On April 26, 2000, he said:

I hope we get to the bottom of the answer. It's what I'm interested to know.

On Meet The Press on April 15, he said:

Laura and I really don't realize how bright our children is sometimes until we get an objective analysis.

On April 6, 2000, the Associated Press reports this quote:

You subscribe politics to it. I subscribe freedom to it.

That was a question about whether he and AL GORE were making the Elian Gonzalez case a political issue.

This appeared in The Los Angeles Times on April 8, 2000:

I was raised in the West. The west of Texas. It's pretty close to California. In more ways than Washington, DC, is close to California.

On March 28, 2000 in Reston, Virginia, he said:

Reading is the basics for all learning.

This was at Fritsche Middle School in Milwaukee on March 30, 2000:

We want our teachers to be trained so they can meet the obligations, their obligations as teachers. We want them to know how to teach the science of reading. In order to make sure there's not this kind of Federal—Federal cufflink.

Mr. President, I will make my final quote for tonight. We have several pages more we will do at a subsequent time.

In the Washington Post of March 24, 2000, this is his quote:

Other Republican candidates may retort to personal attacks and negative ads.

Mr. President, I read these direct quotes. It would have been very easy to editorialize on every one of them. I chose not to do that. I chose, though, to spread across the record of this Senate statements made by Governor George W. Bush which should lead some to believe that if this man is going to be heavily involved in policy not only of this Nation, but this world, that they should be aware of some of the statements he has made. We want this to be a Government where people are clear on the issues, understand the issues. We have difficult, very complex problems not only domestically, but internationally. I think these quotes speak for themselves.

Mr. President, it is my understanding the Senator from Iowa is here and wishes to speak.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask the Senator to yield to me for a second.

Mr. REID. How much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator was given as much time as he may consume.

Mr. REID. I will yield the Senator some time.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for mentioning some of those quotes. I didn't hear them all because I was on my way to the floor from my office.

Mr. REID. I was only able to get to a few of them. I only spent about 40 minutes talking on the direct quotes from the Governor of Texas. There will be more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada can only yield for a question at this point in time.

Mr. REID. It is my understanding he was asking me a question.

Mr. HARKIN. Yes. I appreciate the Senator's comments and reading those quotes. I wonder, did the Senator listen to the third and final debate?

Mr. REID. I didn't miss a single word of that debate.

Mr. HARKIN. I want to ask the Senator, did he hear the quote by about Governor Bush—there was a question asked about agriculture. Vice President GORE answered the question and it came to Governor Bush. He started talking about using food as a weapon. He made this quote—he said:

We have got to stop using food. It hurts the farmers.

Does the Senator remember that quote?

Mr. REID. I listened with amazement. In responding to my friend from Iowa, following the second debate, the Vice President, during that debate, said that there was a young lady in Florida that wasn't able to get a desk. The Republican spin doctors came back the next day and said that wasn't true, she was only out of a desk for a day. In fact, she missed 7 days because of not having room in that classroom, for whatever reason. I was so amazed that the press picked up on what the Vice President said, which to me indicated that was just one of the minor problems that we have in education.

I heard a day or two after the debate from Governor Bush. He said this. I heard it. He said: Well, I did fine in the debate because the expectations were so low of me that all I had to do was show up and say my name is George W. Bush and win the debate.

I say to my friend from Iowa, that is about how the American press has treated it. All he had to do was show up and tell his name, because if they looked into some of his statements—for one, the statement that the Senator from Iowa asked me about regarding food—it seems to me for our farmers who are suffering so much in our country today that is something the press might want to pick up on.

Does the Senator have another question?

Mr. HARKIN. No.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not have the right to do that. Under the previous order, the Senate will recess until tomorrow morning at 9:30.

Mr. REID. I did not hear the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Nevada was allowed time to speak, and after he spoke, the Senate is to be in recess until tomorrow at 9:30 a.m.

Mr. REID. I want to complete my statement. I will finish that in a hurry. This is a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair: We are going to come in at 9:30 tomorrow morning?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REID. And we are to pick up the older Americans legislation.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I asked for 15 minutes at the end of the time. For some reason it got mixed up and I was not included on the list. It is my intention to ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak for 15 minutes before the Senate goes out on recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Chair.

SHORTAGE OF AIRLINE PASSENGER SPACE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, one of the most serious issues facing our national air transport system is the shortage of space—both in the air and on the ground at key airports. We've seen this most clearly this past summer in the backups at Chicago O'Hare and in much of the airspace in the Northeast.

Americans have developed a tremendous appetite for air travel for both leisure and business needs. In the last few years, with our economy so strong, the result has been an increasing number of packed planes all year round, especially during the peak summer travel season.

But for many Americans trying to enjoy some vacation time, this summer was a season of discontent filled with bad weather, aging air traffic control systems and airline-employee difficulties. Countless Americans spent hours sitting on the tarmac at O'Hare waiting to take off, or sitting in the airport lounge, waiting for their planes to arrive. Thousands of Americans found themselves delayed, stranded and disappointed. A once-reliable system has become increasingly unreliable.

Some of these events are unavoidable. Clearly, there are times when bad weather requires us to delay or cancel flights. But when an airport is near capacity, even the tiniest alteration in landing and takeoff timing can quickly turn into considerable delays.

We've been seeing the warning signs for years. The National Civil Aviation Review Commission, chaired by the current Secretary of Commerce, Norm Mineta, warned us three years ago about our looming air travel crisis.

In fact, the very first sentence of the Commission's report reads as follows:

Without prompt action, the United States' aviation system is headed toward gridlock shortly after the turn of the century. If this gridlock is allowed to happen, it will result in a deterioration of aviation safety, harm the efficiency and growth of our domestic economy, and hurt our position in the global marketplace.

Mr. President, the future is now. As we have turned the corner into the 21st Century, the predicted air traffic control crisis is clearly upon us.

I believe FAA Administrator Jane Garvey has done a terrific job. However, there are a number of steps that the FAA and the airlines must take—in both the short and long run—to modernize the air traffic control system and reduce congestion, particularly as it affects the heavily traveled northeast air corridors between New York, Boston, and Washington, DC, and Chicago and other key Midwestern airports.

In the short term, the FAA needs to make better use of existing capacity. This means better communication between the FAA and airlines when bad weather ties up key airports and decisions must be made about reducing or rerouting air traffic. Right now, airlines have no coordinated plans on bad weather days, and they're left to guess whether their competitors will cancel or slow their flights or not.

Now I recognize that airlines can't simply pick up the phone and talk to each other about capacity decisions. Such discussions would run afoul of our nation's antitrust laws. But Congress and FAA should consider whether they should grant some form of very limited immunity so that airlines can discuss with the FAA the most efficient way to cope with bad weather.

Another short term solution involves alternative routings. I understand that the airlines, working cooperatively with FAA, have begun flying many routes at lower altitudes. This practice is costly since flying at lower altitude burns more fuel—but it should help increase airspace capacity. FAA also needs to explore the possibility of accessing airspace previously reserved for military use. Much of this military airspace can be made available to commercial operations on a short-term basis during severe weather.

The FAA must also add additional air traffic controllers. And FAA must make sure that these controllers have the most modern, up-to-date tools available to do their jobs.

The FAA needs to take full advantage of GPS technology to allow more direct routings between airports. FAA also needs to develop technology to allow pilots and air traffic controllers to communicate more effectively with each other. One such technology is advanced data links which could reduce controllers' workload and improve their ability to create and communicate alternative routines in severe weather. It would be far more accurate and efficient for many air traffic control commands to be given to pilots in written form. The airlines and the FAA are currently undergoing tests along those lines, but I believe they must move forward more quickly.

Finally, we in Congress must continue to increase FAA research and operating budgets. We need to expand programs that examine the problems of aging aircraft. And we need to invest more in technologies that will give both pilots and air traffic controllers the very best equipment for making safe decisions. We've got to fully fund NASA aviation programs like the one designed to better detect wake-vortex trailing behind aircraft. Such technology can allow the FAA to narrow the decades old 7-mile separation standard and free up more airspace.

But these actions alone will not be sufficient. Our current system can barely handle the roughly 600 million passengers that currently travel each year. Yet, it is projected that the system will need to handle an expected 1 billion annual passengers within the next decade. Indeed, our demand for air travel seems ready to overrun our overburdened system. In some cases, we do need to add additional runway capacity.

Let's look specifically at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport. O'Hare is a place that I—and hundreds of thousands of fellow Iowans who land or connect through there every year—know well. On a blue-sky day, it's one of the best, most efficient airports in America. However, when the rain clouds or thunderstorms roll in, O'Hare can become one gigantic travel obstruction.

When O'Hare backs up, the result is a monumental ripple effect on the entire air traffic control system from Los Angeles to Boston. Because of its central location and population base, Chicago O'Hare has developed into the first or second largest hub airport in this country. It is the only hub that has two major airlines which maintain competing hub operations. This is good for the citizens of Chicago and Illinois, and it is also good for the people of Iowa and surrounding states that use O'Hare to connect to distant destinations.

We in Iowa can connect to our final destinations through such hubs as Minneapolis-St. Paul, Cincinnati, St. Louis or Denver. However, the largest share of Iowans choose to go through O'Hare because it is the largest and most convenient hub for our citizens. O'Hare also provides far more international connections than those other airports. In fact, well over 50 airlines operate there. In the past 12 months, more than 360,000 of my fellow Iowans have flown through O'Hare.

So the problems at O'Hare are not just a Chicago issue, they are a Midwestern issue, and they are a national issue.

This situation calls for immediate action. I strongly believe that the most important step we can take to begin to alleviate our national airline crisis is to provide additional facilities for planes to land and take off at Chicago's O'Hare airport. I believe O'Hare should logically have additional parallel runways to provide expanded capacity.

As we move into this new century, we need to ensure that the critical pathways of our air transport system are not encumbered by local disagreements, which constrain the needs of interstate commerce. In addition, if we want to foster increased competition between airlines and see continued service to O'Hare from the smaller commercial airports like Burlington and Waterloo in Iowa, and if we want to expand services to cities like Sioux City, then we must provide additional take off and landing space for new airlines.

Some have suggested building a new airport south of Chicago to relieve the problems at O'Hare. I feel that this is a poor policy choice. This proposed new airport has yet to attract any airline tenants who would pay for it. Furthermore, this proposed airport would drain customers away from Chicago's Midway Airport, which is the 9th busiest airport in America and provides point to point flights to over 50 cities. In addition, in order to build this new airport, we would have to take 24,000 acres of farmland out of production. Building another airport in Chicago does not solve our current problems at O'Hare.

The solution is new runways at O'Hare. O'Hare certainly has the space for them. We know that building new runways is far more cost-effective than spending billions of dollars on a new airport. And new runways would mean an immediate reduction in delays at O'Hare. These new runways would allow simultaneous landings during all weather periods—something the current configuration does not allow.

Normally, in order for a runway to be built, approval must be granted by the operator of the airport—the City of Chicago in the case of O'Hare—and the FAA. However, under Illinois law, the Governor of Illinois, through his Department of Transportation, must also approve such a plan. Speaking as a friendly neighbor from Iowa, I am sending a letter to both Mayor Richard M. Daley and Governor George H. Ryan asking that they approve new runways in the interest of improving our entire national air transport system.

While I am not privy to all of the local concerns surrounding O'Hare, I know that all airports confront noise mitigation problems. I also know that Chicago O'Hare has the best-funded and most extensive sound mitigation program of any airport in the country. I applaud the Mayor for that far-sighted undertaking. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I offer my assistance to the Mayor and my distinguished colleagues from Illinois to ensure that appropriate Federal dollars are channeled into that effort.

I would say to Governor Ryan, who, I understand, favors a new airport, that I do not see much in the way of Federal assistance for new airport construction in the foreseeable future. Airports today are built and/or rehabilitated by airport tenants and their passengers. I believe that the most efficient way to minimize our tax dollars is to maximize our current facilities and continue to upgrade our air traffic control system.

Earlier this year, the Senate passed overwhelmingly and the President signed, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century, commonly known as Air21. As many of my colleagues know, I worked closely with Senators GRASSLEY, MCCAIN, HOLLINGS, ROCKEFELLER and DURBIN to draft the provision in the Air21 legislation that phases out the artificial slot-constraints at O'Hare by July 1, 2002. The intent of our effort was to increase small and mid-sized communities' access to the national air transportation system via O'Hare and to provide for increased competition at that premier connecting hub. This increased access is critical for business wishing to settle and grow in small and mid-sized communities.

While we succeeded in eliminating the barrier posed by slots, it is clear to me that O'Hare's runway, gate, and terminal space constraints continued to keep small and mid-sized communities from fully realizing the benefits of the Air21 legislation. I was extremely pleased to hear about the substantial progress in Chicago's World Gateway program. This program calls for $3.2 billion in infrastructure investments over the next several years at O'Hare—including 20 new gates and 2 new terminals. My understanding is that the two major carriers at O'Hare—United Airlines and American Airlines—have reached agreement with the City on this. I congratulate Mayor Daley on his work in bringing that agreement to closure. I also applaud American and United for their far-sighted investment in O'Hare. I only request that every effort be made to accelerate that program and to assure that space is allocated to smaller aircraft that serve smaller cities so that small town America gets a fair shake.

Without new runways, we will still be constrained by weather and air traffic control problems. It is time to remove this barrier to small and mid-sized community access to O'Hare. And it is time to expand our current national air traffic system in an effective, cost-efficient, cost-efficient way. We have neither the time nor the money nor the political will to build a new airport. Instead, we need to maximize the resources we already have. In the end, we may have to find a federal solution to this national problem.

New runways would make O'Hare and our entire national air transport system run more smoothly. I am certain that the hundreds of thousands of Iowans and others across the country who travel through O'Hare each year would appreciate this improvement. As would all those whose travel plans to other hubs and destinations are upset because aircraft are tied up at O'Hare. There is no more efficient, effective solution to aircraft delays in the Midwest and much of the Northeast than providing additional runway capacity at O'Hare.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR LAUTENBERG

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to make a few brief remarks about one of our colleagues and a good friend of mine who is retiring this year.

Senator LAUTENBERG is a perfect example of the American dream come true. He grew up the son of immigrants, joined the Army Signal Corps in Europe during World War II, and then attended Columbia University on the G.I. bill. After graduation, Senator LAUTENBERG helped found a payroll services company called Automatic Data Processing. He soon became the firm's CEO, and, with 33,000 employees, his company is now one of the largest computing services companies in the world.

But Senator LAUTENBERG knew that the American dream isn't just about making it to the top. It's about giving back once you get there. That's why he ran for the United States Senate, and that's why, during his eighteen years in this Chamber, he's fought hard to make our country better for all Americans. He has fought hard to leave the ladder of opportunity down for others to climb. He's fought to improve transportation. His legislation and leadership has built and modernized highways and bridges and Amtrak rails across this country, and he's worked hard to make sure our planes and trains and cars are safe.

FRANK LAUTENBERG has fought to clean up our environment. Over the course of his career, he's worked on legislation to improve the Superfund program, redevelop Brownfields, force industry to cut down on pollution, clean up our beaches and protect our air and water. And he's fought to balance our budget. Senator LAUTENBERG focuses his sharp, business mind on the work of the Budget Committee, where he is ranking member and he helped move us from record deficits to record surpluses.

And Senator LAUTENBERG has taken on special interests like few others. He took on the gun lobby when he authored the domestic violence gun ban and other laws to fight gun violence. And he's one of the strongest supporters of the Brady bill in this Congress. He took on the liquor lobby when he became the lead sponsor of the bill that raised the drinking age to twenty-one. And he sponsored the recent provision in the transportation appropriations bill to lower the blood alcohol content standard to .08—a provision that's going to save hundreds of lives each year. And he's taken on big tobacco. When you fly on a commercial flight now, and you can actually take a breath without choking on smoke from other passengers, you can thank Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG, because he wrote the law that bans smoking on airplanes.

You know, after he got that bill passed, I was flying out to Iowa, and several flight attendants came up to me and said, ''Senator, can you please thank Senator LAUTENBERG for us. We can finally work now without all that smoke.'' I hear that to this very day, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey always gets first class service even when he sits in coach. I still can't quite believe that Senator LAUTENBERG is leaving us. But I hope that wherever he goes, he'll find a new way to use his energy, intelligence, and talent to serve the American people. Our country can't afford to lose someone of his caliber.

My wife Ruth and I have been privileged to be friends of FRANK since we first came to the Senate in 1985. We have been privileged to travel on many trips, on many congressional delegations with Senator LAUTENBERG, as he confronted our enemies abroad and spoke with our friends abroad, to strengthen our U.S. position both in our economic endeavors with other countries and in our military position overseas.

We will miss him from this body, but I of course will not miss him as a friend. I sincerely hope that whatever FRANK LAUTENBERG does in the future, he will make himself available for further public service. Someone of his caliber and of his talent, of his compassion, and of his interest in making sure we leave the ladder of opportunity down for all Americans to climb, someone such as that we can't afford to lose from public life.

So, FRANK, we wish you Godspeed, the best in all your endeavors, the best of health and happiness in your future life. But please, if duty calls for public service, I know you will answer.

I thank the Presiding Officer for affording me the opportunity to make these comments this evening.

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, October 26, 2000.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:23 p.m., recessed until Thursday, October 26, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.