

nor should we, but what you do get is the ability to pick up the phone and call anybody in the world and they will take your call. You can call Nobel laureates, you can call experts in any field, and if you want to learn, this is the ultimate seminar if you take it seriously. There is no other place I can think of that a person can do that.

Mr. President, I have a lot more to learn. And of those 10,000 votes, I am sure there are many that were not as enlightened as I thought they were at the time I cast them. Hopefully, I have learned. Hopefully, I will get a chance to learn more than I know now. If you want to do it, and if you take it seriously and if you reach out across that chasm, you reach out across that aisle, believe it or not, there is somebody on the other side willing to talk to you, willing to exchange ideas with you. If you work hard enough, you actually may do a little bit—just a little bit—to change the state of affairs in this great country. That is all we can do here.

I have no illusions about the significance of the Senate in terms of determining national policy, but within the context and the role the Senate plays, we get to play little parts. The only time it works is when we cross that chasm. That is the only time it works.

I thank my colleagues. They are honorable men. They are men of achievement. I think the public gets a pretty good buy for their investment in the men that are sitting here on the floor today and the women and men who cast all the votes today; they are competent.

It has been a pleasure working with them. I hope I get to cast a few more votes. I hope I get to convince ORRIN HATCH and Senator ENZI to cast more votes my way. The truth of the matter is, as I said, nothing gets done unless you reach across that aisle. I appreciate the fact there has always been somebody on this side to talk to me.

I thank all my colleagues. For those who made other statements, I will respond in the RECORD and not take the time of my colleagues. The Baltimore-Washington tunnel is probably clear by now. We can both head north.

I yield the floor.

FINANCIAL SERVICES MODERNIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to make brief comments about the bill.

I congratulate all of the people that have been involved in passing this bill today. It is a significant piece of banking legislation. It is a significant piece of legislation for this country. It will make a difference to consumer safety, to banks, to insurance companies, to securities companies, to all of the financial institutions of any form in this country.

I want to congratulate the staff people who worked on that bill. They were tireless, they were diligent. They have worked for longer hours than I have seen people work. I want to congratu-

late my fellow Senators on the Banking Committee for not only their tireless effort, but the way they debated, brought issues and amendments to the floor, and worked through the process together. This could have been a much more lengthy process than the 3 days that it took.

I particularly want to commend the ranking member on the committee. It has been a tremendous education working with him through these days. I want to congratulate the chairman, as well. I point out the contrast between the ranking member and the chairman: One is very quiet and one is very vocal. But together they worked through this issue, helped to expedite the votes that we took, helped to expedite the debates, and worked together well so we could reach this point.

I have to make a few comments about the chairman who is one of the most tireless and focused people that I have seen. I know he was an economics professor and I appreciate the amount of research he did for this, and saw that as an example of the effort he probably put in when he was teaching.

I listened to him speak. I think I would have liked to have had him as one of my professors. He can take things that are very detailed and make them interesting. If banking can be made entertaining, he does it. He has a unique use of charts and words that help to paint a picture. Unlike some economists, he is not doing the "on the one hand and on the other hand," he is very decided in his opinions.

I have to mention that in Banking Committee after one of our hearings he was asked how the procedure would go on this bank reform. It was a leftover issue from last year, and a number of people were concerned and wanted it to progress. So they asked him how it would work.

He said: We are going to have a number of hearings on it, and then following the hearings we will draft the bill, and then I want Senators to have an opportunity to talk to their constituents, to talk to their banks, to talk to all of their insurance agents and to talk to their securities dealers and companies. Following that, we will have a markup.

He said: On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday we will have hearings, the draft will be available on Friday, and Tuesday we will do a markup. We did have the hearings on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. The draft wasn't available until Monday so we did not do the markup until Thursday. That has to be some classic action on a bill.

It was not just a matter of taking the bill from last year, it was a matter of simplifying that. He insisted that since we had language in there that was to simplify banking language and to force the banks to operate in plain language, it was only fair that we do that too. It changed the bill from a 308-page bill to a 150-page bill.

We have had the opportunity to debate that. There are still some things

to be worked out. I look forward to the conference committee. Even if I am not on it I will observe it, because I am sure it will be educational. With the intellect of the chairman and the ranking member, it will be a fascinating study and well worth watching. It is one that everybody who is hoping the playing field gets leveled and specified will be holding their breath about.

THE OCEANS ACT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it has been 30 years since the Stratton Commission took a close look at our Nation's coastal policies. The Stratton Commission's recommendations have served as a guide for U.S. oceans policy for three decades, yet as we move towards the next millennium, it is imperative that we once again consider the direction and coherence of our policies towards this immense resource. I applaud Senator HOLLINGS' efforts to explore ways to again examine these policies, and to determine the action necessary to responsibly steward this resource into the next century. I look forward to working with Senator SNOWE and others to create bipartisan support for an Oceans Act that will craft policy for a healthy ocean for our children and for their grandchildren.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, May 5, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,573,001,415,759.57 (Five trillion, five hundred seventy-three billion, one million, four hundred fifteen thousand, seven hundred fifty-nine dollars and fifty-seven cents).

One year ago, May 5, 1998, the Federal debt stood at \$5,486,129,000,000 (Five trillion, four hundred eighty-six billion, one hundred twenty-nine million).

Five years ago, May 5, 1994, the Federal debt stood at \$4,573,713,000,000 (Four trillion, five hundred seventy-three billion, seven hundred thirteen million).

Ten years ago, May 5, 1989, the Federal debt stood at \$2,770,989,000,000 (Two trillion, seven hundred seventy billion, nine hundred eighty-nine million) which reflects a doubling of the debt—an increase of almost \$3 trillion—\$2,802,012,415,759.57 (Two trillion, eight hundred two billion, twelve million, four hundred fifteen thousand, seven hundred fifty-nine dollars and fifty-seven cents) during the past 15 years.

CLOSING THE SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the closing of the United States Army School of the Americas, located at Fort Benning, Georgia. I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of S. 873, a bill to close this troubled school once and for

all, which was introduced recently by the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN.

The School of the Americas (SOA) was created in 1946 to train Latin American military officers in combat and counterinsurgency skills with the goal of professionalizing Latin American armies and strengthening democracies. Originally located in Panama, SOA moved to Fort Benning in 1984. There has been a great deal of controversy surrounding some of SOA's alumni, leading it to be called "the School for Dictators." Some of SOA's notorious graduates include Manuel Noriega, Argentinian dictator Leopoldo Galtieri, at least 19 Salvadorean officers implicated by El Salvador's Truth Commission in the murder of six Jesuit priests, and two of the three officers prosecuted in Guatemala for their roles in the murder of anthropologist Myrna Mack.

In 1991, following an internal investigation, the Pentagon removed certain SOA training manuals from circulation. On September 22, 1996, the Pentagon released the full text of those training manuals and acknowledged that some of those manuals provided instruction in techniques that, in the Pentagon's words, were "clearly objectionable and possibly illegal." The "techniques" in question included such awful activities as torture, extortion, false arrest, and execution.

Not only are the human costs of this training program unjustifiable, but so are its financial costs. When I first ran for this body in 1992, I included the School of the Americas as an item on my 82+ point plan for deficit reduction. With a national debt in excess of \$5 trillion, we must carefully scrutinize every program to ensure that federal tax dollars are wisely spent. We certainly do not need to spend taxpayer dollars on this kind of activity.

Since coming to the Senate in 1993, I have been contacted by hundreds of Wisconsinites who support closing the School of the Americas. Just this week, a number of Wisconsin residents joined scores of individuals from around the country at a protest here in Washington, D.C., against the continued operation of the school. The group from my home state included students, human rights activists, and members of several religious communities. I am pleased that so many Wisconsin residents are committed to working toward the closing of this school.

Numerous organizations, including Public Citizen, the Washington Office on Latin America and Human Rights Watch also support the elimination of SOA.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I am committed to promoting human rights throughout the world. In my view, our government cannot continue to support the existence of a school that counts so many murderers among its alumni. While it may be appropriate for the United States military to train its colleagues from other nations, it is

inexcusable that this training should take place at an institution with a reputation as far beyond salvage as that of the School of the Americas. This legislation gives members of this body the opportunity to separate the legitimate training exercises conducted by the United States military from the sordid acts of many individuals who have been trained at SOA. We must lift the cloud of suspicion that has fallen on these programs by closing SOA.

I am pleased that S. 873 includes language expressing the sense of the Congress that all foreign military training conducted by the United States should stress respect for human rights, the proper role of the military in a democratic society, and accountability and transparency in defense and security policy. This is an excellent opportunity for the Congress, which has oversight responsibilities for military training programs, to reiterate the importance of these basic principles to the Administration, the American people, and perspective candidates for military training from other countries.

The bill also calls on the Department of Defense to vigorously screen all candidates for military training programs to ensure that they have not been implicated in human rights abuses, corruption, or drug trafficking.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 873 and close the "School for Dictators" once and for all.

SBP BENEFIT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise to join my Senate colleagues in supporting the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) Benefit Improvement Act of 1999. This bill corrects a discrepancy between what Congress intended at the creation of this Act in 1972, and how it eventually got implemented.

I have always believed that the people most affected by military service are not the service members, it is the family. The spouses that raise kids on their own during a deployment. The sons and daughters that change schools in the middle of a school year because a parent got assigned to a new base. It's hard to make up for missed soccer games and scout meetings. The Senate has already passed legislation to try to improve some of these areas of quality of life, but S.4 was passed absent one item that I feel is very important, especially to our elderly military retirees living in Montana.

The uniformed services spousal benefit annuity provides 55 percent of retirement pay for a surviving military spouse, as long as the spouse is under age 62. Once the survivor reaches age 62, the benefit drops as low as 35 percent of retired pay. Let me put it on a more familiar level. If a Korean War-era Marine had signed up for this plan after his 20 years of military service, when he passed on, his wife would only get 35 percent of his eligible retirement

pay, instead of the 55 percent she would have received if she was under age 62. No other federal retirement plan has this age-oriented cut. It was also intended for Congress to pay 40 percent of the benefit, and premiums for the plan were set up with that target in mind. Unfortunately, the actuaries were too pessimistic, and as a result, premiums now pay for 73 percent of the cost, with congress paying for 27 percent. This is a far cry from the 40 percent we originally intended. Other federal civilian survivor benefit plans pay up to a 50 percent subsidy with no reduction after age 62.

This bill corrects the problem by stepping up the federal share of military retirement to 45 percent by FY 2005. Given the sacrifices by our service men and women and their families, it's time we provided fair survivors benefits and fulfill our original Congressional intent.

I'm grateful to Senator THURMOND for introducing this legislation to correct this discrepancy and for letting me vocalize my support for this bill by including me as a co-sponsor. I'm confident that the Armed Services Subcommittee will give this a favorable review, and I look forward to supporting it when it comes to the floor. I encourage my colleagues to lend their support to this important provision as well.

FUNDING OF ACADEMIC HEALTH CENTERS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the combination of Medicare payment cuts and the growth of managed care has become a devastating one-two punch against many of the nation's most respected academic health centers. A front-page article in today's New York Times documents what is happening. Teaching hospitals across the country are losing money and facing the prospect of cutting back the research, the teaching and training, and the advanced medical care that have made American medicine the envy of the world. These centers are also major safety-net institutions that provide extensive care for the uninsured.

Every American depends for quality health care on doctors trained in the nation's teaching hospitals. Research conducted at these hospitals is the basis for much of the astounding progress that we are making in medical science, and these institutions are indispensable in bringing advances in the laboratory to the bedside of the patient. For the most serious and intractable illnesses, teaching hospitals are the caregivers of last resort. They have the newest and most sophisticated equipment. The physicians who practice there are on the cutting edge of new treatments, and they see the largest number of such cases.

It would be an American tragedy if, as a result of short-sighted Medicare payment policies and equally short-sighted pressures for HMO profits, academic health centers are forced to