One cannot overstate how important it is to get the Government-industry relationships right, because without them as a foundation, the value of all other efforts will be significantly diminished. A fundamental challenge in many cases is getting information about vulnerabilities and threats itself, and this simply cannot be done without the foundation of public-private sector information sharing. We cannot solve this by unilateral Government efforts. We have to move together to solve it.

Mr. President, it is no surprise that both the Government and private sector are finding this difficult and complicated and frustrating. To combat cyber attacks—whether by terrorists, spies, disgruntled employees, pranksters—one needs both technical sophistication and cooperation among numerous companies, agencies and nations.

It is going to be imperative for the protection of our information infrastructure that the private sector, national security officials, and law enforcement work together—not just on this issue, but on issues for the future.

Many fear these discussions would lead to Government intrusiveness and abuse of power. Americans have always had a healthy skepticism towards Government power and our Constitution sets strict limits on what Government can and cannot do. We are a strong and vibrant nation directly because we enjoy rights of free speech, free assembly, and against unreasonable searches and seizures. Information technology can allow us greater exercise of those rights. When we examine the security of information technology, these rights must remain our guiding principles, and our Government policies should reflect them.

We must get past the suspicion between the private sector and Government and move forward. The information infrastructure is vital to America's defense and to America's economy and we cannot preserve one without protecting the other.

Here we need two things: First, we need a mechanism that transcends narrow organizational politics to bring consensus; and, secondly, we need a facility for advanced research into information technology protection that also provides a venue for constructive and ongoing dialog with industry, the Government, and academia.

I believe Congress should act as soon as possible to create a blue-ribbon panel of top federal officials, key leaders from Capitol Hill, and experts from the high-technology field to address the issues of information assurance, infrastructure protection, and encryption that cut across committee lines. We need to have a panel that can speak with authority on both politics and policy.

From the White House, we need to see a commitment of time, attention, and resources at the highest levels.

Cabinet officers need to play an active role in shaping the solutions that are going to emerge from such a panel. These issues are complicated and they have far-reaching implications, so at the end of the day we need to have leaders in their respective areas—Cabinet and Cabinet-level officials—who are prepared to forge the necessary compromises and make the case to industry and to the public. Congress needs to take a similarly pragmatic approach. Committee chairpersons, with their expertise in different areas and institutional memory, need to be on this panel and give it all the attention they would a piece of legislation. But in addition we need to acknowledge the politically charged nature of these issues and be prepared to deal with them. So I propose that we not only have representatives by issue area, but representatives who are designated to speak for each major faction in the Congress: a representative of the majority in the Senate, and one for the House, a representative of the minority in the Senate, and one for the House, and representatives of the legislative caucuses that have an interest.

Clearly Government cannot do this alone. We need the perspective, the insight, and the vision of experts who are part of the developments in the information technology field and who can predict on the basis of that experience where technology is going. We need their expertise and a willingness to work with their government, for otherwise this problem will only grow worse. The panel I envision must therefore have a strong component of private sector experts devoted both to the advancement of technology and to the security of our country.

The complement to this Congressional panel should be a forum where Government, industry, and academic officials can work on these problems in a systematic, confidential, and dispassionate way. I propose that we learn from our experience and look to those models of industry-and-Government cooperation that have worked in the past.

We can learn from agencies like the National Safety Transportation Board, DARPA, and other federally funded research and development centers. Specifically, Congress should pass legislation that would enable the President to create a new national laboratory and research facility to address information infrastructure protection. The role and mission of such an organization would be to target those specific areas that are now suffering from sporadic, contradictory, or insufficient attention.

We must have a structure that can address the entire range of national security planning and execution—in other words, threat assessment and evaluation, development of requirements, R&D, acquisition and procurement, development of strategy and the conduct of operations across the entire spectrum, from large-scale conflict to peacekeeping and operations other than war. But this center would also help develop techniques, policies, and procedures to make civilian and commercial information technologies secure.

To accomplish that mission, the information technology laboratory would have to: Support research and development by industry or Government-industry consortiums that aims to protect our privacy, shield our commercial interests, and defend our nation against information technology threats; ensure that there is a secure conduit for the exchange of information about security threats; provide a forum for developing and managing responses and contingency plans, both directly and in cooperation with a national command authority.

The Information Technology Laboratory would be funded through annual appropriations as a Federally Funded Research and Development Center. But it should also be able to establish fee-based contracts with agencies of federal, state, and local government as well as universities for specific services so that budget costs could be kept to a minimum.

The Information Technology Laboratory could also contract with private industry to do research and development, while taking special precautions to protect the confidentiality of proprietary data or information. The laboratory would also report annually to the appropriate oversight committees in Congress and the President.

In just four years from now, knowledge and information workers will make up one third of all the workers in our multi-trillion dollar economy. We can create a safe corridor for their passage to the next century. Or we can continue to talk past each other while the Information Superhighway attracts more and more robbers and frauds and terrorists.

We need to come to this task with a clear sense of purpose and full understanding of the urgency involved. America has gained much from information technology, and stands to gain much more as these systems mature. Our future depends on the success of this technology.

But that success and our security depend on finding the policies and practices that will identify and correct vulnerabilities before they are exploited. Together, I am certain we can address this problem. In a noble but imperfect democracy such as ours, answers are not impossible, they are only impending. I look forward to working with my colleagues to face this challenge. I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—CONTINUING GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I have a couple of unanimous-consent requests.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives from the House legislation providing for continued Government funding until midnight on Wednesday, October 14, the resolution be considered agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, and I am sure I won't. Let me check for just a moment.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I believe it has been cleared with the other side.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I do not object.

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 4 p.m. today, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, with that, I will continue now and speak in morning business for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

EDUCATION

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, a great deal has been talked about here this afternoon as to what this Congress and our President will do on the issue of education. I am, once again, pleased to see our President engaged and spending time talking about education. He spent so much time skipping class and trying to avoid detention that he failed to learn about what Republicans and the majority here in Congress have been doing on behalf of education for the last good many months.

It is with that in mind that I would like to, for a few moments, talk about what we have done and what is being done. I am pleased that the President is once again engaged. We finally got his attention in the last week. He is staying in the White House and trying to work with us to resolve some of these issues. That is important. It is time that Congress adjourn, but most important, we must finish our work before we go.

The President did come home on occasion to veto a few bills this year, but he seems to have forgotten them. He seems to have forgotten the Coverdell A+ education bill that he vetoed, which would have provided educational savings accounts, would have allowed parents to set aside $2,000 a year per child for educational expenses, and teacher testing and merit pay would reward teachers for their performance in the classroom. That was part of the bill that he vetoed. It also included dollars to the classroom, which would put money directly from the Federal Government into helping students instead of the bureaucrats. It is interesting that my colleagues on the other side, a few moments ago, introduced information about what GAO said. Let me tell you what the Federal Government said, what the Department of Education said about its own problems with paperwork and the burning up of valuable educational dollars. The U.S. Department of Education estimates that it takes approximately 48.6 million paperwork hours—the equivalent of almost 25,000 employees working 40 hours a week for a full year—to complete the paperwork involving the administration of the Federal education programs. The Senator from Washington spoke about the amount of time that local units of education use filling out the paperwork.

In my State of Idaho, as is true in Iowa, Ohio or any other State across the Nation, 50 percent of its paperwork burden is directly related to the 5 percent of the money that it gets. What happened? The President vetoed it. He came home, focused for a few moments, vetoed it, and left town again.

What about the tax regarding the College Tuition Program, encouraging parents to save for their child's college education? That, too, was vetoed by the President.

So when this President stands up and says, ''I want billions of dollars more for education,'' what he is saying is, ''I want billions of dollars more here in Washington to be run through a Federal system to be directed out for education,'' while this Senate voted, by a majority, to do quite the opposite—to literally turn the public loose to fund education without Federal strings.

Eighty-four percent of Federal elementary and secondary education funds are used for instruction, according to the April 1998 report by the U.S. Department of Education. What happened to the other percentage? Let's see. I guess that would be 16 percent. What happened? Overhead and administration. That is what it cost to get the money out.

You see, there is a game played in this town. It is how big you can build the agency and how many times you can roll the paper before you send the money out.

That is exactly what this Congress tried to avoid. That is exactly what we did avoid with legislation passed by this Senate and passed by the House and vetoed by this President.

Now that we are attempting to adjourn our Congress, just in the last few days the President is home back in school, not avoiding classes, and he is trying to spend, or spin his story about education.

Mr. President, why did you veto all of these productive pieces of legislation that were passed by a majority, a bipartisan majority, in Congress? Why did you veto legislation that, when polled, well over 60 percent of the American people said it gave more power to the family, to the parent, to the local education school board? That is what America wants. They don't want 100,000 federally paid-for teachers and a bureaucracy to go along, and over 20 percent of the money staying right here to be spent on thousands and thousands of hours of paperwork.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky still has his 5 minutes.

Mr. FORD. I thank the Chair very kindly. I appreciate it very much.

RETIREMENT OF SENATE COLLEAGUES

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, as the 105th Congress comes to a close, I want to take a moment to say thank you to my fellow colleagues who, like me, will be retiring this year.

I came to the Senate in 1974 with Senators GLENN and BUMPERS. It was a different time, when campaigns were still won by going door to door, when the Senate itself was much more open to compromise and bipartisanship.

Despite the changes in the Senate, Senator BUMPERS has continued to be a voice for his State, never giving up the fight for something in which he believed. And when the Senate itself began to listen, they began to respond. In fact, after fighting 19 years to reform the National Parks concessions operations, he finally won approval of the legislation on last Thursday.

And while it's true the Senate long ago lost its reputation as a place of eloquent debate, my colleague from Arkansas has proven time and again the power of words with his skillful oratory, whether the issue was arms control, education or balancing the budget. In all my years here in Washington, I was never so moved as I was by a speech he gave on preserving the Manassas, Virginia, Civil War Battlefield. He not only changed votes, but he reminded his colleagues and the American people that our greatest strength lies in our ability to give voice to our beliefs and to our constituent's concerns.

Like Mark Twain who came into this world with Halley's comet and left this world with the return, Senator GLENN came into the public eye with his historic orbit around the earth and he will close out his public career with another historic flight into space. In between, he's demonstrated over and over that he's truly made of the ''right stuff.''

As the ''Almanac of American Politics'' wrote, he is ''the embodiment of the small town virtues of family, God-fearing religion, duty, patriotism and hard work . . .''. And over the years, he has brought the same fight and determination that made him a brilliant fighter pilot to his efforts to expand educational opportunities, increase funding for scientific research, to clean up nuclear waste sites, promote civil rights and to make our government more efficient.