

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 10, 1999 after the first vote, approximately 12 p.m., in the President's Room to conduct a markup.

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

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Governmental Affairs Committee be authorized to meet on Wednesday, November 10, 1999, at 1 p.m., for a hearing entitled "Private Banking and Money Laundering: A Case Study of Opportunities and Vulnerabilities."

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

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs and the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 10, 1999 at 10 a.m. for a hearing regarding Federal Contracting and Labor Policy: Could the Administration's Change to Procurement Regulations Lead to "Blacklisting" Contractors?

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on International Relations of the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 10, 1999 at 2 p.m. to hold a hearing.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

GEORGE GABRIEL CELEBRATING HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor my fellow New Yorker George Gabriel on the occasion of his 90th birthday. George has been a war veteran, tennis instructor, lawyer, and vice president of Broadcast Music, Incorporated (B.M.I.). His family will always know him for his love of classical music, quick wit, and pertinent advice.

During World War II, George was stationed in Australia and the Philippines. He distinguished himself as a member of the Army's code-breaking operations, reading enciphered cables intercepted from Japan. This might explain his affinity for the always challenging New York Times crossword puzzles!

After the war, he graduated from Brooklyn Law School and went to work for B.M.I. His work in the field of music copyright prompted a quick rise up the corporate ladder. He was even-

tually promoted to the position of vice president, where he remained until the time of his retirement.

Yet, for all his professional achievements, it is his personal life that gives him the most fulfillment. This epochal moment marks a grand achievement for a man who is a mentor to grandchildren, nieces, and nephews. I offer my prayers to George for continued good health and cheer, and close with a particularly apt Irish blessing:

May joy and peace surround you,
Contentment latch your door,
And happiness be with you now,
And bless you evermore. •

COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

• Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, several weeks ago the Senate wisely rejected the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Much was written about how the debate evolved here in the Senate. As one closely involved in this historic debate, I submit for the RECORD an excellent article in the November 8 issue of National Review by Richard Lowry. The article follows.

[From the National Review, Nov. 8, 1999]

TEST-BAN BAN

(By Richard Lowry)

"If we had a hearing and had a vote on the CTBT, we would win overwhelmingly."

—Sen. Joe Biden, July 29, 1998

Jesse Helms mounted his motorized cart and left the Republican cloakroom, just off the Senate floor. Arizona senator Jon Kyl was right behind him. Georgia's Paul Coverdell got word in his office and immediately headed out the door. All were converging on the offices of majority leader Trent Lott late Tuesday afternoon, Oct. 12, as Senate staffers and others buzzed of an imminent deal to avoid a vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Minority leader Tom Daschle had just offered Lott a treaty-saving agreement. Now the small group of Republicans—after clearing Lott's cramped conference room of all staff, to ensure privacy—would decide whether the Senate would vote down a major international treaty for the first time in 80 years.

Their decision would be the culmination of months of work, and it would determine whether the congressional wing of the GOP would win its most significant victory since welfare reform in 1996. They knew they had a strong case on the merits. Defeating the treaty would, among other things, fit into a two-pronged national-security strategy featuring both missile defense and nuclear deterrence; deterrence is impossible without a safe, reliable American arsenal of the sort that the treaty would endanger. Shrewd GOP tactics and a series of Democratic miscalculations had brought the treaty to the brink, and now the senators were back where they had started—around that conference table—pondering whether to push it over the edge.

The first meeting in Lott's office had been in late April, when those same four began a quiet, well-organized effort to defeat the treaty. Kyl was the point man. A bright, serious-minded conservative and an authority on arms control, he had hosted meetings of anti-treaty staff as early as February. Soon after, he enlisted the help of Coverdell, always an important behind-the-scenes Senate player. Treaty opponents realized from the beginning that they would be wise to learn from their defeat on the Chemical Weapons Convention two years earlier, when Lott undercut them at the last minute. The first lesson? Get Lott on board early.

At the April meeting, Lott indicated his opposition to the treaty but said that no decisions could be made until the group determined how many Republicans were with them. So, in early May, treaty opponents began the first in a series of careful "whip checks" of how GOP Senators intended to vote. They gave wide berth to Senators who were likely to support the treaty or might spread word that something was afoot. "There were 15 to 20 members we didn't even ask," says a Senate aide. The first count showed 24 votes against the treaty—10 short of the number needed to stop it—with another 11 "leaning against."

Around this time, an internal debate among treaty opponents was close to resolution, at least in the minds of Kyl and Coverdell. The question had been whether it was better to "go fast"—gather the votes to defeat the treaty, then vote on it right away—or "go slow," in the hope of bottling it up forever. The "go fast" advocates figured treaty opponents would only lose strength as the November 2000 elections neared. With the approach of Election Day, Senators would want to avoid any controversial vote, while the White House would benefit from additional time to hammer its opponents. The chemical-weapons fight had demonstrated the awesome communications power of the administration. Why wait for it to shift into gear?

In early August, Lott was shown a binder full of clips—op-eds and letters—that supported the treaty, which seemed to indicate that the administration's push for it was underway. For a long time, treaty opponents had feared the administration would use a September conference commemorating the third anniversary of the treaty's signing as a deadline for Senate action. A July 20 letter from all the Senate Democrats—demanding hearings and a vote by October—seemed to confirm this plan. A fall treaty fight would coincide nicely with the period in which Republicans would be scrambling to pass appropriations bills. Democrats would have leverage to threaten to bollux up the spending process—creating the conditions for another "government shutdown"—unless Republicans released the treaty.

Lott settled on a three-part interim strategy: (1) Helms—with 25 years' experience opposing ill-conceived arms-control treaties—would continue to hold up the treaty in his Foreign Relations Committee; (2) meanwhile, influential former national-security officials would continue to be lined up in opposition to it; and (3) Kyl and Coverdell would continue to work the vote count. By the time of a Sept. 14 meeting in Lott's office, Kyl could guarantee 34 votes in opposition—just enough. He could also deliver the energetic help of former secretary of defense (and secretary of energy) James Schlesinger.

Before long, the education effort by treaty opponents was in full swing. Kyl's staff prepared briefing books to distribute to other Senate staffers. Two nuclear-weapons experts who had worked in the labs briefed senators both individually and in small groups. And Schlesinger, who had served in both Republican and Democratic administrations, spoke at a luncheon for Republican Senators, then returned for more briefings the following week. "He was key to us," says the Senate aide. The effort began to show in the steadily rising vote count: Sept. 14-34 opposed; Sept. 17-35; Sept. 22-38; Sept. 30—an amazing 42.

At the same time, Democrats heedlessly stepped up their agitation for action on the treaty. North Dakota Senator Byron Dorgan

was threatening to tie up Senate business, getting under Lott's skin. "They were a huge influence on the decision to say, 'Okay, let's just hold this vote,'" says Coverdell about the Democrats. On Sept. 28, Biden showed Helms a resolution that he planned to offer, proposing hearings on the treaty this year and a vote by March 31, 2000. Biden's ploy seemed to indicate that the Democrats now planned to raise the temperature on the treaty in the spring, when it would get enmeshed in the presidential campaign and discomfit George W. Bush. As a result, Lott decided to move. He quietly reassured Biden that his resolution would be unnecessary.

On Sept. 30, Lott offered a "unanimous consent" agreement—all Senators have to sign on to such an agreement for it to go into effect—to bring up the treaty for an immediate vote. Daschle objected, charging that, among other things, there wasn't enough time for debate. Lott gave the Democrats the additional time they wanted, and on Oct. 1, Daschle lent his support to a new agreement. There would be a vote on the treaty within two weeks. Every Democrat in the Senate had endorsed the timing—and this was a mistake of major proportions.

Why did the Democrats do it? In part, they were trapped by their own rhetoric. Gleeful GOP staffers had a sheaf of statements from Democrats demanding a treaty vote this year. How could they back out now? They were also probably unaware of the direness of their situation. "It was plain arrogance," says Kyl. "They didn't have any idea they wouldn't win." Democrats also might have figured that they could, if necessary, cut a last-minute deal with Lott to avert a vote. The final days of the treaty fight featured a panicked Democratic effort to reverse course and do just that, even as the vote count against them continued to mount: Oct. 1-43 against; Oct. 7-45.

Lott was still open to avoiding a vote, but only if he could get an ironclad agreement from the Democrats that it would not come up again for the duration of the Clinton administration. It was this possibility—and the wiggle room the administration would surely find in any such deal—that had treaty opponents on edge. "We were nervous until the vote took place that something was going to sidetrack it," says Arkansas Senator Tim Hutchinson. On Oct. 12, Daschle sent Lott a letter proposing to shelve the treaty, barring "unforeseen changes." Lott promised to run it by his members. Hence the call that brought Helms, Kyl, and Coverdell dashing to Lott's office. Daschle's staff was already telling reporters that a deal was at hand, prompting yet another treaty opponent, Oklahoma's Jim Inhofe, to sprint to Lott's office unbidden.

Kyl, Helms, and Coverdell huddled with Lott over Daschle's proposal. What did "unforeseen changes" mean? Coverdell thought it was a "glaring escape clause." The consensus of the group was that it was unacceptable. "We couldn't have had a more calm, considerate discussion," says Kyl. "Lott didn't need to be persuaded or harangued in the least." There was a brief discussion of going back to the Democrats with a draft of a foolproof deal. But it dawned on everyone that any deal would be impossible. The Democrats weren't serious, and some Republicans were unwilling to go along no matter what. Inhofe, arriving at Lott's office, emphasized just that. The only way out, as one Senate aide puts it, would have been "an internal Republican bloodbath."

So, the next day, all systems were go. Lott firmly rejected a last-minute floor attempt by Democratic lion Robert Byrd to place obstacles in the way of a vote. Byrd threw a fit—to no avail. It was too late. Republican Senator John Warner was running around

the floor, still gathering signatures on a letter asking that the vote be put off. Again, too late. President Clinton called Lott, asking if there was anything he could do. Replied Lott: Too late. When the floor debate was concluded, 51 Republican Senators voted down the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in the face of international pressure, the opposition of the White House, and hostile media.

Surprising? Well, yes. "I thought we had 50," says Jon Kyl.●

RECOGNITION OF JULIE ROLING

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to express my appreciation for the hard work of Julie Roling, a Brookings Institution Fellow who has worked as part of my staff for the past six months. Julie has been a tremendous asset to my legislative staff, and I am fortunate to have had her assistance. When she returns to the National Security Agency in December, I know she will be missed by me and my staff.

Very often, Brookings Fellows have reputations that precede them in Capitol Hill offices. Known as some of the best and brightest government employees, they are considered secret weapons to the Members they assist. Julie has been no exception. She came to my office with a wealth of government experience and policy knowledge, as well as a model work ethic and positive attitude. While her expertise lies in defense procurement, Julie welcomed projects in a broad array of new issue areas and contributed a great deal to my legislative staff.

Throughout the past six months, Julie has worked on a number of projects dealing with the environment, natural resources, agriculture and trade. Julie led research efforts regarding a controversial wetlands policy during her time in my office. The unfortunate circumstances surrounding this issue pitted the interests of agricultural producers against environmental groups. It was imperative that my staff and I have access to the most recent information, in order to effectively address the concerns of my constituents. Julie's research provided my office with up-to-date and unbiased information that enabled me to communicate clearly with both farmers and environmentalists during this time. Julie handled frequent communication with government agencies and almost daily communications with South Dakotans.

Julie also provided valuable assistance on crop insurance legislation this year as well. Both the House of Representatives and the Senate introduced numerous bills to reform the crop insurance program in this Congress, an issue of great importance to the farmers of South Dakota. Julie collected and synthesized information that enabled me and my staff to decide which crop insurance reform bills most effectively addressed the concerns of South Dakota farmers.

One of the most challenging tasks Julie undertook was the creation of a comprehensive resource guide regard-

ing restructuring of the electricity industry. The end result of Julie's work was a thorough index of restructuring terms, industry positions, key issues and legislative proposals. Anyone who is familiar with the complexity of deregulation proposals can appreciate the hard work and attention to detail required to create such a resource, which will be invaluable to me as the Senate Energy Committee continues to discuss and evaluate restructuring legislation.

Again, I wish to express my deep gratitude to Julie for a job well done. I wish her the very best in her future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO CIVIL WAR HERO FREDERICK ALBER

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the late Frederick Alber of Lapeer County, MI. On November 13, 1999, the community of Oregon Township will dedicate a new headstone for Mr. Alber and also honor other veterans buried in the Oregon Township Cemetery.

Frederick Alber enlisted in the Seventeenth Michigan Infantry on July 2, 1862 at age 24 and served valiantly during the Civil War. On July 30, 1896, Private Alber was issued the Medal of Honor for his undaunted bravery in the wilderness and his heroic actions at Spotsylvania. On May 12, 1864, Private Alber rescued Lieutenant Charles Todd of the 17th Michigan Infantry who was in the hands of a party of rebels. Private Alber shot down one enemy rebel and knocked over another with the butt of his musket. He then took the rebels as prisoners and conducted them both to the rear of the formation.

The Civil War is one of the most important events in our nation's history. Thanks to the brave actions of soldiers like Frederick Alber, we are a united, free country. It is only fitting that we remember the great sacrifices made by those who have gone before us. The marker dedication at Frederick Alber's grave site is a meaningful way to remember and honor the past heroes of our country and is an appropriate manner in which to salute our cherished liberties.

I join the entire community of Oregon Township and Lapeer County as they pay their respects to a real American hero, Frederick Alber.●

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD P. AUGULIS

● Mr. HOLLINGS. I rise today to pay tribute to Richard P. Augulis on the occasion of his retirement as director of the National Weather Service Central Region.

In Mr. Augulis' 35 years with the National Weather Service, including 13 years as director of the 14-state Central Region, he has held public safety paramount, whether as a forecaster or as a manager. He has now retired to Las Vegas, Nevada where he is able to enjoy this new venture with members of his family.