Pfeifer taught my dad" (Dr. Kenneth MacDonnell '57 a Boston physician), MacDonnell said. He gave his students the drive to think independently, and confidence in expressing their thoughts.

Pfeifer was a master Socratic teacher, which meant using the Q & A method to guide the student, leaving room for different opinions and approaches and calling for conclusions from the student. "That is the hardest kind of teaching, yet the one with the most rewards for the student," MacDonnell said, who aspires to Pfeifer's method.

Joe Constance concurs, "Dr. Pfeifer was probably the finest practitioner of the Socratic method that you'll ever find as a teacher—getting the student to arrive at the answer," and encouraging you as you progressed. Constance says Pfeifer also inspired him to pursue the intellectual life; he earned a master's in history at UVM and a library degree at SUNY Albany. Constance is now library director and political science professor at St. Anselm College, and is pursuing his Ph.D. in political science at Boston University.

"I asked Dr. Pfeifer a question in class one morning about a trade agreement between Peru and Bolivia and he didn't know the answer," Constance related. "That afternoon I found a note in my mailbox from him with the answer to the question—I've never been so impressed with a teacher before or after."

Pfeifer's students all describe him as extremely kind and concerned about them as individuals. They suggest that his influence creeps up on you quietly and takes strong hold, rather than hammering you. He was a model teacher and scholar, one student said; fairness, balance, objectivity characterized him. But there was humor—droll, quiet, dry—but a key element in his make-up that emerged unexpectedly.

In 1986 Edward Pfeifer retired with his wife Joan Sheehey Pfeifer to Cabot, Vt. He says he now has time to keep up with his four children, chase after his grandchildren and mow lots of grass. Because his teaching touched many who have gone on to become teachers, Dr. Pfeifer's legacy multiplies beyond his own classroom into the lives of students in university classrooms from New Hampshire to Illinois to California. Ed's son and daughter are graduates: John '85 and Justine '84 who is married to Frank Landry '82. His brother, Charles '43 is deceased.

EDWARD PFEIFER PROFILE

Pfeifer graduated from Saint Michael's in 1943 with a degree in English, and served in WWII in the U.S. Navy, 1943-46. He earned a master's in American civilization from Brown University in 1948 and then joined the SMC English department. He served in the Navy during the Korean War, 1951-53, and returned to Brown in 1954, where he earned a