motion to proceed until the 9:30 time that we have now just agreed to on Thursday. Should there be any interest in accelerating that, we would certainly entertain it. However, at least now we know we will have a vote at 9:30, and that our Republican colleagues will be recognized to offer their first amendment at noon on Thursday.

I appreciate very much the willingness of Senator NICKLES and certainly the Republican leader and others who have been discussing this matter with me for the last couple of hours.

Mr. REID. Could I ask the majority leader a question?

Mr. DASCHLE. Yes.

Mr. REID. In that we will start this debate this coming Thursday, is it still the intention of the leader to finish this bill before we take the Fourth of July recess.

Mr. DASCHLE. There are two matters I think it is imperative we finish. This is the first of the two, I answer my colleague, the assistant Democratic leader; and the other is the supplemental. I think 2 good weeks of debate on this issue is certainly warranted.

We have had a debate on this matter in previous Congresses. I think we should be prepared to work late into the night Thursday night. We will be here on Friday. We will be in session on Friday, with amendments and votes. We will stay on the bill throughout next week. As I say, we will hopefully set at least a desirable time for final consideration Thursday of next week. Should we need Friday, we can certainly accommodate that particular schedule, and if we need to go longer into the weekend to do it, my intention is to stay here until we complete our work.

So, yes, I emphasize, as I have the last couple of days, that the Senate will complete this work, and hopefully the supplemental prior to the time we leave for the July recess.

Mr. REID. We will work this Friday with votes, no votes on Monday, but we will work on Monday.

Mr. DASCHLE. Correct.

Mr. NICKLES. I heard the leader say we would be working on the legislation, considering amendments on Friday. Did the leader clarify whether or not there will be votes on Friday?

Mr. DASCHLE. There will probably be votes on Friday but no votes on Monday.

Mr. NICKLES. I thought I understood the majority leader to say we would hold votes ordered on Friday to Tuesday.

Mr. DASCHLE. If I misspoke, I apologize. I intended to say, if I didn't say, we would have votes and amendments offered on Friday but that there wouldn't be any votes on Monday, but there would be amendments considered and hopefully we can make some arrangement to consider these votes as early on Tuesday morning as possible.

Mr. NICKLES. Does the leader have any indication how late we will vote on Friday?

Mr. DASCHLE. We certainly wouldn't have any votes scheduled after around 1 o'clock on Friday.

Mr. NICKLES. To further clarify, I heard the intention that you would like to have this completed by the Fourth of July, but correct me if I am wrong. We spent a little over 2 weeks on the education bill just on the motion to proceed. I believe on the education bill in total we spent 6 or 7 weeks, and the education bill is a very important bill. Likewise, this is a very important bill. And this bill, like the education bill, in my opinion, needs to be amply reviewed.

I don't know the period of time, but at least it is this Senator's intention we thoroughly consider what is in the language and how it can be improved. Some Members want to have significant changes so the bill can be signed. I am not sure if that can be done or completed in the time anticipated or hoped for. I appreciate the dilemma the majority leader is in and his desire to conclude it a week from Thursday or Friday, but I am not sure that is obtainable. We will see where we are next week.

Mr. DASCHLE. I agree. I don't know whether it is attainable or not. But I do know this: We will continue to have votes into the recess period to accommodate the completion of this bill.

My concern is, very frankly, we will come back after the Fourth of July recess—and I have talked to Senator LOTT about this—with the realization we have 13 appropriations bills to do and a recognition that we have a very short period of time within which to do them. I know the administration wants to finish these appropriations bills and Senator LOTT has indicated he, too, is concerned about the degree to which we will be able to adequately address all of the many complexities of these bills as they are presented to the Senate.

I want to leave as much time as possible during that July block for the appropriations process to work its will, and it is for that reason, in particular, that I want to complete our work on this bill so we can accommodate that schedule.

Again, I appreciate the desire of the Senator from Oklahoma to vet this and to debate it. I hope we can find a way to resolve it prior to the time we reach the end of next week.

There will, therefore, be no votes today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

PRESIDENT BUSH RECOGNIZES LT. COL. BILL HOLMBERG AS AN AMERICAN HERO

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I want to call my colleagues' attention to a specific passage in President Bush's commencement address at the U.S. Naval Academy last month that was particularly meaningful to me. In that reference, the President paid tribute to the heroism of a longtime friend of mine, retired Marine Corps Lt. Colonel William C. Holmberg, class of '51.

I would like to quote from the President's speech:

> But there are many others from the Class of '51 whose stories are lesser known, such as retired Lieutenant Colonel William C. Holmberg. One year and a handful of days after graduation, Second Lieutenant Holmberg found himself on the Korean peninsula, faced with a daunting task: to infiltrate his platoon deep behind enemy lines in an area swarming with patrol; to rout a tenacious enemy; to seize and hold their position. And that's what he did. And that's what his platoon did.
>
> Along the way, they came under heavy fire and engaged in fierce hand-to-hand combat. Despite severe wounds, Lieutenant Holmberg refused to be evacuated, and continued to deliver orders and direct the offensive until the mission was accomplished.
>
> And that's why he wears the Navy Cross. And today, his deeds, and the deeds of other heros from that class, echo down through the ages to you. You can't dictate the values that make you a hero. You can't buy them, but you can foster them.

I commend the President for his recognition of this very special American. I have known Bill Holmberg ever since I came to Washington as a freshman Congressman more than 20 years ago. I know Bill not as a war hero, but as an indefatigable champion of the environment and as a visionary who understood the potential of renewable fuels for improving air quality and reducing our dependence on imported oil long before they were accepted as a viable alternative to fossil fuels.

Bill is a true American hero who stands as a model for us all. His selfless commitment to making the world a better place to live has been demonstrated not only on distant battlefields, but also by his daily pursuit of a more secure, environmentally sustainable and just society.

I join with President Bush in saluting Lt. Colonel William C. Holmberg, a sustainable American hero.

THE EXECUTION OF JUAN RAUL GARZA

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Federal Government's execution today of Juan Raul Garza.

This is a sad day for our Federal criminal justice system. The principle of equal justice under law was dealt a severe blow. The American people's reason for confidence in our Federal criminal justice system was diminished. And the credibility and integrity of the U.S. Department of Justice was depreciated.

President Bush and Attorney General Ashcroft failed to heed the calls for

fairness. Instead, the Government put Juan Garza to death.

Now, no one questions that Juan Garza is guilty of three drug-related murders. And no one questions that the Government should have punished him severely for those crimes.

But serious geographic and racial disparities exist in the Federal Government's system of deciding who lives and who dies. The government has failed to address those disparities. And President Bush and Attorney General Ashcroft failed to recognize the fundamental unfairness of proceeding with executions when the Government has not yet answered those questions. No, the government put Juan Garza to death.

Today, most of those who wait on the Federal Government's death row come from just three States: Texas, Missouri, and Virginia. And 89 percent of those who wait on the Federal Government's death row are people of color. But President Bush and Attorney General Ashcroft failed to recognize the fundamental unfairness of executing Juan Garza, a Hispanic man from Texas, before the Government had answered why those disparities exist.

On December 7, President Clinton stayed the execution of Juan Garza ''to allow the Justice Department time to gather and properly analyze more information about racial and geographic disparities in the federal death penalty system.'' That day, President Clinton said, ''I have . . . concluded that the examination of possible racial and regional bias should be completed before the United States goes forward with an execution in a case that may implicate the very questions raised by the Justice Department's continuing study. In this area there is no room for error.''

But today, the thorough study that President Clinton and Attorney General Reno ordered is nowhere near completion. Even so, the Government put Juan Garza to death.

It now appears that, until recently, this administration's Justice Department had no plans to proceed with this thorough study. We now see that, on June 6, the Justice Department released a report that contained no new analysis but nonetheless reached the conclusions that they wanted to reach.

Yes, after I called for a hearing and demanded that the thorough study resume, the Justice Department did agree to renew its thorough examination of racial and geographic disparities in the Federal death penalty system. But even so, the Government put Juan Garza to death.

Experts at that hearing of the Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution testified that the facts did not support the conclusions that the Justice Department reached in its June 6 report. Experts testified that more information is needed before the Justice Department could credibly conclude that racial bias is absent from the Federal death penalty system. But even so, the Government put Juan Garza to death.

The Justice Department now acknowledges that it has not conducted a complete review and that more study is needed. Before the Department completes that thorough review, and before it finishes that study, the Federal Government should not execute one more person.

I once again call on the President to implement a moratorium on executions by the Federal Government. I call for it in the name of the credibility and integrity of the Department. I call for it in the name of justice. And I call for it in the name of equal justice under law.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Federal execution that was carried out earlier today.

I believe that the Justice Department did what was right today when it carried out the death penalty against drug kingpin and murderer Juan Raul Garza.

Steadfast death penalty opponents have tried to use Mr. Garza's case to justify a moratorium on the death penalty. It is puzzling why they would because his case in no way supports their arguments about innocence and racial disparity in the administration of the death penalty.

First, Mr. Garza was clearly guilty. He was convicted of murdering three people, one of who he shot in the back of the head, and he was tied to five other killings. Even his lawyers are not claiming innocence.

Second, there was no evidence that his race had anything to do with him receiving the death penalty. The judge and the main prosecutor in his case were Hispanic, as were all of his victims except one. The majority of the jurors had hispanic surnames, and all the jurors certified that race was not involved in their decision.

Moreover, there were six death-eligible cases in this district, the Southern District of Texas, all involving Hispanic defendants. Yet, Mr. Garza's was the only case for which the local U.S. Attorney recommended the death penalty, and the only one for which it was sought.

Mr. Garza was convicted under a law that Congress passed in 1988, which reinstated the death penalty and directed it at ruthless drug kingpins like Mr. Garza who commit murder as part of their drug trafficking. By following through with the death penalty in appropriate cases such as this, the Attorney General is simply enforcing the laws he has a duty to uphold.

Mr. Garza was treated fairly and had full access to the extensive protections of the criminal justice system. This execution is not a case study in injustice. It is a case study in how the system works properly.

I agree that continued study of the death penalty is worthwhile, but studies should not be used as an excuse to place a moratorium on the death penalty while opponents endlessly search for flaws in the system.

THE TALIBAN IN AFGHANISTAN

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the critical situation concerning the Taliban in Afghanistan. The seriousness of the Taliban's gross injustices is alarming. This movement continues to make outrageous demands on religious minorities, women, and the relief workers trying to alleviate the suffering of the Afghan people. With impunity, the Taliban has largely ignored international condemnation, becoming increasingly fanatical and strict.

I am cosponsoring a bill with Senators BROWNBACK and BOXER which condemns the Taliban for its harsh demands on Muslims, Hindus, women, and religious minorities. The legislation strongly urges the Taliban to reopen United Nations offices and hospitals so that the people of Afghanistan may receive necessary relief. I encourage my colleagues to consider cosponsoring this legislation.

Hindus and all other religious minorities have been ordered to distinguish themselves from Muslims by wearing yellow badges. This decree is reminiscent of the Nazis forcing the Jews to wear the yellow star of David. It is shocking that the Taliban would order this kind of religious branding. Furthermore, Muslims and non-Muslims are prohibited from living together, and religious minorities are not permitted to construct new places of worship. The fanatic Taliban religious police invoke terror on city streets, sometimes whipping those who are not attending mosques at designated times. This kind of religious intolerance is abominable and should not be allowed.

The Taliban's iron grip on Afghanistan not only affects religious practices, it is further devastating the suffering Afghan people by obstructing relief efforts by the United Nations and other humanitarian organizations. The United Nations World Food Program believes it may be forced to close around 130 bakeries in Afghanistan's capital city if the Taliban will not allow women to help address the needs of the hungry. Without the aid of both men and women, program leaders cannot maintain the bread distribution program. Also in the capital, a 40-bed surgical hospital was forced to close its doors. Sixteen international staff members escaped to Pakistan because there were genuine concerns about their safety. This is not the first time foreign staff have had to flee. Several U.N. workers have even been arrested, a gross violation of a previous agreement between the Taliban and the U.N. that relief workers would be protected. The Taliban is compromising both the safety of international relief workers and the well-being of the Afghan people with their harsh and unreasonable policies.

The injustice meted out by the Taliban is sobering and demands continued attention. That is why I am cosponsoring S. Con. Res. 42 with Senators BROWNBACK and Boxer, and it is