

to talk about the troubling marginalization of fathers in his infamous speech in 1992—although she still holds firm that the former Vice President was wrong in his specific criticism of Murphy Brown's choice to have a child on her own. "It was a completely logical speech," Bergen said in a newspaper interview. "Fathers are not indispensable. They are vital to a family."

Which raises an obvious question: If Dan Quayle and Murphy Brown can find common moral ground now, why then do we continue to hear the steady beat of the culture war drums echoing throughout the political arena?

No one can deny here, nor do I think there is any question that these differences do reflect the broader philosophical schism dividing parts of our society, a moral fault line that generally separates—and here is how I would describe that fault line—it generally separates the champions of tolerance like Jane Fonda from the defenders of traditional values like James Dobson.

But I suspect the values vacuum that overrides all has been represented to both exaggerate and exacerbate these divisions, making the extent of our moral disagreements appear far greater than Professor Alan Wolfe's research, and several other supporting polls, actually show them to be. It seems that the less we express our morality publicly, the more trouble we have finding a common vocabulary of values, which makes it even more difficult for us to discuss civilly and constructively those issues that divide us, or to identify those principles that unite us. This communications breakdown deepens the contempt and suspicion that each side already feels for the other.

The news media, I am afraid to say, which itself has been infected by that anything-goes mentality—not always, but often infected by the anything-goes mentality pervading the entertainment culture—seems too often to fan the flames of controversy. The result is not so much an honest, engaged debate about values, but a culture war echo chamber that only heightens the average citizen's distorted sense that the country is locked in a mortal moral struggle.

The conflict over homosexuality's place, the place of homosexuals in our society, I think, offers a contemporary example of this tension that is very real in our lives and in our discussions and debates. Let's start with the reality that many Americans continue to believe that homosexuality is immoral and not just because the Bible tells them so. In fact, Professor Wolfe's research showed that this is one of the few areas where Americans of all religious inclinations feel so strongly that they are willing to risk the tag of intolerance to express or hold to their points of view, although most of the people he interviewed tempered their disapproval by making clear that they did not support discrimination against

gay men and lesbians. It is unfair, when you think about Professor Wolfe's research, then, for anyone to automatically conclude that people who express moral reservations or even disdain about homosexuality are bigots, or to publicly attack them as hateful. These are sincerely held morally based views.

Yet the suspicions and concerns of the gay community are understandable when one considers the Senate's treatment of James Hormel's nomination as Ambassador to Luxembourg, which is now being blocked by multiple holds by Members of this Chamber. If we truly believe in the claim of equality and the universal principle of fairness of the Declaration of Independence, and if we want to talk more broadly about values with true credibility in this Chamber, I think we owe Mr. Hormel a chance to be evaluated by the same standards we have applied to other nominees. We owe him a chance to be judged by his career and competence, not by his sexual orientation. We owe him a vote on this floor.

If we truly hope to repair the moral breach that separates us and prevents us from confronting what most Americans agree is a crisis of values, I think we have to start by recognizing that the tone of the debate matters as much as the substance. We need to declare a cease-fire in the culture wars, to lay down our rhetorical arms, step back and look at the person across the PTA meeting room or the abortion clinic or the affirmative action rally not as the enemy, but as a fellow American, deserving of the same respect and courtesy we all expect for ourselves, who happens to have a different, deeply held point of view. We need to build on the common moral ground staked out by the call to civil society and begin to reassert in public life those fundamental values that, despite the collateral damage of the culture warring, continue to connect our incredibly diverse populace.

I think the largest responsibility, the first responsibility, falls on those of us who are concerned about the weakening of our common values and the ramifications for our society. We have to acknowledge that many of our fellow citizens not only feel uncomfortable talking publicly about matters of morality, they are also skeptical of those who do. Indeed, one of the great ironies of our time is that many Americans have come to regard morality as a code word for intolerance. So our challenge today is to persuade the skeptics that it is crucial for the future of our country to rediscover those common core principles that made our democracy possible in the first place—those common core principles that were described, declared in the Declaration of Independence—and to renew their strength. We in Congress have the opportunity and the responsibility to support the search for common moral ground.

From those of us who have been privileged and honored to be elected to lead

this country, the American people have a right to know that we hear their anxieties about the Nation's moral future, that we are striving to reflect their core values in our work and in our lives. But more than that, we have to recognize that so much of what we aspire to in this body, by passing legislation to serve the public interest and make this a better country, will ultimately be for naught if we do not fill the values vacuum in American life and rediscover, reclaim the high ground, the common moral ground.

For those reasons, I hope, in the months ahead, to return to the Senate floor, this historic Chamber that truly serves as the American people's forum, to speak with my colleagues from across this great country about different aspects of the values crisis that I have discussed today and to try to offer some specific ideas about how, together, we can better secure "the Safety and Happiness" that our Declaration of Independence promises us all.

I thank the Chair and my colleagues for their patience. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. GRAMS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GRAMS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2291 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OMNIBUS PATENT REFORM ACT OF 1997

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will celebrate America's independence by focusing its energy on issues that create American jobs, protect American ingenuity, and improve the lives of the American people.

One such issue that I would like to talk about today is as American as fireworks on the 4th of July. This is our nation's patent system. Patents are the life's blood of America's industry and economic strength.

America's patent system was established in the Constitution itself. It is no coincidence that some of those who framed our government were inventors. Both Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson were avid inventors. Indeed,

Jefferson invented a cryptographic system that was used by the United States during World War II.

The Founders included in our enduring Constitution as an enumerated power of the Congress, the power "To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." (United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8.) This Constitutional provision was carefully drafted to reflect a recognition by the Founders that our patent system would have to evolve in order to serve its intended purposes.

Congress, from its early days, implemented this constitutional prerogative. The First Congress, in its second session, passed an "Act to Promote the Progress of Useful Arts." President Washington signed that law on April 10, 1790, and the United States Patent Office was thereby created.

Since that time, Congress has updated the patent laws of this country to make sure that the fuel of American genius was well stoked. Indeed, on an Independence Day more than 150 years ago, on July 4, 1836, Congress reorganized the patent system, created the office of "Commissioner of Patents" and reinstated the requirement that patent applications be examined. The Act provided that if the Commissioner deemed an invention "to be sufficiently useful and important, it shall be his duty to issue a patent therefor."

Abraham Lincoln, the only President to be issued a patent, declared that "patents add the fuel of interest to the fire of genius." The patent system has continued to evolve over the last century and one-half as we have adapted to changing times and advances in technology. All the while American innovators have remained at the forefront of useful invention.

I, for one, would like to keep American innovators in the lead. Our jobs and our economic security depend on it. As we enter a new millennium, however, fewer and fewer of America's innovators feel confident that our patent system is keeping pace.

According to the Commissioner of the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), in the last fiscal year, the PTO received 237,045 patent applications—a 14.9 percent increase over the previous year. Inventors are rightly demanding that the PTO conduct quicker and more careful searches. After all, in today's digital world, an innovator cannot afford to wait two years for his or her patent application to be processed. And once that application has been processed, an applicant wants to know that the patent will hold up and that the patent holder will not be caught up in litigation for years attempting to defend it.

It is for this reason that American inventors of all shapes and sizes, large and small, independent inventors and large corporations, have been pleading with Congress to improve our current

patent system. They are asking us to help cut the red tape at the PTO, provide our inventors with stronger patent applications, reduce the cost of resolving patent disputes, and put an end to rules that favor foreign applicants over American applicants. What they have been asking us to do is to pass the Omnibus Patent Reform Act of 1997, S. 507.

Who wants this bill? American innovators and businesses large and small.

The White House Conference on Small Business Technology Chairs wrote to me on May 7, 1998 urging passage of S. 507 because, and I am quoting from their letter:

We believe that S. 507, as amended, will lower the litigation costs for small businesses, make it easier to know what areas of technology are open for innovation, and will go a long way towards giving us a more level playing field vis-a-vis our foreign competitors. We wholeheartedly support passage of the bill and appreciate the attention and support you have given to small business.

The Chief Executives of 48 of America's largest companies wrote the Senate Majority Leader, asking him to schedule a vote on the bill before the Senate adjourns in the fall because "S. 507 makes several major improvements in U.S. patent law that will greatly benefit American companies and inventors."

So what has been stopping this bill? Well, one of the most outspoken opponents of the bill has been the Eagle Forum. The Senate Republican leadership should not clip the wings of technology for the benefit of the Eagle Forum. That would be no way to honor America's independence and no way to honor America's proud tradition of innovation.

Instead, let us celebrate America's independence by helping out the millions of Americans who owe their jobs and prosperity to industries created by America's innovators and creators. The Senate should take up and pass S.507.

I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 23, letters of support from the White House Conference on Small Businesses, the National Association of Women Business Owners, the Small Business Technology Coalition, National Small Business United, the National Venture Capital Association, and the 21 Century Patent Coalition.

I ask that additional letters of support for S. 507 be included in the RECORD following the conclusion of my statement. These letters are from The Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America; the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, PhRMA; the American Automobile Manufacturers Association; the Software Publishers Association; the Semiconductor Industry Association; the Business Software Alliance; the American Electronics Association; and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. and Industry Corporation.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, October 24, 1997.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR TRENT: As you know, this time of year brings a flurry of bills to the fore, each with its own strengths and argument why it deserves floor time prior to adjournment. One bill that clearly merits your consideration for debate is S. 507, the Omnibus Patent Act of 1997.

In the chamber's view, the Hatch/Leahy bill has successfully bridged the debate between proponents of modernizing the patent system (the Chamber has long supported this) and a relatively small group of independent inventors who feared their patent rights might be abridged. The resulting compromise will help strengthen our competitiveness and create jobs while encouraging the inventiveness that always has been an American hallmark. We urge your support for this important legislation.

The House has already passed their corresponding bill. S. 507 was reported from the Judiciary Committee earlier this year by a bipartisan vote of 17 to 1. We believe the time is right now to move these needed reforms, adding another solid accomplishment to this session.

Thank you again for your support.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH AND
MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, June 2, 1998.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LOTT: On behalf of the research-based pharmaceutical industry, we urge you to schedule a vote on S. 507, *The Omnibus Patent Act of 1997*. This bill, which passed out of the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 22, 1997 by voice-vote, will strengthen U.S. patent law, advance innovation, and increase our global competitiveness.

We appreciate your interest in moving legislation that will not result in undue delay in the Senate. We question, however, whether opposition can ultimately be sustained on the Senate floor against S. 507 given its importance to American industry and innovation. Of particular interest to the pharmaceutical industry are provisions that would: Strengthen the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) by making it a government corporation "with resulting operational and fiscal flexibility;" restore patent life lost as a result of unusual administrative delays at PTO; and provide for publication of patent applications 18 months after their filing to allow U.S. companies to have access to applications filed in the U.S. by foreign applicants.

Our industry, which in 1998 will spend over \$20 billion in research and development, depends on strong patent protection to ensure that pharmaceutical companies are able to maximize their efforts to discover new medicines that prevent, cure, and treat disease. S. 507 will foster that and deserves floor consideration soon.

Thank you for your attention to this important legislation.

Sincerely,

Raymond Gilmartin, Chairman President and CEO, Merck & Co., Inc., PhRMA Chairman; David R. Ebsworth, Ph.D., Executive Vice President and President, Pharmaceutical Division, Bayer Corp.; Robert A. Ingram, Chairman, CEO and President, Glaxo Wellcome Inc.; Arthur D. Levinson, Ph.D., President and CEO, Genentech, Inc.; William

C. Steere, Jr., Chairman and CEO, Pfizer Inc.; Wayne P. Yetter, President and CEO, Novartis Pharmaceuticals; Gordon M. Binder, Chairman and CEO, Amgen; Charles A. Heimbold, Jr., Chairman and CEO, Bristol Myers Squibb Co.; Jan Leschly, Chief Executive, SmithKline Beecham; Richard J. Markham, CEO, Hoechst Marion Roussel Inc.; Sidney Taurel, President and CEO, Eli Lilly and Co.

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,

November 7, 1997.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: The American Automobile Manufacturers Association and its members, Chrysler Corporation, Ford Motor Company and General Motors Corporation, urge you to support S. 507, the "Omnibus Patent Act of 1997," co-sponsored by Senators Hatch and Leahy. The House passed patent reform earlier this year, and the Senate Judiciary Committee favorably reported S. 507 by a vote of 17 to 1. The bill has been modified in numerous ways to accommodate the concerns of small inventors, universities, and other interested groups.

We believe S. 507 is a fair and balanced bill that will significantly improve the U.S. patent system. Modernization of the Patent and Trademark Office will permit it to offer improved services to patent applicants and owners. The publication provisions will help avoid duplicative research efforts and will accelerate the development of technology by speeding the dissemination of research advances. Those who file only in the U.S. can avoid early publication if they desire, and new provisional royalty rights will ensure that no inventor is deprived of the economic value of his or her invention between the date of publication and patent approval. The bill also provides a safe harbor for domestic users of new manufacturing processes through the provision of prior user-rights. And, an improve patent reexamination process will provide a low-cost, speedy alternative to expensive litigation for determining the validity of any challenged patent.

The provisions of S. 507 will substantially improve our nation's patent system. This will serve the interests of inventors and technology users alike. More importantly, it will benefit the entire American public by further encouraging technological advances and the products such advances bring. We urge you to vote for S. 507.

Sincerely,

ANDREW H. CARD, Jr.,
President and CEO.

SOFTWARE PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION,

Washington, DC, June 11, 1998.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: On behalf of the Software Publishers Association (SPA), I am writing to ask you to urge Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott to schedule a floor vote on S. 507, the Omnibus Patent Act, early this summer, and call on you to vote to enact its important patent reforms into law.

SPA has more than 1,200 member companies, ranging from large well-known companies to hundreds of smaller companies and Internet start-ups, that develop and market software for business, education, entertainment and the Internet. Patents represent an increasingly important means for these companies to protect the intellectual property in their software-related inventions. In fact, a 1997 survey of over 800 software companies found that over 20 percent either owned or had applied for a patent.

As the collective voice of one of the fastest growing, most competitive industries in the world, SPA supports S. 507 because it would enact patent reforms that would encourage investment and innovation in the software industry and other industries that will create more high-paying jobs in America. This legislation would make significant improvements in U.S. patent law, including early publication of pending patents, expanded re-examination, and a provisional right to a reasonable royalty.

Leading members of SPA long ago came out in favor of S. 507, and Eric Ruff, CEO of Utah-based PowerQuest Corp., testified in support of the bill before the Senate Judiciary Committee (his statement is enclosed). In May 1997, the Judiciary Committee favorably reported S. 507 by a vote of 17 to one. S. 507 continues to enjoy strong bipartisan support.

In closing, I urge you to support S. 507 without amendments that would undermine its objective—a patent system that produces high quality, carefully and examined patents. The House has already passed a similar bill, but time is running out for the Senate to ensure that these important patent reforms become law this year.

Sincerely yours,

KEN WASCH,
President.

SEMICONDUCTOR INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION,

Santa Jose, CA, July 24, 1997.

Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Re Omnibus Patent Act of 1997.

DEAR SENATOR: The Semiconductor Industry Association urges you to support S. 507, the "Omnibus Patent Act of 1997", by Senators ORRIN HATCH, and PATRICK LEAHY.

The U.S. semiconductor industry employs over 235,000 Americans, including in California. Semiconductors are the enabling technology for the nearly \$400 billion U.S. electronics industry, an industry that provides jobs for 2.5 million Americans.

The U.S. semiconductor industry invests over 11% of sales on R&D, \$7 billion in 1996 and leads the world in microchip technology. A strong and efficient U.S. patent system is essential for the U.S. to maintain this technology leadership. S. 507 will create a Patent and Trademark Office that is more efficient and responsive to the needs of U.S. investors, mandate the speedy issuance for patents, and reduce lawsuits and legal bills paid by American inventors and companies. American companies will become more competitive by speeding up research and development and bringing new products to market faster.

S. 507 is a carefully crafted measure that will encourage new inventions and protect American innovators and corporations while at the same time addressing the special concerns of small inventors, small business and universities. S. 507 cleared the Senate Judiciary Committee in May and a similar measure, H.R. 400, already passed the House.

Please vote for S507 when it comes to the Senate floor. If you or your staff would like to discuss this legislation and its importance to the semiconductor industry, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

GEORGE SCALISE,
President.

BUSINESS SOFTWARE ALLIANCE,

Washington, DC, June 29, 1998.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: On behalf of the members of the Business Software Alliance ("BSA"), I want to thank you for your lead-

ership on the Omnibus Patent Act of 1997, S. 507. This legislation will make many significant improvements to the U.S. patent system that will greatly benefit the U.S. software industry and other users of the U.S. Patent Office.

We appreciate your efforts on this important issue and look forward to working with you to seek its enactment before the end of the session. Again, thank you for your hard work on behalf of our nation's high technology industries.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. HOLLEYMAN, II,
President & CEO.

AMERICAN ELECTRONICS ASSOCIATION,
Santa Clara, CA, June 1, 1998.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing on behalf of the more than 3,000 member companies of the American Electronics Association (AEA) to urge you to support S. 507, the "Omnibus Patent Act," and respectfully request that you contact the Senate Leadership and urge them to schedule debate and a floor vote on S. 507 in the near future.

The AEA's member companies span the spectrum of electronics and information technology companies, from semiconductors and software to mainframe computers and communications systems. For over 50 years, AEA has helped its members compete successfully in the global marketplace and has been the accepted voice of the American electronics and information technology industry.

According to AEA's Cyberstates Update report, the high-tech industry added some 200,000 new jobs in the U.S. between 1996 and 1997, for a total of nearly 4.5 million U.S. high-tech workers earning salaries 73 percent higher than the average private sector wage. AEA believes that modernizing the U.S. patent system is critical to sustain the innovation that has resulted in this tremendous job growth and the global competitiveness of U.S. high technology companies.

S. 507, which was introduced by Senators ORRIN HATCH (R-UT) and PATRICK LEAHY (D-VT), contains critical reforms that will protect the interests of American inventors and innovators while preparing the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) to meet the needs of our nation's high technology firms as we enter the 21st Century. The reforms contained in S. 507 will increase the value of patents to inventors and companies, slash red tape in the PTO, and make it easier for U.S. inventors and companies to research, develop, and commercialize inventions.

AEA urges you to support this critical legislation to further advance American technology and strengthen our nation's global competitiveness. If you or your staff have any questions regarding S. 507 or patent reform, please contact Stephanie Stitzer of AEA at (202) 682-4431.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM T. ARCHEY,
President and CEO.

INSTITUTE OF ELECTRICAL AND
ELECTRONICS ENGINEERS,

October 9, 1997.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Senate Majority Leader, Russell Senate Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LOTT: On behalf of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers United States Activities Board (IEEE-USA) and its 220,000 electrical, electronics and computer engineers who are U.S. members of IEEE, we urge you to place the Omnibus Patent Act of 1997 (S. 507) on the legislative calendar during this session of Congress.

The Omnibus Patent Act and its various provisions have already had extensive analysis, numerous public hearings and full consideration of a wide range of perspectives. We believe that it is now time to call for a vote on this important legislation before the end of the first session of this Congress.

IEEE-USA supports the Omnibus Patent Act of 1997 (S. 507) and its publication provisions. Many important compromises have been made and we are now confident that the bill will strengthen the U.S. patent system. S. 507 takes into account many of our members' concerns regarding the disclosure of their technology prior to receiving patent protection. The Omnibus Patent Act provides inventors with the option of delaying the publication of their application until the patent is awarded—as long as they choose to file solely in the United States.

The bill provides our 220,000 U.S. members with a strengthened patent system and arrives as a reasonable balance between inventor protection and public disclosure of technology. We believe that his balance will assist in promoting U.S. innovation and competitiveness.

If you or your staff would like to discuss this with us further please contact Scott Grayson in our Washington, D.C. office at (202) 785-0017.

Sincerely,

DANIEL FISHER,
Chair, IEEE-USA
Intellectual Property Committee.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Thursday, July 9, 1998, the federal debt stood at \$5,526,093,018,467.09 (Five trillion, five hundred twenty-six billion, ninety-three million, eighteen thousand, four hundred sixty-seven dollars and nine cents).

One year ago, July 9, 1997, the federal debt stood at \$5,359,038,000,000 (Five trillion, three hundred fifty-nine billion, thirty-eight million).

Five years ago, July 9, 1993, the federal debt stood at \$4,336,575,000,000 (Four trillion, three hundred thirty-six billion, five hundred seventy-five million).

Twenty-five years ago, July 9, 1973, the federal debt stood at \$454,517,000,000 (Four hundred fifty-four billion, five hundred seventeen million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,071,576,018,467.09 (Five trillion, seventy-one billion, five hundred seventy-six million, eighteen thousand, four hundred sixty-seven dollars and nine cents) during the past 25 years.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1998

(In the RECORD of July 9, 1998, on page S7873, a portion of the text of Mr. DODD's remarks was inadvertently omitted. The permanent RECORD will be corrected to reflect the following:)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, very briefly, I see my colleague from Ohio here, I want to add my voice to those who have spoken in praise of Senator JEFFORDS, the chairman of the committee, his staff, and the wonderful job they did in leading this piece of legislation

and working with Senator KENNEDY as the leading Democrat on our side.

What we witnessed today is a wonderful example of how the legislative process ought to work. It is hard to imagine taking on a piece of legislation that has a 5-year lifespan to it, a higher education bill that affects so many millions of Americans. We did this in one day in large measure because the committee worked very closely together, Mr. President. A lot of work went into trying to resolve issues as a committee. There were a couple we couldn't, so we left those to our colleagues, which is the way it should be here when you can't come to a final resolution.

That shows remarkable leadership on the part of the chairman and the ranking Democrat, that they can take a bill as complicated and as comprehensive as this, one as long in duration as this and bring it to the floor and, in the space of virtually 12 hours, provide the kind of unanimous—it may have been unanimous, I don't know what the vote was here—almost unanimous vote in support of the Higher Education Act for our Nation.

I want others to know that this is a good example of how we ought to work here. I hope others will heed this example.

For DAN COATS, who is not on the floor this evening, our colleague from Indiana, this will be the last higher education bill he will be involved in, as he made the decision to leave the U.S. Senate at the end of his term. Certainly, there will be other bills between now and when the session ends. I am certain Senator COATS feels a sense of pride, as he should, having played a major role in the last higher education bill he will be involved in in the U.S. Senate. I commend him for his efforts.

Let me join in commending staff: Mark Powden for his fine work, Susan Hattan, Scott Giles, Jenny Smulson, Corey Heyman.

Senator KENNEDY's staff: Marianna Pierce did a wonderful job on the Democratic side working on this and keeping us well informed and trying to work out amendments during the committee process and on the floor.

Jennifer Kron and Jane Oates did a wonderful job, as did Townsend Lange from Senator COATS' staff. And you will all understand why I pay a special tribute to Suzanne Day of my office who does a fabulous job on these issues, and has for many, many years. She was joined this year by a new member of our staff who did a terrific job, Megan Murray, who is here with us on the floor this evening. I want to thank her, as well, for the tremendous effort she put into making this a successful bill.

So, Mr. President, I commend our colleagues, and staff particularly, for really doing a very, very fine job. And in these days of acrimony and partisanship and invective behavior, it is wonderful to know there are examples of where this institution shines and shows its best. It did so under the leadership

of the distinguished Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting one withdrawal and sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-5934. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a payment to Rewards Program Participant 96-22 under the State Department Basic Authorities Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5935. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule regarding airworthiness directives on certain Rolls-Royce Limited turbojet engines (Docket 98-ANE-15-AD) received on July 8, 1998; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5936. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300, A300-600, and A310 Series Airplanes" (Docket 97-NM-257-AD) received on July 8, 1998; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5937. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 0100 Series Airplanes" (Docket 97-NM-329-AD) received on July 8, 1998; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5938. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB 2000 Series Airplanes" (Docket 97-NM-145-AD) received on July 8, 1998; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5939. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and DC-9-80 Series Airplanes, Model MD-88 Airplanes, and C-9 (Military) Series Airplanes" (Docket 96-NM-203-AD) received on July 8, 1998; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5940. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF340A, SAAB 340B,