We need to help workers like Charley Richardson, a shipfitter at General Dynamics in Quincy, Massachusetts in the mid-1980's. He suffered a career-ending back injury when he was told to lift a 75 pound piece of steel to reinforce a deck. Although he continued to try to work, he found that on many days, he could not perform the lifting and the use of heavy tools. For years afterwards, his injury prevented him from participating in basic activities. But the loss that hurt the most was having to tell his children that they couldn't sit on his lap for more than a few minutes, because it was too painful. To this day, he cannot sit for long without pain.

We need to protect workers like Wendy Scheinfeld of Brighton, Massachusetts, a model employee in the insurance industry. Colleagues say she often put in extra hours at work to ''get the job done.'' She developed carpal tunnel syndrome, using a computer at work. As a result, Wendy lost the use of her hands, and is now permanently unable to do her job, drive a car, play the cello, or shop for groceries.

Even though it may be too late to help Beth, Elly, Charley and Wendy, workers just like them deserve an ergonomics standard to protect them from such debilitating injuries.

As long ago as 1990, Secretary of Labor Elizabeth Dole in the Bush Administration called ergonomic injuries ''one of the nation's most debilitating across-the-board worker safety and health illnesses.'' Since that time, over 2,000 scientific studies have examined the issue, including a comprehensive review by the National Academy of Sciences. All of these studies tell us the same thing—it's long past time to enact an ergonomics standard to protect the health of American workers and prevent these debilitating injuries in the workplace.

Last fall, when we considered the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, opponents of an ergonomics standard wanted us to wait for the National Academy of Sciences to complete a further study before OSHA establishes a standard. But it was just another delaying tactic. As we said then, over 2,000 studies on ergonomics have already been carried out.

In 1997, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health reviewed 600 of the most important of those studies. In 1998, the National Academy of Sciences reviewed the studies again. Congress even asked the General Accounting Office to conduct its own study.

The National Academy of Sciences found that work clearly causes ergonomic injuries. They concluded that ''the positive relationship between the occurrence of musculoskeletal disorders and the conduct of work is clear.'' The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health agreed. They found ''strong evidence of an association between MSDs and certain work-related physical factors.''

The Academy also found that ergonomics programs are effective. As the Academy found, ''Research clearly demonstrates that specific interventions can reduce the reported rate of musculoskeltal disorders for workers who perform high-risk tasks.'' The GAO has concluded that good ergonomics practices are good business. Its report declared, ''Officials at all the facilities we visited believed their ergonomics programs yielded benefits, including reductions in workers' compensation costs.''

The truth is that the Labor Department's ergonomics rule is based on sound science. In addition to the National Academy of Sciences and the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, medical and scientific groups have expressed widespread support for moving forward with an ergonomics rule. The American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, representing over 7,000 physicians, has stated that ''there is . . . no reason for OSHA to delay the rule-making process while the NAS panel conducts its review.'' The American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons, representing 16,000 surgeons, the American Association of Occupational Health Nurses, representing 13,000 nurses, and the American Public Health Association, representing 50,000 members, all agree that an ergonomics rule is necessary and based on sound science.

Many members of the business community support ergonomics protections, because they agree that good ergonomics practices are good business. Currently, businesses spend $15 to 20 billion each year in workers' compensation costs related to these disorders. Ergonomic injuries account for one dollar of every three dollars spent for workers' compensation. If businesses reduce these injuries, they will reap the benefits of lower costs, greater productivity, and less absenteeism.

That's certainly true for Tom Albin of Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing, who said, ''Our experience has shown that incorporating good ergonomics into our manufacturing and administrative processes can be effective in reducing the number and severity of work-related musculoskeletal disorders, which not only benefits our employees, but also makes good business sense.''

Similarly, Peter Meyer of Sequins International Quality Braid has said, ''We have reduced our compensation claims for carpal tunnel syndrome through an effective ergonomics program. Our productivity has increased dramatically, and our absenteeism has decreased drastically.''

This ergonomics rule is necessary, because only one-third of employers currently have effective ergonomics programs. Further delay is unacceptable, because it leaves too many workers unprotected and open to career-ending injuries. Ten years is long enough. Since OSHA began working on this standard in 1990, more than 6.1 million workers have suffered serious injuries from workplace ergonomic hazards.

It is time to end these injuries—and end all the misinformation too. The current attack on OSHA's ergonomics standard is just the latest in a long series of mindless attacks by business against needed worker protections for worker's health and safety. Whose side is this Congress on? American employees deserve greater protection, not further delay. It's time to stop breaking the promise made to workers, and start supporting this long overdue ergonomics standard now.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I applaud the Senate's passage of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000, WRDA, S. 2796. This legislation is critical to my State of New Jersey, which is so dependent upon its rivers, estuaries, and coasts for its livelihood. New Jersey relies on these unique resources as avenues for freight and business, recreational and harvest fishing, and a vibrant tourism industry. Indeed, it is imperative that these resources be kept environmentally and economically viable.

Along these lines, I am pleased that the Senate has agreed to pursue environmentally responsible alternatives for addressing flooding along the Passaic River. I originally introduced language to address this issue, which represents a new era in flood control, in 1998. S. 2796 authorizes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) to use up-to-date criteria in developing a new environmentally and economically responsible alternative. Such an alternative will take into account non-structural options, such as land buyouts and wetlands preservation. The bill also directs the Corps to study the possible acquisition of open space in the Highlands region of New Jersey as a way of reducing low-land flooding.

I also applaud the Senate's authorization of more than $1.7 billion to bring the channels of the New York and New Jersey Harbor to a depth of 50 feet. This authorization is based on the findings of the New York-New Jersey Harbor Navigation Study which was designed to evaluate the navigational needs of the Port of New York and New Jersey over the next 50 years. The results of the study have made clear the need for deepening the channels of Port Jersey, Kill Van Kull, Newark Bay, Arthur Kill, and Bay Ridge Channels to a depth of 50 feet.

While the region has relied on the maritime industry for over two hundred years, the port lacks the capacity to accommodate new deep draft shipping vessels. More than a decade ago, Congress authorized the deepening of these channels to 45 feet which has begun and is on track to be completed in the next few years. But this is only the beginning. In order to maintain the

165,000 jobs and $22 billion in annual economic activity port commerce generates, these channels must go to 50 feet.

Once clean materials from these deepening projects, and other projects from around the nation, have been dredged we should not neglect possible beneficial uses. Within WRDA, there is a $2 million annual authorization for the Corps to develop a program that will allow all eight of its regional offices to market eligible dredged material to public agencies and private entities for beneficial reuse.

I want to thank my colleagues, particularly Senators SMITH, BAUCUS, and VOINOVICH for their assistance and cooperation in developing this legislation. My colleagues have been remarkably helpful in this matter, having worked closely with me to ensure that the final bill incorporated language based on my legislation S. 2385, the Dredged Material Reuse Act, which I introduced earlier this year. They have understood the need, and I am grateful that they have agreed to include it in this legislation.

Beneficial reuse is a largely underutilized concept. As a result, unwanted dredged material is often dumped on the shorelines of local communities. Through a program of beneficial reuse the dredged material would be sold to construction companies and other developers who would be eager to have this material available.

Mr. President, the people of Southern New Jersey are all too familiar with this situation. Current plans by the Corps calls for more than 20 million cubic yards of unwanted material dredged from the Delaware River to be placed on prime waterfront property along the Southern New Jersey shoreline. However, with some effort and encouragement, the Corps has recently identified nearly 13 million cubic yards of that material for beneficial reuse in transportation and construction projects.

We should learn from beneficial reuse that contracting companies, land development companies, and major corporations want this material. This means we need to encourage the Corps to market dredged material for beneficial reuse up-front so that communities will not be confronted with the same problems faced by the citizens of Southern New Jersey.

The program created by this legislation will give the Army Corps the authority and the funding they require to begin actively marketing dredged material from projects all across the United States. It recognizes the need to keep our nation's rivers and channels efficient and available to maritime traffic while ensuring that communities are treated fairly.

Of equal, if not greater importance, to the small businesses and shore communities of New Jersey is the protection of our beaches. Recreational activity at our beaches is extremely important to NJ, supporting an annual tourist economy of $17 billion.

However, due to beach erosion, many of our shore communities have lost revenue on which they depend. This lost revenue affects the local tax base, property values, results in lost jobs and diminished quality of life in coastal regions.

Rebuilding and protecting our beaches is vital to the health of our economy. With 127 miles of shoreline and a booming tourist industry, simply watching the beaches erode is not an alternative. From commercial and recreational fishermen, to bait and tackle shops and restaurants, our shore communities depend on healthy coastlines.

With this in mind, I applaud the Senate for authorizing in WRDA several Corps projects to protect and re-nourish New Jersey beaches.

One project authorizes the Corps to re-nourish beaches along the entire stretch of Long Beach Island, from Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, in Ocean County, New Jersey. This $51.2 million project authorizes the Corps to create dunes and beaches along the coastline municipalities of Long Beach Island, including: Harvey Cedars, Surf City, Ship Bottom, Beach Haven and Long Beach Township.

Another project for shore protection authorizes the Corps, at a total cost of $30 million, to re-nourish beaches on the 1.8 mile stretch in Port Monmouth along the Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay Shoreline, by constructing floodwalls, levees, dunes, dune grass, dune fencing, dune walk-overs, and suitable beachfill.

Finally, I commend the Senate for including language I supported that would direct the Secretary of the Army to develop and implement procedures to give recreational benefits the same budgetary priority as storm damage reduction and environmental protection in cost-benefit analysis for Corps beach replenishment projects. Currently, the Corps is not required to list recreation benefits in its cost-benefit analysis of beach projects. This language is similar to legislation I introduced earlier this year, and I am pleased that this initiative has been passed in the Senate's WRDA Conference Report.

Prior to the 1986 Water Resources Development Act, the Corps viewed recreation as an equally important component of its cost-benefit analysis. However, the 1986 bill omitted recreation as a benefit to be considered, and New Jersey coastal communities have suffered.

It is imperative that federal policy base beach nourishment assistance on the entirety of the economic benefits it provides. Beach replenishment efforts ensure that our beaches are protected, property is not damaged, dunes are not washed away, and the resources that coastal towns rely on for their lifeblood are preserved.

Mr. President, it is for these reasons that I support the passage of WRDA. New Jersey relies on its unique water resources and this legislation will go a long way towards maintaining our economic and environmental health.

SPACE AND THE CHALLENGES AHEAD

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, this past week Washington, DC was the site of a global meeting of space faring nations at the International Space Symposium. A question raised at this event was how the United States' position, as a leader in both government sponsored and commercial space industry and exploration, is to be maintained in the future in light of emerging competitors and markets around the world.

As a partner in the construction of the International Space Station, we have entered into the greatest example of international cooperation to date. As NASA director Dan Goldin remarked at the Symposium, the Space Station will be a partnership of 16 countries, including the U.S., Russia, Japan, the eleven members of the European Union, and Brazil. The Expedition 1 crew left for the Space Station at 1:53 AM, Tuesday morning, marking October 31, 2000, as the date that humanity began its permanent residence in space. American astronaut Bill Shepherd and Russian cosmonauts Yuri Gidzenko and Sergei Krikalev will dock with the Space Station on Thursday and begin assembly tasks as new elements are added to the orbiting outpost. At completion, the Space Station will have a pressurized volume larger than the cabin and cargo hold of a 747 airliner. Of the seven modules, six will house laboratories. With these, the United States and the nations of the world will have the opportunity to use the resources and capabilities of the Space Station for scientific and technological research. The U.S. laboratory module will have racks, or lab space, for individual experiments, as well as sites where independent research payload can be attached. Some portion of each will be dedicated to commercial use.

As expected, a host of physical science experiments will use the research racks, payload sites, and Earth-viewing windows. Platforms will also be available to test communications systems. Exciting experiments are proposed in the life sciences and other fields only now recognizing the opportunities that exist in space. Studies in porous-ceramic bone replacement, gene transformation, and drug design will all benefit from extended experiments in the weightless environment of the Space Station. The ISS also provides an avenue for other countries to have access to space, for experimentation and exploration, thereby diminishing the need for their own space launch vehicle and potential missile capabilities. We must seize this opportunity for international cooperation, fair access to space, and limitless scientific and technological advancement.

As the International Space Station demonstrates, the future poses many opportunities for the Unites States in space. However, it likewise presents several risks. Also discussed at the International Space Symposium were