Safety Program (SUBSAFE). First initiated in May 1963 and formalized that December, SUBSAFE was designed to ensure the *Thresher* was not repeated. After months of exhaustive hearings, which produced 12 volumes and 1,718 pages of evidence, the service's experts traced the *Thresher's* sinking to a series of failed silver-braze joints and pipes that set into motion a deadly chain of catastrophic events that ended with the warship's main systems flooded and her ballast system unable to muster enough air to send her to the surface. The investigators concluded that once the submarine dove to her test depth of 1,300 feet, water pressure ruptured her pipes and created a two inch leak. This sent an unstoppable stream of icy water over her control panels that her crew was unable to stop because they could not reach her centralized shutoff valves in time. It stopped her reactor and sent her backwards and downwards as she lost all power. Unable to blow enough air into her ballast tanks through her narrow pipes—moisture in her pipes had frozen, blocking her air vents—the *Thresher* imploded as she fell over 8,000 feet to the bottom.

In the wake of this, the Navy's Bureau of Ships and the Ship Systems Command placed depth restrictions on all the service's post-World War II submarines—the *Scorpion* was limited to a depth of 500 feet instead of her standard operating depth of 700 feet—and ordered their inspectors and workmen to begin the time-consuming and expensive task of examining and replacing faulty sea water hydraulic piping systems and rewelding possible faulty joints in over 80 submarines. They also ordered the improvement of flood control systems by increasing ballast tank blow rates and the installation of decentralized sea water shutoff valves.

By the time SUBSAFE was instituted, the *Scorpion* was in dry-dock at the Charleston Naval Shipyard for her first and last full overhaul. Arriving on June 10, 1963, and remaining until April 28, 1964, she had nearly completed her repairs by the time the yard's command received orders to implement the new safety requirements. Although workmen inspected the *Scorpion's* hull and replaced many of her welds, they were not authorized to install emergency sea water shut-off valves. Moreover, the Naval Sea Systems Command deemed the interim emergency blow system the yard constructed unsuitable for service and ordered it disconnected. The Navy decided to defer installing these two systems until early 1967, the date of the *Scorpion's* next scheduled overhaul.

By then, the Navy had spent over $500 million on SUBSAFE and estimated that it needed at least another $200 million more to certify all its submarines. In addition, severe outside pressures were forcing the Navy to rethink how best to allocate its already stretched resources. Faced with fighting an increasingly protracted war in Vietnam while meeting the unchanging demands of maintaining America's global security obligations at a time when the Soviets decided to expand and transform their navy into a full-blown blue water fleet, the service's high command began to grope for new ways to meet its backbreaking obligations.

Confronted now with the urgent need to launch more warships and to keep the ones it already had at sea, the Navy decided to delay installing full SUBSAFE systems in many of its older submarines. What prompted this shift started with a series of confidential memoranda and messages drafted in 1966 as the Navy sought ways to reduce the time its submarines spent in dry dock meeting SUBSAFE's requirements. A Naval Sea Systems Command study of that era revealed not only the rising costs of this program but that approximately 40 percent of the average submarine's time was spent undergoing reconditioning instead of serving at sea.

The Navy's leadership was clearly worried by the political fallout these statistics would generate. On March 24, 1966, the Commander of Submarine Squadron 6—the *Scorpion*'s unit—drafted a memorandum to Admiral Schade, Commander Submarine Force, Atlantic Fleet that candidly admitted that ''the inordinate amount of time currently involved in routine overhauls of nuclear submarines is a recognized source of major concern to the Navy as a whole and the submarine force in particular and stands as a source of acute political embarrassment.'' The memorandum blamed the Navy's Bureau of Ships and the managers of the service's shipyards for these problems and complained about the shortage of skilled workers needed to complete the overhauls, their poor planning in ordering critical materials on time, and the overall magnitude of what SUBSAFE required. It also warned that the *Scorpion*'s next scheduled reconditioning in November 1966 ''will establish a new record for in overhaul duration.''●

SMALL FARM RIDER AMENDMENT

● Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly about an amendment regarding OSHA inspections of small farms, which I was prepared to offer to S. 544, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill. To expedite the consideration of this emergency legislation, I withdrew my amendment, but I want my colleagues to know that I will continue to press this issue.

As other Senators may know, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, by statute, can enforce health and safety rules and investigate accidents on farms or businesses of any size.

However, a rider prohibiting OSHA from expending funds to carry out its statutory duty with respect to small farms has been attached to Department of Labor appropriations bills for the past several years. Small farms are those that employ ten or fewer workers and do not maintain a camp for temporary employees.

I want to emphasize that this prohibition extends even to the investigation of fatal, work-related accidents. I am not speaking of malicious acts leading to deaths on the job—law enforcement authorities are capable of addressing those circumstances. I am speaking of deaths caused by preventable health and safety hazards—hazards that no agency other than OSHA has the capacity to address.

Since the death of a sixteen-year-old Rhode Islander in an accident on a small farm in 1997, I have worked to address this issue.

Mr. President, it is heartbreaking for a parent to send a child off to a summer job only to see him die in an accident, and it is infuriating for these parents to wonder whether other youngsters now working on that job are safe.

I am sensitive to the concerns that some Senators will have about protecting the interests of family farms. That is why I have attempted to only moderately amend the current rider. Indeed, my amendment only allows OSHA access to small farms if there is a death, and only for investigation, not punitive action.

I have advanced this proposal in the hope of disseminating information about the causes of fatalities in order to prevent repeat tragedies and to bring a sense of closure to families who lose a loved one.

When I raised this issue during the markup of the Safety Advancement for Employees (SAFE) Act in the Labor and Human Resources Committee during the last Congress, several of my colleagues expressed a willingness to work with me on this issue. Regrettably, there is little the authorizing committee can do, because the problem stems from an appropriations rider, and an appropriations bill is where a correction should be made.

Mr. President, agriculture is one of the most hazardous industries in the United States today. We should take at least this minimal step to ensure the safety of agricultural employees.

Last Fall, the National Research Council (NRC), an arm of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), issued a report entitled Protecting Youth at Work. Among its recommendations was the following related to small farm safety:

> To ensure the equal protection of children and adolescents from health and safety hazards in agriculture, Congress should undertake an examination of the effects and feasibility of extending all relevant Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations to agricultural workers, including subjecting small farms to the same level of OSHA enforcement as that applied to other small businesses.

Mr. President, it is the opinion of the NAS panel that small farms should be subject to the same level of enforcement as all other small businesses. In comparison to this recommendation, my proposed amendment is moderate, because, again, my amendment only allows an OSHA inspection on a small farm following a fatal accident. The inspection could not result in fines or any other OSHA enforcement.

During consideration of the SAFE Act in the 105th Congress, the Labor Committee voted for a provision requiring an NAS peer review of all new OSHA standards. Today, we have a report from the NAS making recommendations on OSHA enforcement on small farms. I hope that colleagues will keep that in mind and that they will remember that my amendment is not as extensive as the NAS recommendation.

Mr. President, some have criticized my amendment as unfair to small farm owners. I am mystified by their argument. The only small farms to be impacted would be those where an employee dies in a work related accident. Then, the only imposition the business would face would be an investigation: no fines, no enforcement, and no regulation. If information could be disseminated to prevent just one of the 500 deaths that occur annually in the agriculture industry, I believe this minor

inconvenience would be worth it. I know my constituents who lost their son feel that way, and I would venture to guess that many other families would feel that way too.

Mr. President, I want to thank Senator SPECTER, Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, for his good faith efforts to address this issue. His commitment to continue working with me was a major reason for my decision not to proceed my amendment on the Supplemental Appropriations bill. I look forward to working with the Senator from Pennsylvania and other concerned Senators in the months ahead.●

HONOR VICTIMS OF SCHOOL VIOLENCE BY ENACTING THE SAFE SCHOOL SECURITY ACT

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to state that today marks the first anniversary since the tragic school shooting in Jonesboro, Arkansas. We all remember hearing about the gun shots fired by two young boys hiding in the woods—shots that led to the tragic death of four of their classmates and a Jonesboro teacher. March 24th will forever be ingrained in our memories as the day our children's safety at school was threatened in a way we could hardly imagine.

One of the bills I introduced recently was aimed at keeping our kids in school. But solving the truancy problem is only one of the issues we must work together to tackle. Not only do we need to keep our kids in school, we need to keep our kids in school safe! The Safe School Security Act I introduced last week is intended to do just that.

Children should not have to fear for their safety while attending our public schools. At a time when violent crime in the nation is decreasing, ten percent of our public schools reported at least one serious violent crime during the 1996–97 school year. Because of this level of violence, 29 percent of elementary, 34 percent of junior high and 20 percent of high school students fear that they will be a victim of crime while at school. The school yard fist fight is no longer a child's worst fear: 71 percent of children ages 7 to 10 say they worry about being shot or stabbed. In fact, 13.2% of high school seniors reported being threatened by a weapon between 1995 and 1996. We all know that a violent environment is not a good learning environment.

Educators and law enforcement know that technology is the key to preventing and reducing crime in our schools. Most of us understand the importance of protecting our assets, yet we have neglected to protect our biggest investment of all: our school children. The Safe School Security Act would establish the School Security Technology Center at Sandia National Laboratory and provide grant money for local school districts to access the technology developed and tested by the lab. Because Sandia is one of our nation's premier labs when it comes to providing physical security for our nation's most important assets, it is fitting that Sandia would be chosen to provide security to our school districts throughout our nation.

Increased school security not only reduces violent crime, it reduces truancy and property crime. The latest technology was recently tested in a pilot project involving Sandia Labs and Belen High School in Belen, New Mexico and the results were astounding. After two years, Belen High School experienced a 75 percent reduction in school violence, a 30 percent reduction in truancy, an 80 percent reduction in vehicle break-ins and a 75 percent reduction in vandalism. More important, Belen realized a 100% reduction in the presence of unauthorized people on the school grounds. Also, Belen saw insurance claims due to theft or vandalism at the high school drop from $50,000 to $5,000 after the pilot project went into effect. Clearly, the cost of making our schools safer and more secure is a good investment for our nation.

The School Security Technology Center will partner with the Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center in Georgia to facilitate the transfer of available security technology to schools that could benefit the most from such technology. The School Security Technology Center will also provide security assessments for schools so they do not spend limited school resources on security tools that do not work. This bill will authorize $10,000,000 for schools to access the technical assistance from Sandia and to purchase security tools that fit their needs.

This one year anniversary of the horrible tragedy in Jonesboro should make it clear to everyone that it is time to focus on making our kids feel safe in school and ultimately putting kids first.●

SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY'S REMARKS AT THE AMERICAN IRELAND FUND NATIONAL GALA

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last week, on the eve of Saint Patrick's Day, the American Ireland Fund recognized Senator KENNEDY for his life-long commitment to the Irish people and to peace in Northern Ireland. Senator HATCH and myself had the honor of introducing Senator KENNEDY that night. Today, I rise to recognize Senator KENNEDY for his work on behalf of peace and justice here in the United States and around the world, particularly in Ireland.

Before Ireland was in fashion, Senator KENNEDY was its loyal friend. Throughout the adult lives of most of the members of this body, Senator KENNEDY, his sister United States Ambassador to Ireland Jean Kennedy Smith, and members of their family have worked tirelessly, day in and day out, to better the lot of the least fortunate of their fellow men and women. Senator KENNEDY's efforts regularly reach across the borders of nation, race and religion.

It was only natural, then, that the conflict and injustice in Northern Ireland would make a claim on Senator KENNEDY's conscience. His unceasing interest in achieving peace in Northern Ireland was, and is, the one constant over the many ups and downs on the still bumpy road to resolving that conflict. He labors both as a distinguished representative of the United States, and as a loyal son of Ireland.

Reflecting on the way Senator KENNEDY has led so many of his colleagues down the tortured path that must inevitably lead to peace, I am reminded of the figure of the great Irish poet, William Butler Yeats, standing amidst the portraits of his contemporaries in the Dublin municipal gallery of art, and urging history to judge him not on this or that isolated deed but to:

Think where man's glory most begins and ends;
And say my glory was I had such friends.

Mr. President, I, and many others, are most grateful to be able to call Senator KENNEDY both a colleague and a friend.

In recognition of the honor he received last week from the American Ireland Fund, Mr. President, I ask that the remarks he gave that evening be printed in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

Thank you, Chris Dodd and Orrin Hatch, for those kind words. Bertie Ahern, Kingsley Aikens, Loretta Brennan Glucksman, Father Gerry Creedon, friends, family—and fellow immigrants!

I just wish my parents could have been here. Mother would have loved everything you said—and Dad wouldn't have believed a word of it!

There's an old Irish saying that half the lies your opponents tell about you are not true.

But when your friends tell lies like that—it's beautiful.

It is an especially great honor to accept this award in the presence of so many of those who were essential to the success of the Good Friday Agreement.

The shamrock has three leaves, and I'm convinced that the peace agreement would never have been possible without the strong support at all the critical moments of the three greatest friends of Ireland in America—President Bill Clinton, Vice President Al Gore, and our truly indispensable peacemaker, Senator George Mitchell.

I welcome Bertie Ahern back to Washington. He deserves great credit for his own leadership during the peace negotiations and in the succeeding months.

I also pay tribute to the leaders of the Northern Ireland political parties who are here—John Hume and Seamus Mallon, Gerry Adams, David Trimble, Lord Alderdice, and Monica McWilliams. And I especially congratulate John Hume and David Trimble for the well-deserved Nobel Peace Prize.

I also welcome Secretary of State for Northern Ireland Mo Mowlam. And I salute Prime Minister Tony Blair, and many other Irish and British officials for their courage and determination not only in reaching the peace agreement, but in moving it forward, inch by inch, day by day.