The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. There is an objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am surprised by this objection by our Democratic colleagues. This issue concerns two very important matters: one, the intelligence authorization for the year, and also the very important Department of Energy reforms as a result of the Chinese espionage that has occurred during the last several years within the Department of Energy.

Needless to say, this issue needs to be debated in the Senate. I am truly sorry our Democratic colleagues do not want to debate it at this time.

I have urged the President, the National Security Adviser, Sandy Berger, and the Secretary of Energy to engage this issue. The headline should read: Senate resolves how in the future the Department of Energy will handle these matters to stop the leaks of very important nuclear weapons information from our labs.

That should be the headline, that we are working together to resolve this problem, instead of the situation where the Secretary of the Department of Energy is still trying to have a diffused system of reporting. There should be only one person who is reported to on the matters of national security at our nuclear labs, and that is the Secretary of Energy, and it should go straight to him and from him to the President of the United States. Surely we can work this out.

Having said that, I now move to proceed to H.R.——

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. REID. I say to the majority leader, there are ongoing discussions. There was a hearing today in the Senate on this very issue. There are meetings that are going to take place today on that issue. I have spoken to the Secretary of Energy as recently as last evening.

We are really trying to work something out. I think parties on both sides are trying to work something out. I think it would be to everyone's best interest that when we do bring this up, there is some degree of certainty that it will be resolved.

We also understand, without any question, the importance of the intelligence authorization bill. Senator KERREY, the ranking member of this committee, has expressed, on numerous occasions, how important it is we move this legislation. So I say to the leader and Members of this body, we are doing our utmost to resolve this issue as quickly as possible.

Mr. LOTT. I am glad to hear that.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. But having said that, I now move to proceed to H.R. 1555, and I have sent a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1555, the intelligence authorization Bill:

Trent Lott, Pete V. Domenici, Paul Coverdell, Jesse Helms, Chuck Hagel, Judd Gregg, Slade Gorton, Craig Thomas, James Inhofe, Frank Murkowski, Jon Kyl, Jim Bunning, Tim Hutchinson, Connie Mack, Rick Santorum, Richard Shelby.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 1 hour for debate, beginning at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, to be equally divided, of course, in the usual fashion between Senator DOMENICI and Senator DASCHLE, or their designees, and that the cloture vote occur at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 20, and the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. There is not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. I now withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Georgia has time allocated this morning. I am asking his indulgence that I might speak for a period not to exceed 5 minutes and to yield within that period a brief moment or two to our distinguished colleague, Senator HAGEL.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding we do have an hour under my control, or my designee. I will designate up to 5 minutes. I ask the indulgence of the Senator from Virginia because I have a flight to accommodate as quickly as we can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

NOMINATION OF RICHARD HOLBROOKE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I address the Senate regarding Executive Calendar No. 135, the nomination by the President of the United States of Richard Holbrooke of New York to be the Representative of the United States of America to the sessions of the General Assembly. That was presented to the Senate by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. HELMS, on June 30, 1999. Following the favorable reporting by the Committee. It is now pending.

I have been in this magnificent body, privileged by the State of Virginia, for 21 years. I fully recognize the rights of Senators to place holds on nominations. I respect that right. I respect them for the reasons they have done it. I have done it myself, although sparingly. But in my judgment, the urgency for the Senate to address this nomination is increasing daily. I urge the Senate to proceed to an up-or-down vote because the United States of America, in my judgment, is increasingly in need of having a very powerful voice at the U.N.

Ambassador Holbrooke, in my judgment, is eminently qualified. He is well experienced with the complex issues in the Balkans.

I ask unanimous consent that at the end of my remarks there be printed an article in today's Washington Post.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. WARNER. It covers the following:

> Five weeks after the end of bitter ethnic war and the arrival of NATO troops in Kosovo, growing confusion among Western officials, local politicians and Kosovo's population about who controls the province is hampering efforts to begin rebuilding its tattered economy and political structure and social services.

The essence of this article captures a concern of this Senator, that the men and women in the Armed Forces, be they wearing the uniform of the United States or the uniform of our other NATO allies, all under the command of an American officer, General Clark, are at increasing personal risk because the United Nations is not able, perhaps for valid reasons, perhaps for invalid reasons, to take up their allocation of responsibilities and relieve the burdens from the troops so they can restrict their responsibilities to professional military duties.

I believe we should proceed with this nomination, have a vote up or down. Hopefully, this nomination will be approved by the Senate, and we can have a strong voice to enter into this very serious situation in Kosovo. We have invested billions of dollars. We have put at risk tens of thousands of lives, the men and women of the Armed Forces of this country and other countries, to reach the conclusion we now have of relative stability, in clear contrast to the cruel ethnic cleansing inflicted upon the people of Kosovo.

I think the time has come. I ask those who have reasons to be further considering this nomination—I am actively working to resolve those problems—to weigh the risk to the men and women of the armed forces of all nations involved in Kosovo.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, July 16, 1999]

KOSOVO'S NEW ADVERSARY: CONFUSION

(By R. Jeffrey Smith)

PRISTINA, Yugoslavia, July 15—Five weeks after the end of a bitter ethnic war and the arrival of NATO troops in Kosovo, growing confusion among Western officials, local politicians and Kosovo's population about who controls the province is hampering efforts to begin rebuilding its tattered economy, political structures and social services.

The Western allies are preparing an ambitious multibillion-dollar program to repair war damage and bring stability to Kosovo and the surrounding region for the first time in at least a decade. But the effort has already become bogged down by major disagreements among the rival claimants to power in the Serbian province.

In the resulting power vacuum, Kosovo's myriad problems are multiplying. Thousands of vacant buildings, homes and businesses are being taken over by squatters, some of whom are investing in new, unlicensed enterprises whose legal basis is unresolved. No one is sure who owns public enterprises or who is to benefit from their revenues now that most Serbian officials have left and hundreds of thousands of ethnic Albanian refugees have returned.

With municipal offices otherwise unoccupied, former members of the rebel Kosovo Liberation Army are taking up positions as local administrators even though they lack any legal authority. Even so, the former rebels are making decisions and issuing edicts whose long-term viability is open to question.

In the meantime, fire departments have no trucks, hospitals have no ambulances or equipment, gas stations have no fuel. Electricity and water supplies function only intermittently, and telephone service is available only in parts of Pristina, the Kosovo capital, and a few other towns. Without a trained police force, ''the level of lawlessness is stable on the high side,'' one senior Western official said.

But no one knows who to complain to—or where.

According to NATO, the United Nations—officially in charge of reestablishing a civilian government—is the top authority. But almost no one here seems to heed, or even recognize, the U.N. presence. Many civilians still regard NATO and its 32,400 troops as the ultimate arbiter on civil matters. Other residents say unelected ethnic Albanian representatives, led by KLA members, are in charge.

Moreover, the KLA and the United Nations have begun to joust over matters both large and small. In one such encounter, Jay Carter, the senior U.N. official in charge of civilian government here, told a senior KLA official that all state-owned property in Kosovo is now under U.N. control. But Visar Reka, the KLA official, said he responded that ''You're not the owner, you're just the manager; Albanians are the owners.''

Reka and others who work in the offices of KLA political leader Hashim Thaqi, who has been named prime minister of a provisional government, say they have the authority to run the province until elections next spring. But U.N. officials refuse to recognize this claim. ''To me, [Thaqi] represents the KLA, not the government; we are clear on this,'' said Brazilian diplomat Sergio Vieira de Mello, the interim U.N. administrator in Kosovo.

Even so, the United Nations itself is unsure how far its legal mandate extends and recently asked its lawyers to review what authority its officials are entitled to assert. In particular, the lawyers are looking at whether revenues from state-owned enterprises, such as electric and water utilities, must be placed in escrow until Kosovo's legal status is resolved or can be spent without input from authorities in Belgrade, the capital of both Yugoslavia and its dominant republic, Serbia. Kosovo's final legal status—whether it will remain part of Serbia, for example—is likely to take years to resolve.

For now, no one knows for sure what Yugoslavia—and its Serbian leadership—owns or is entitled to control in Kosovo. ''Ownership is one of the toughest problems we face,'' said de Mello, who is being replaced this week by Bernard Kouchner of France. ''If it is state-owned, it is the U.N.'s, at least during the interim administration. If it's private, we are in serious trouble.''

Kosovo's ethnic Albanian majority is reasserting itself in the wake of the withdrawal of Serb-led forces and the flight of tens of thousands of Serbs from the province. More than 660,000—or roughly 85 percent—of the ethnic Albanians who fled or were expelled from the province have now returned, each expecting to have considerably more say in Kosovo's governance.

Meanwhile, the government in Belgrade has complained repeatedly that provisions in the June 12 cease-fire accord offering Serbia at least a token role in policing borders and monuments in Kosovo have not been respected. It has also denounced talk of creating an independent currency for the province and has claimed rights to revenues from state-owned mines and power plants.

Much of the confusion stems from the uncertain status of the agreement signed by ethnic Albanian leaders and Western officials in France last March, which set out in dozens of pages what the new government here would look like. But Serbian officials never accepted the document, and nothing was written to replace it when the cease-fire accord was signed. Since then, the United Nations, NATO and local leaders have had to renegotiate which of its provisions will be followed.

KLA officials, for example, complain that the United Nations got off on the wrong foot by demanding that jobs at city halls, utilities and state-owned media be apportioned equally among Serbs and ethnic Albanians. The intent was to demonstrate even-handedness and to help persuade Kosovo Serbs to stay here. But the plan angered ethnic Albanians, who expected that jobs would be divided according to their proportion of the overall population—now hovering at 95 percent.

''It means a new slavery,'' said Ram Buje, a KLA political official now employed in Thaqui's office, of the proposed 50–50 split. When asked about the split last Friday, de Mello indicated he was unaware of it and called inappropriate. By Sunday, U.N. officials agreed that 330 ethnic Albanians will eventually work alongside just 60 Serbs at the city hall in Pristina, a likely model for other towns. But the city hall was closed Tuesday after the most prominent Serb there was badly beaten by an ethnic Albanian mob, which claimed he had committed atrocities during the war.

The ethnic Albanian leadership has not been the only source of friction for the U.N. mission. A U.N.-appointed consultative council was to have been established Tuesday, which would have the power to confirm the selection of mayors for each of Kosovo's 29 municipalities. It was supposed to have two representatives from longstanding ethnic Albanian political parties, one from the KLA, two independent ethnic Albanians, two Serbs, a Turk and a Muslim. The Belgrade government's local representative was not invited, de Mello said, ''because the others won't come if he is there.''

But some KLA officials last week created a new party that will not be represented, and the two Serbs picked by de Mello—Serbian Orthodox Church Bishop Artemije Radosavljevic and Serbian Resistance Movement leader Momcilo Trajkovic—announced last weekend they would boycott the commission on grounds that Serbs and Serbian interest are not being adequately protected. As a result the council has yet to get off the ground.

De Mello acknowledged that it remains to be seen how the council will be replicated ''at the district or . . . municipal level, where democratic institutions will truly be tested.'' Buje, the Thaqi aide, has in the meantime stepped into the vacuum by appointing mayors for 25 municipalities—all but the four in which Serbs compose a majority of the local population.

''We are the people who know all the business,'' Buje said, but the government ''is a mosaic. We know this is an international protectorate, but it's all mixed.''

WHO'S RUNNING KOSOVO?

The U.N.? Bernard Kouchner, the U.N. administrator in Kosovo, faces a situation in which disputes over control have bogged down reconstruction efforts.

NATO? Many in Kosovo still regard NATO, commanded by Gen. Wesley K. Clark, as the ultimate arbiter on civic matters, but NATO says it's the United Nations.

The KLA? Kosovo Liberation Army leader Hashim Thaqi says the rebels have authority over Kosovo for now, but the United Nations refuses to recognize this claim.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield to my distinguished colleague, Senator HAGEL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I echo what my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has said.

It is not wise policy nor responsible governance for the greatest power on earth to hold captive one of the most important and responsible positions in this government, a position that has an effect and consequence to all of our allies as well as our adversaries. It is a constitutional mandate for this body to act with responsibility, aside from dispatch, and to move on this. I personally think holds are irresponsible. I understand the tradition of this body. I am new to this body, but I would go so far as to say, if you wish to hold someone, have the courage to take a stand on the floor of the Senate. Come before the American public and say why that hold is to be put on and why it is so important to hold captive such a critical position for this country, for our allies, for the representation of American values and standards across the world.

To put in jeopardy our men and women in uniform who defend this Nation, as the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee has so directly stated, is irresponsible. I support strongly what the senior Senator from Virginia is saying. This body

should have the courage to bring this nomination up and vote straight up or down. Let every Member be recorded.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to continue the remarks so forcefully made by our beloved chairman of the Armed Forces Committee, the Senator from Virginia, and the Senator from Nebraska, as regards the nomination before us on the calendar for the position of permanent representative to the United Nations.

I would like to make the point—and I have served in that role—that this is a Cabinet position. It has been from the time of President Eisenhower when Henry Cabot Lodge was in the Cabinet. It is one of the oldest traditions of this body that a President is entitled to and must have his own counselors. Be they right-minded or wrong-minded, they are the President's judgment and they are his responsibility.

This office is a Cabinet office of the highest importance, as the Senator from Virginia has said, in mediating urgent international issues. But there is an awesome principle. Once, almost a half century ago, the Senate did reject a Cabinet nomination of President Eisenhower. It was not a proud moment for the Senate. We have not done it since, for the good reason that we ought not to do it ever.

I plead with the Senate to respect this prerogative of the other branch. I hope I will not seem mischievous if I repeat the remarks of my friend from Nebraska who said the day may come when there is a President of the other party. And indeed that could come very shortly. I do not predict it, but that is the way we work here. That President would want to choose his Cabinet members and would be entitled to do so, for all the errors they may make or not. That is the constitutional form of government in which we live. Let us, sir, support that regime of two centuries, unparalleled in the history of democratic government, based upon this principle of the separation of powers and the President's right to choose.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues.

Yesterday, the Armed Services Committee had a briefing on the Balkan Task Force from the Department of Defense. I put the question to the uniformed officers: Is there a correlation between the absence of strong leadership in the U.N. and risk to our troops? Their response was a definitive yes.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

TAX CUTS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I recognize the distinguished Senator from Missouri for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I thank the Chair, and I thank the Senator from Georgia. I thank the Senator from New York for his allowing me to accommodate a previously developed schedule. When I had asked for time during this special order, I had anticipated being able to begin at about 11, so I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues.

This morning the Senate voted on a Social Security lockbox to protect every dollar of Social Security, protect the surplus and the integrity of Social Security. We were not able to do that. We had a majority of the Senate vote in favor of it, but there is still the filibuster on the part of others who are unwilling to guarantee a vote on this issue.

The supporters of the lockbox believe the money Americans pay for Social Security ought to go for Social Security, period. That happens to be the language of the President of the United States who has endorsed that position. But Social Security taxes are only one of the many taxes, as we all know, that are placed upon the American people. Too many taxes, forms of taxation, proliferate in this place. These taxes place an enormous $1.8 trillion burden on the American people annually. That is 1.8 trillion, trillion being a thousand billions and a billion being a thousand millions. It is more money than one can virtually imagine.

These taxes also bring in more money than the Government needs. It is amazing. What we have is a Government which is charging more in taxes than it needs in order to provide services. I find it interesting that over the next 10 years there will be a trillion dollars more than are needed to provide the services we now provide.

Normally, if you go into a store and you give them $20 and you are buying something worth $8, they give you change. When you pay in excess of what you need to buy the product you are getting, they give you change. I think the U.S. Government ought to do that. We ought to say: There is a surplus coming in. The people have paid more than is needed for these services. We ought to give the money back.

If a store owner came to me and said: You have bought two bottles of milk and you get some change from your $10 bill, but instead of the change, I want to give you six more bottles of milk, I would say: Wait a second.

I think the American people want some change. They want change in the way Government is consuming their resources. I believe it is time for us to begin to address the idea that we have tax relief for the American people.

Never before in history have we paid as high a tax as we pay today—State, local, Federal taxes—and a lot of the State taxes are really disguised Federal taxes. I say that because the Federal Government forces the State governments to do things. Then the State government has to charge the people for that. The truth of the matter is, it is a mandate from the Federal Government. It is an expense occasioned by the demand of the Federal Government through the system. And when you put all of our taxes together, they are higher than any time in the history of the country—higher than in wartime, the First World War, Second World War, Korean war, Vietnamese war, Gulf war; you name it, we are higher than ever before. Now, it seems to me we ought to be asking ourselves with whom we are at war. I had one taxpayer say to me: I think you are at war with the American people, because we are taxing them the way we are.

I think the American people deserve a break. The Republicans in Congress agree with that. We believe we should return the tax overpayment. Senator ROTH has offered an $800 billion tax cut over the next 10 years. This tax cut is deserved; it has been earned. The American people are the ones who are responsible. This Congress didn't create the surplus. The American people earned the surplus. It is just as if you hand $20 to the grocer and you are entitled to change; it is money you earned.

It is the same with the American people who are overpaying for Government services now, creating a surplus. It is money they earned. They earned it, and we should return it. So we should change the slogan of Washington from, ''You send it, we spend it,'' to, ''You earned it, we returned it.''

I think one of the things we ought to do as we begin to provide relief to the American people is to scrub out of our system those things that are discriminatory and those things that are harmful, pernicious punishments in the Tax Code, especially punishments for things that are very important to our culture. One of those things is marriage.

I don't believe there is an institution in this country more important to the future of America than marriage. We want people to be married. We want the durable, lasting commitments of families to undergird this culture with the kind of principles and responsibilities and values that will keep us from having really serious social problems. I believe we will minimize the difficulties and trauma we have in this culture if we have strong marriages, things we need to minimize such as the tragedies we experience.

What we find out when we look at our Tax Code is, for the last several years Americans have been paying a tremendous penalty in taxes merely because they are married; $29 billion is paid by people as a penalty to the Tax Code simply because they are married, and 21 million couples pay that penalty. It is an average of $1,400 per couple, per year. That is over $100 a month. Think of the food, the shoes, the schoolbooks, the entertainment that could pay for. That is at least a very nice vacation for that family. Think of the relief to families if we simply say, we are not going to punish you for being married.

It is time for us in Congress to say that among those items of tax relief,