

question as to their significance. Since they indicated a particular interest in the Pacific Fleet's base, this intelligence should have been appreciated and supplied to the Hawaiian commanders for their assistance, along with other information available to them, in making their estimate of the situation.

"(b) To be properly on the qui vive to receive the 'one o'clock' intercept and to recognize in the message that the fact that some Japanese military action would very possibly occur somewhere at 1 p.m., December 7. If properly appreciated this intelligence should have suggested a dispatch to all Pacific outpost commanders supplying this information, as General Marshall attempted to do immediately upon seeing it."

**TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL
TERRY L. PAUL, UNITED STATES
MARINE CORPS**

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to pay a special tribute today to Brigadier General Terry L. Paul, the Legislative Assistant to the Commandant of the Marine Corps and trusted friend of the United States Senate. After almost thirty years of honorable and dedicated service in the Corps, Brigadier General Paul will retire from active duty October 1st, 1999.

The Members of Congress and their staffs have come to know General Paul as a person who possesses a deep and abiding passion for the institution which he has served so faithfully—the United States Marine Corps. It is difficult to comprehend a Corps absent the ranks of a Terry Paul. His absence will be especially felt in the Office of Legislative Affairs where he served nine years in the Senate Liaison and most recently as the Legislative Assistant to the Commandant. He has set the standard by which all other Legislative Assistants will be measured.

The strength of the Marine Corps relationship with the Congress is in large measure due to the professional dedication of Brigadier General Paul. This relationship has been forged and nurtured over the years by his unrelenting resolve to establish a climate of mutual respect and understanding. The underpinning for this success was a rapport that was built on a credible and straightforward approach for dealing with issues, large or small. He possessed an innate ability to appreciate the environment in which he worked. It is through this understanding we can fully treasure the tenacity of Terry Paul to communicate the Commandant's message of "making Marines and winning battles" on Capitol Hill.

Brigadier General Paul's imprint will resonate through these hallowed halls and unto our Nation long after his departure. Through the foresight and oversight of the United States Congress, the Corps will have been provided the needed resources that will enable it to confront the challenges of the 21st century. Terry Paul was always there to foster and develop our knowledge of key resource needs. When all seemed lost with the pending cancellation of the V-22 program it was

Brigadier General Paul that was assigned as "point-man" on the Hill—responsible for building support to resurrect, not merely a dying program, but to advocate a concept which would ultimately revolutionize warfare in the next century. General Paul ensured Congress was aptly informed as to the capabilities, technological advances, concept of operations, and funding requirements to bring this program to fruition. His vigilance and ability to communicate carried the day. The V-22 Osprey will enable commanders to accomplish the mission more efficiently, with far fewer casualties than otherwise would have been the case. Terry fought the hard fight and he should be extremely proud that his unrelenting efforts have borne the fruit of his labor.

General Paul carried the message to the Hill on a plethora of programs. Programs that represented innovation, ingenuity, and a willingness to adapt to changes on the emerging battlefields which will elevate the Marine Corps as the world's premier crisis response force in the 21st century. Programs such as the Advanced Assault Amphibious Vehicle, the KC-130J, Maritime Pre-positioned Force-Enhancement and LHD class ships.

General Paul is a leader of unquestionable loyalty and unswerving standards. His tenure as the Commandant's Legislative Assistant was the capstone performance of nearly thirty-year career in the infantry, Senate Liaison office, and as a Special Assistant to the Commandant. For his efforts the Marine Corps is a better institution today, one that has a bright and prosperous future. Terry, we the Members of the United States Senate and the 106th Congress want to convey our sincere appreciation for all you have done for our Nation. Your legacy will be the well-equipped Marines who will continue to provide for our country's defense. They will be better equipped, more capable, and better able to survive on the modern battlefield due to your dedication and selfless sacrifice to duty. You will be sorely missed, but surely not forgotten.

**STOP PLAYING POLITICS WITH
OUR NATIONAL SECURITY: RATIFY
THE TEST-BAN TREATY**

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, three years ago today, the United States led the world in signing the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty. Since then, 152 countries have followed our lead; and 45 of them, including Great Britain and France, have ratified the Treaty.

Two years and two days ago, the President of the United States submitted the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty, plus six safeguards, to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification. Since then, the Senate has done nothing.

That is an outrage. We—who are rightly called the world's greatest deliberative body—have been unwilling

or unable to perform our constitutional duty regarding this major treaty.

Some of my colleagues have principled objections to this treaty. I respect their convictions. I have responded on this floor to many of their objections, as have my colleagues from Pennsylvania, North and South Dakota, Michigan and New Mexico.

Now it is time, however, for the Senate to do its duty. Administration officials, current and former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and eminent scientists are prepared to testify in favor of the Test-Ban Treaty. We, in turn, are prepared to make our case in formal Senate debate on a resolution of ratification.

It is high time that the Republican leadership of this body agreed to schedule Senate debate and a vote on ratification. It is utterly irresponsible for the Republican leadership to hold this treaty hostage to other issues, as it has for two years.

The arguments in favor of ratifying the Test-Ban Treaty are well-known.

It will reinforce nuclear non-proliferation by reassuring non-nuclear weapons states that states with nuclear weapons will be unable to develop and confidently deploy new types of nuclear weapons.

It will keep non-nuclear weapon states from deploying sophisticated nuclear weapons, even if they are able to develop designs for such weapons.

It will improve our ability to detect any nuclear weapons tests, with other countries paying 75% of the bill for the International Monitoring System.

U.S. ratification will encourage India and Pakistan to sign and ratify the Test-Ban Treaty—one of the few steps back from the nuclear brink that they may be willing to take, without a settlement of the Kashmir dispute.

U.S. ratification will encourage Russia, China and other states to ratify.

Our ratification will maintain U.S. leadership on non-proliferation, as we approach the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference next April. That U.S. leadership is vital to keeping non-nuclear weapons states committed to nuclear non-proliferation.

Equally important are the safeguards that the President has proposed, to ensure that U.S. adherence to the Treaty will always be consonant with our national security:

A: The conduct of a Science Based Stockpile Stewardship program to ensure a high level of confidence in the safety and reliability of nuclear weapons in the active stockpile. . . .

B: The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities and programs . . . which will attract, retain, and ensure the continued application of our human scientific resources to those programs. . . .

C: The maintenance of the basic capability to resume nuclear test activities. . . .

D: Continuation of a comprehensive research and development program to improve our . . . monitoring capabilities. . . .

E: The continuing development of a broad range of intelligence . . . capabilities and operations to ensure accurate and comprehensive information on worldwide nuclear . . . programs.

F: . . . if the President of the United States is informed by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy (DOE) . . . that a high level of confidence in . . . a nuclear weapon type which the two Secretaries consider to be critical to our nuclear deterrent could no longer be certified, the President, in consultation with Congress, would be prepared to withdraw from the CTBT . . . in order to conduct whatever testing might be required.

Thus, if nuclear weapons testing should ever be required to maintain the U.S. nuclear deterrent, then we will test.

Thanks in part to these safeguards, our senior national security officials support ratification of the Test-Ban Treaty. These officials include not only cabinet members such as former Senator Cohen, but also the directors of our National Laboratories and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty is vital to our national security. If the Senate dallies, India and Pakistan could fail to cap their nuclear weapons race; China could resume testing, to make better use of stolen U.S. nuclear secrets; and non-nuclear weapons states could give up on non-proliferation.

In the coming days, therefore, several of us will bring up in a more formal form the need for Senate action on this Treaty. I urge all my colleagues to support that effort.

Whatever our views on the Test-Ban Treaty, it is a national security issue. Let us agree that it is not to be held hostage to other issues. Let us agree that it is not just one more football in the Washington game of "politics as usual."

If the Republican leadership does not handle this Treaty responsibly, I have no doubt how the issue will play out in next year's elections. The latest national poll shows overwhelming public support for the Test-Ban Treaty: 82 percent in favor and only 14 percent opposed.

Those results go beyond party lines. Fully 80 percent of Republicans—and even 79 percent of conservative Republicans—say that they support the Test-Ban Treaty.

Republicans may appeal to the far right by calling for a return to the Cold War of nuclear testing. Bob Dole did that in 1996 on the Chemical Weapons Convention; but he lost. Then he took the responsible stand.

This time, let's skip the politics. Let's do our job—with hearings, debate, and a timely vote, at least before next April's Non-Proliferation Treaty review conference.

We can address the Test-Ban Treaty responsibly. It isn't hard, and the American people know that. It's time the Senate did what Nike says: "Just do it."

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, it has been a moving and gratifying experience to witness the outpouring of genuine, spontaneous concern by countless Americans for the victims of the Hurricane Floyd flooding.

It goes without saying that I am deeply grateful for the countless public servants and concerned neighbors who have been and still are working around the clock to extend heroic efforts and helping hands to the thousands of Eastern North Carolina people who have lost everything they possess—except their courage, and their determination to rise above the hardship that befell them.

Mr. President, before I go further I am compelled to convey publicly my personal gratitude to FEMA Director James Lee Witt and his remarkable associates for their dedication to helping those in such dire need. No federal agency could possibly be more efficient in carrying out its mission, and Director Witt deserves enormous credit for the incredible responsiveness FEMA has demonstrated on so many occasions when disasters have befallen many other areas of America.

Also, I am deeply grateful to my colleagues, who have responded to this disaster not merely with kind condolences and genuine sympathy, but also with their actions. For example, the senior Senator from Missouri, Senator BOND, made every effort to assure that FEMA is adequately funded to do the job in North Carolina. The Senate Leadership on both sides of the aisle—particularly Senator LOTT—have been gracious in their offers of assistance.

Many in the administrative branch are also going out of the way to be helpful. Yesterday, Customs Service Administrator Raymond Kelly granted my request to administratively waive certain maritime regulations, thereby allowing grain and feed shipments to reach flood-ravaged farmers more quickly. I am genuinely appreciative of his swift action.

And Mr. President, let there be no mistake: Eastern North Carolina needs all the help it can get. I do not exaggerate when I say that the flooding is of near-Biblical proportions. At least 45 people have lost their lives; there are fears of finding even more bodies as the flood waters recede. Entire communities have been washed away. Standing flood waters are becoming more polluted each day by gasoline, chemicals, animal waste and drowned livestock. An estimated 1,000 roads have been flooded, and countless houses have been damaged, some beyond repair. Perhaps the most poignant stories are those of cemeteries washing away, with coffins rising to the surface.

It is a devastating regional problem, Mr. President, but more than that, it is truly a national problem affecting every state in the Union. Because the communities affected by this flooding—whether they be Wilson or Greenville, Rocky Mount or Goldsboro, Kinston or Tarboro—are communities that are essential to American agriculture.

The heart of the agriculture community in North Carolina has been virtually destroyed by this storm, Mr. President. And as concerned as we are

for the countless citizens who have lost their homes and their possessions, the agricultural implications of this disaster for our entire country are enormous.

Here's why: North Carolina ranks third in total agricultural income, behind only California and Iowa. Numerous commodities will be radically affected by the flooding because North Carolina ranks in the top ten states of production for such a wide variety of products: turkeys, sweet potatoes, hogs, cucumbers for pickles, peanuts, poultry and egg products, chickens, blueberries, peanuts, strawberries, cotton, catfish, pecans, watermelons, peaches, tomatoes.

In short, Mr. President, North Carolina agricultural production is inseparable from U.S. agricultural production, and this regional disaster is in fact a national disaster. And I highlight this not to insist upon a government response—though one is needed—but to underscore the inescapable fact that the private sector must play a key role in helping Eastern North Carolina recover from this disaster.

The federal government can do its share to meet the needs of those who have been affected by the flood—and I will work to make sure the federal government plays a substantial role in assisting in the recovery. (In fact, those who are being helped by FEMA know that the federal government is already doing its part to lend a helping hand.) But government cannot do it all, Mr. President. The private sector must play an enormous role in rebuilding the communities and economy of my home state. And this will be an historic test of the strength and purpose of the free enterprise system—and of all of us who believe that the strength of America is the willingness to stand up for each other in times of hardship.

North Carolinians understand this fact instinctively, Mr. President. Already, private citizens and businesses from all over the state are volunteering their time and money to help their neighbors. May I offer a few examples:

Carolina Power & Light, a wonderfully civic-minded electrical company, has promised to match citizens' donations to the Red Cross up to \$100,000 and is double-matching its employee's contributions. Capitol Broadcasting in Raleigh has donated \$100,000.

From the financial industry, Bank of America has donated \$150,000. First Union is contributing the same generous amount to the Red Cross and is also pitching in with in-kind contributions of ice and water. First Citizens Bank has donated \$100,000 and has already developed a short-term emergency loan program.

The tobacco industry, which is so important to Eastern North Carolina—and which, incidentally, is now facing another spiteful attack by the Justice Department—has been especially generous. RJ Reynolds has donated \$250,000; Philip Morris has donated

\$50,000 in addition to the food products they are donating through Kraft. US Tobacco has given an additional \$25,000.

And, of course, I have been in contact almost daily with Franklin GRAHAM, son of the remarkable Billy GRAHAM, who operates a truly wonderful organization called Samaritan's Purse, which distributes food, clothing and medical supplies to people who are suffering all over the world. Franklin and his associates have once again demonstrated their usual selflessness by sending truckloads of potable water and other needed supplies to the areas in greatest need.

All of this generosity does not include the generous contributions of individual North Carolinians that are pouring in, Mr. President. Our fine Governor, Jim Hunt, has set up a Disaster Relief Fund for contributions to the United Way, and the contributions are coming in so fast that they have yet to be counted. I am continually amazed and highly gratified by the thoughtfulness of North Carolinians who genuinely want to help those in distress.

Mr. President, neither government nor the private sector alone can help rebuild the communities of North Carolina. If ever there was a time in North Carolina's history when all of our institutions—public and private—must work together, that time is now. And I pledge to do my part to make sure that individuals, businesses and government are working together to help North Carolina recover from the worst disaster in its history.

PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE REPUBLICAN TAX CUT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I want to say a few words about President Clinton's veto of the Republican-sponsored \$792 billion tax cut. I commend the President for vetoing this bill because it would have taken us down the wrong path:

- The path to huge budget deficits;
- The path to higher interest rates; and
- The path that fails to protect Medicare and Social Security;

In vetoing this bill, the President has taken us down the fiscally responsible path toward:

- Paying down the \$5.7 trillion national debt;

- Lowering interest rates and continuing our economic growth; and

- Protecting Medicare and Social Security in anticipation of the baby boom generation.

Republicans claim the projected surplus over the next ten years is large enough to give taxpayers a \$792 billion tax cut and still make \$500 billion worth of investments in domestic priorities.

They claim that there is an estimated \$1.4 trillion worth of surplus funds available for tax breaks and whatever else needs attention.

But their surplus projection is based on a fantastic, unrealistic, and unwise assumption about domestic discretionary spending: It is based on the as-

sumption that Congress will enact drastic cuts in domestic services over the next ten years.

The New Republican Baseline is the amount of Total Discretionary Spending over the next ten years as figured by the Congressional Budget Office at the request of Senator DOMENICI. It is the level of spending that Senator DOMENICI said on the Senate floor on July 29, 1999 would allow for the Republican tax cut and \$505 billion to be added back. It was also posted on the Budget Committee Website.

This proposal assumes that Congress will cut discretionary spending in accord with the budget caps through 2002 and then freeze discretionary spending at 2002 levels for the years 2003 through 2009.

In other words, while the price of a home, car, food goes up; while the cost of health care and tuition go up, the level of domestic services such as Head Start, student loans and economic development grants remains frozen in nominal dollars.

A freeze in nominal dollars means a decrease in real dollars. So the Republicans are proposing real, severe cuts in domestic services in order to make their tax cut seem feasible.

Huge cuts—tens of billions of dollars below current 1999 levels—are totally unrealistic (and a bad idea).

This chart shows that the Republican proposed reductions in domestic services defy history.

This chart shows the trend in domestic discretionary services over the last 15 years (in terms of actual outlays) in real 1999 dollars.

The trend—(regardless of whether Democrats or Republicans controlled Congress) is upward—and sharply upward over the last ten years—during a period of serious efforts to reign in spending.

Looking forward, the trend (on which the Republican tax cut and proposed investments in domestic priorities are based) is sharply downward with domestic services slashed by over a third by the year 2009.

A reversal in domestic discretionary services of this size just won't happen—and it shouldn't happen—we shouldn't slash head start, and Pell grants, and community development block grants, and safe drinking water programs by tens of billions of dollars over the next ten years. And history tells us we won't.

The current budget process tells us we won't: Newspaper editorials across the country are chiding Congress for already having spent next year's surplus.

I support the President's veto because it recognizes our collective responsibility to get America's fiscal house in order and because the Republican tax cut plan and the assumptions that underlie it are unwise, unrealistic and would have squandered this historic opportunity.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the chart to which I referred.

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

DOMESTIC DISCRETIONARY SPENDING: PROPOSED REPUBLICAN PLAN COMPARED TO 15 YEAR HISTORY IN CONSTANT DOLLARS

(Outlays in billions, constant 1999 dollars)

Year	Dollars
1984	227
1989	235
1994	282
1999	307
2004	226
2009	195

Source: CBO. Projection assumes Domestic Discretionary Spending for FY 2000-2009 = \$2.968 trillion; the level of the New Republican Total Discretionary Spending Baseline (\$5.707 trillion over ten years), minus Defense Discretionary Spending at the Budget Resolution level (\$3.062 trillion over ten years). Figures do not add to totals due to rounding.

MONTREAL PROTOCOL FUND

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for offering this amendment. I am a cosponsor of the amendment. The Montreal Protocol has always enjoyed broad bipartisan support in the Congress and public support across the country.

As our colleagues will remember, it was President Reagan who negotiated and signed the Protocol in 1987. Since that time, many strengthening amendments have been adopted and ratified during the administrations of both President Bush and President Clinton.

One of the most effective provisions of the protocol is an international fund that provides assistance to developing nations to aid their phaseout of ozone depleting substances. This is not a U.S. aid program. It is an international fund supported by 35 countries. It has assisted projects to reduce ozone use in 120 developing countries.

Mr. President, I can tell the Senate that the Montreal Protocol Fund is a very cost effective program because the U.S. General Accounting Office audited the program in 1997 and gave it high praise. GAO had only one recommendation to make to improve its performance and that recommendation has since been implemented. I would note that the U.S. business community also strongly supports this program. Quite often the assistance provided by the fund is used by developing nations to buy our technology to reduce CFC use. So, there is no question that this program works and has been highly successful.

The only issue is whether there is room for the U.S. contribution in this budget. We have pledged approximately \$39 million for this coming year. There is \$27 million in the Foreign Operations appropriation. Which means that we need an additional \$12 million to honor our commitment. The amendment by the Senator from Massachusetts would provide that \$12 million from EPA's budget. This follows a long tradition of paying for part of our contribution from State Department funds and part of our contribution through the EPA budget.

Can EPA afford \$12 million for this purpose. We know that the budget is