

Landrieu-Specter amendment No. 384 to the FY 2000 Defense Authorization, S. 1059, bill regarding the need for vigorous prosecution of war crimes and crimes against humanity in the former Yugoslavia, I would have voted in favor of the amendment. My vote would not have changed the outcome of the vote on the amendment which passed by a vote of 90-0.

I was unable to reach the Capitol in time for the vote because of air travel delays due to weather conditions. I am disappointed that, though I and other Members notified the Senate leadership about our travel difficulties hours before the vote began, they were unwilling to reschedule the time of the vote.

AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the Honorable TRENT LOTT dated May 17, 1999, signed by myself and Senator KERREY.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, May 17, 1999.

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

DEAR SENATOR: The Select Committee on Intelligence has reported a bill (S. 1009) authorizing appropriations for U.S. intelligence activities for fiscal year 2000. The Committee cannot disclose the details of its budgetary recommendations in its public report (Senate Report 106-48), because our intelligence activities are classified. The Committee has prepared, however, a classified annex to the report which describes the full scope and intent of the Committee's actions.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 8(c)(2) of Senate Resolution 400 of the 94th Congress, the classified annex is available to any member of the Senate and can be reviewed in room SH-211. If you wish to do so, please have your staff contact the Committee's Director of Security, Mr. James Wolfe, at 224-1751 to arrange a time for such review.

Sincerely,

RICHARD C. SHELBY,
Chairman.
J. ROBERT KERREY,
Vice Chairman.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, May 24, 1999, the federal debt stood at \$5,597,942,875,397.10 (Five trillion, five hundred ninety-seven billion, nine hundred forty-two million, eight hundred seventy-five thousand, three hundred ninety-seven dollars and ten cents).

Five years ago, May 24, 1994, the federal debt stood at \$4,591,881,000,000 (Four trillion, five hundred ninety-one billion, eight hundred eighty-one million).

Ten years ago, May 24, 1989, the federal debt stood at \$2,781,133,000,000 (Two trillion, seven hundred eighty-one billion, one hundred thirty-three million).

Fifteen years ago, May 24, 1984, the federal debt stood at \$1,489,236,000,000

(One trillion, four hundred eighty-nine billion, two hundred thirty-six million).

Twenty-five years ago, May 24, 1974, the federal debt stood at \$471,902,000,000 (Four hundred seventy-one billion, nine hundred two million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,126,040,875,397.10 (Five trillion, one hundred twenty-six billion, forty million, eight hundred seventy-five thousand, three hundred ninety-seven dollars and ten cents) during the past 25 years.

HONORING ROBERT SUTTER

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity today to salute a distinguished servant of the legislative branch of the U.S. Congress in the field of foreign affairs. In June 1999, Dr. Robert Sutter will leave the Congressional Research Service after 22 highly productive years as a source of expertise on China and the Asia-Pacific region. Dr. Sutter is resigning from his current position as a Senior Specialist in Asia and International Politics in the Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division of CRS to become the National Intelligence Officer for East Asia, a critical intelligence community assignment.

Since 1977, when he first came to work at CRS as a China specialist, Dr. Sutter has provided Members of Congress and their staffs with authoritative, in-depth analysis and policy options covering a broad range of foreign policy issues involving China, East Asia, and the Pacific. It should be a matter of pride to this body to know that Dr. Sutter is well known both here and in the Asia-Pacific region as one of the most authoritative and productive American Asia hands.

In his government career to date of over 30 years, Dr. Sutter has held a variety of analytical and supervisory positions including service with the Foreign Broadcast Information Service and temporary details with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Department of State. It is in service to Congress, however, specifically with the Congressional Research Service, that Dr. Sutter has spent most of his distinguished career. I want to make a few comments that illustrate the strengths and great contributions of both the institution and the man himself.

The first point to make concerns one of the great institutional strengths that CRS offers to the congressional clients it serves, and which Dr. Sutter's tenure and contributions here epitomize perfectly: institutional memory. Dr. Sutter's first published report at CRS was entitled U.S.-PRC Normalization Arguments and Alternatives. Published first as a CRS Report for general congressional use, on August 3, 1977, it soon became a Committee Print of the House International Relations Committee's Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. The report and subsequent Com-

mittee Print addressed a number of highly controversial issues arising out of President Carter's decision to normalize relations with China. Congressional concern about the consequences of derecognition of the Republic of China, and dissatisfaction with the terms of the agreement negotiated with the People's Republic of China, directly led to the landmark Taiwan Relations Act, which still governs our policy decisions today, and which continues in 1999 to be a factor in debates in this very chamber.

Besides Bob Sutter, only 48 Members of Congress serving today, in the 106th Congress, were here in 1977 and 1978 to witness these initial steps of U.S.-China relations. In the more than 20 years since then, both U.S.-China relations and the U.S. Congress itself have undergone tremendous change, both for the better and for worse. Bob Sutter has been an active participant in congressional deliberations on China policy, and in the U.S. national debate over these issues, from normalization of relations, to the Tiananmen Square crackdown, to the recent tragic bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade. Dr. Sutter's two decades of service spanned the tenures for four U.S. presidents and some ten Congresses. Despite several shifts of party control in the Senate, and one in the House, Dr. Sutter continued to deliver timely, accurate, objective, and non-partisan analysis. The institutional memory represented by CRS analysts, which Dr. Sutter so perfectly exemplifies, is of incalculable value to the work of the Congress.

The second point I want to make concerns Dr. Sutter himself. He has, for one thing, consistently demonstrated an astonishing capacity for work. In 1974 Dr. Sutter received his Ph.D. in History and East Asian Languages from Harvard University, writing his Ph.D. thesis while maintaining a full-time job. Routinely, he has been one of—perhaps the most in terms of sheer output of written work—productive analysts in CRS. In the last 5 years alone, Dr. Sutter has been called on for advice from Members of Congress and their staffs nearly 6,000 times—an average of 1,140 times each year. He has regularly maintained six or more ongoing, continually updated products, and his output of CRS written reports for Congress totals at least 90 since late 1987 alone. As is evident in these products, he excels at providing accurate, succinct, and well-organized analysis of congressional policy choices and their likely consequences. His work always reflects up to date knowledge of issues, usually based on personal research in East Asia and/or close contact with the U.S. private and official community of Asian analysts and scholars.

Even more to the point, Dr. Sutter has always understood the powers and special needs of Congress, including its legislative and oversight responsibilities, and our obligation to represent

the interests of our constituents. In his research and writing, Dr. Sutter never forgets the unique role of Congress and the importance of reflecting the full range of competing viewpoints.

Reflecting his commitment to service and cheerful willingness to assume responsibility, Dr. Sutter has fulfilled a number of roles in the CRS. He has served as Chief of the Foreign Affairs Division in CRS, as well as Chief of the Government Division in CRS, in both cases maintaining a full research work load for Congress in the midst of significant management duties. He has frequently conceived, coordinated, and moderated Asia policy seminars and workshops for Members of Congress and their staffs. He routinely serves on special advisory groups in CRS and the Library of Congress. As a well-known and respected analyst, he has been a sought-after speaker at dozens of foreign policy seminars, panels, and conferences in Washington and around the world.

In recent years, he has maintained this outstanding record of productivity for the Congress while managing in his spare time to teach several college courses per year at Washington area universities. He has also found time to write more than a dozen books on foreign policy issues during his tenure at CRS.

Finally, Dr. Sutter's simple decency, modesty, engaging manner, and professionalism set a high standard for others and make it a great pleasure to work with him. He cheerfully volunteers for onerous tasks. He is pleasant and good-humored. Moreover, in the midst of the pressured environment of Washington and Capitol Hill, he has always found time to serve as a mentor, counselor, and friend to others, whether they be his own students, younger colleagues, or new congressional staff. And, a fact known only to close friends, he has a record of community service, including Church work and teaching of English to native Spanish speakers, that is nearly as impressive as his professional contribution.

Dr. Sutter will be greatly missed, but the loss of his service to the Congress will be partly compensated for by bringing to the Executive branch his knowledge of the Congress and its special role in the making and oversight of U.S. foreign policy. When he comes back to Capitol Hill for one-on-one meetings, briefings, and testimony, he will bring with him a high degree of credibility and a special awareness of congressional needs for information and analysis.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S VISION FOR EDUCATION IN AMERICA

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, over the weekend Vice President Gore outlined his vision for American education if he becomes President. The speech was billed by the Washington Post as the Vice President's "vision for American education in the 21st Century". Unfor-

tunately for our children, the Vice President's vision for American education in the 21st century looks a lot like the failed policies of the last 35 years.

The VP's speech laid out seven new proposals for American education—seven proposals that all say AL GORE knows more about educating children than do parents, teachers, principals, superintendents and school board members all across America. Seven proposals to add to the hundreds upon hundreds of education programs run by the federal government, so many in fact that no one, not the Department of Education, the General Accounting Office or even the Vice President, is sure how many there are. Seven proposals that will add to a system of top down control of education that puts a higher priority on adults filling out forms correctly than on children passing a math or a spelling test.

Today, President Clinton unveiled his proposal to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Unfortunately, the President's proposal is filled with more of the "D.C. knows best" programs he has touted for the past 6½ years. For example, the President's proposal for reducing class size is filled with requirements for states and districts to comply with, but does not address the issue of children learning.

For most of this half century Washington, D.C., has been dominated by people who believe that centralized decisions and centralized control exercised by Washington, D.C., is the best way to solve problems, including those in the classroom. This approach has not worked. As Washington, D.C., has taken power and authority from local school districts, our schools have not improved. But, old habits die hard. The belief in centralized power is still very much alive, and embodied by the President's and Vice President's proposals.

I don't believe AL GORE or Bill Clinton know more about what America's schools and communities need than they do. In fact, I don't believe that I or any other member of Congress or the Administration knows more about educating children than do parents or local educators. Unfortunately, AL GORE and Bill Clinton have indicated that they will continue on the path they've trod throughout their administration—a path that begins and ends in Washington, D.C.

In 1997 I first proposed an amendment to the fiscal year Education funding bill. It was stated clearly in that amendment that I believe that those closest to our children—their parents, teachers, superintendents and school board members—are best able to make decisions about their children's education. Last year, I refined that legislation to include a "triple option" that would allow a state to decide where the federal education dollars should go. Both proposals passed this body by slim margins and were immediately met with a veto threat by the Administration.

This year, I have worked with a bipartisan coalition of members and groups to devise legislation that will allow states maximum flexibility in return for increased accountability for the academic achievement of their students. My bill, the Academic Achievement for All Act, or Straight A's, will be introduced after the Memorial Day recess. I am hopeful that this time my colleagues in the Senate will join me in giving back to states and local communities the ability to make critical decisions about the education of their children.

This issue boils down to each Senator asking if he or she believes schools will be improved through more control from Washington, D.C., or by giving more control to parents, teachers, principals, superintendents and school board members? I believe our best hope for improving the education of our children is to put the American people in charge of their local schools.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT 384

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I wanted to indicate to the Senate why I was unavoidably absent, as was recorded in yesterday's RECORD, at the time of the vote on amendment 384 to S. 1059. I was in Connecticut yesterday. Because of serious thunderstorm and wind conditions my flight from Connecticut to Washington was delayed for several hours, causing me to miss the vote on the amendment.

As yesterday's RECORD indicates, had I been able to return to vote, I would have voted for the amendment, which passed 90 to 0.

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-3254. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Accidental Release Prevention Requirements: Risk Management Programs Under Clean Air Act Section 112(r); Amendments to the Worst-Case Release Scenario Analysis for Flammable Substances (FRL# 6348-2)", received May 18, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3255. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Primary Lead Smelting (FRL# 6345-8)", received May 18, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3256. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry (FRL#