SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. DEWINE):

S. Con. Res. 70. A concurrent resolution supporting National Funeral Service Education Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 68

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 68, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve benefits for Filipino veterans of World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 595

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 595, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the required use of certain principal repayments on mortgage subsidy bond financings to redeem bonds, to modify the purchase price limitation under mortgage subsidy bond rules based on median family income, and for other purposes.

S. 950

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 950 , a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 973

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) were added as cosponsors of S. 973, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a shorter recovery period for the depreciation of certain restaurant buildings.

S. 1010

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1010, a bill to enhance and further research into paralysis and to improve rehabilitation and the quality of life for persons living with paralysis and other physical disabilities.

S. 1245

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1245, a bill to provide for homeland security grant coordination and simplification, and for other purposes.

S. 1465

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1465, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress honoring Wilma G. Rudolph, in recognition of her enduring contributions to humanity and women's athletics in the United States and the world.

S. 1622

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM of Florida, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1622, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to exempt certain members of the Armed Forces from the requirement to pay subsistence charges while hospitalized.

S. 1637

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM of Florida, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to comply with the World Trade Organization rulings on the FSC/ETI benefit in a manner that preserves jobs and production activities in the United States, to reform and simplify the international taxation rules of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 222

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 222, a resolution designating October 17, 2003 as ''National Mammography Day.''

AMENDMENT NO. 1544

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1544 proposed to H.R. 2660, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1731

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1731 proposed to H.R. 2691, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1737

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1737 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2691, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1638. A bill to amend title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase teacher familiarity with the educational needs of gifted and talented students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to help prepare new teachers to recognize and meet the needs of gifted and talented students. As many of my colleagues are aware, I have been working for some time to advance a comprehensive approach aimed at improving access to gifted and talented educational services in every State. My proposal has been introduced in this Congress as S. 501. While I will continue to work to enact this needed legislation, the bill I am introducing today addresses the different but related need to raise awareness among all teachers about the unique educational needs of gifted and talented students.

Unfortunately, many misconceptions persist about the needs of gifted children in both the educational community and in public policy circles. There is often a tendency to think of gifted kids as those kids who will succeed with or without help. This is simply not the case and reflects a misunderstanding of giftedness. What makes a child gifted and talented is not how well the child does in school, but how he or she learns. A student may get straight A's and not be a gifted learner, while a gifted and talented student might do poorly on his or her schoolwork. Gifted and talented children actually have a different way of looking at the world. They tend to have distinct approaches to learning and interacting socially, and they frequently learn at a different pace, and to different depths, than others their age. The bottom line is that gifted and talented children have unique learning needs that need to be met in order for them to succeed in school.

Earlier this year, when I re-introduced my bill to expand the availability of gifted education services, I told the Senate about a third grade student from Iowa City names Jose. I would like to remind the Senate about Jose's experience because I think it illustrates some important points about gifted students and their needs. Jose wasn't completing his assignments and his grades were suffering. He had trouble paying attention and would act up in class. He got along with his classmates, but didn't have much social interaction with others. Jose's teacher tried to get him to pay attention and do his work like the other kids, but was left frustrated. Still, Jose's parents recognized in him a real hunger for learning and had his IQ tested over the summer. It turns out that, while Jose's teacher saw him as a problem student, the problems she noticed were really symptoms of a gifted student who was bored because he was not being properly challenged. Jose now leaves his regular classroom a couple of times a week for what Iowa City schools call the ''extended learning program.'' As a result of the added stimulation he now receives, Jose enjoys school more, has made friends

with his gifted peers, and is doing great with his regular school work.

Jose's experience is more than just a success story showing how quality gifted education services can make a real difference for a child. It also illustrates that gifted students have real needs that can all too easily go unrecognized and unmet. Moreover, Jose' experience highlights the need for teachers to understand the characteristics of gifted kids. In Jose's case, he had parents who were able to recognize his gifts and have him assessed privately. Jose's parents were then able to take these findings to the gifted education teacher at Jose's school and have him identified to receive gifted education services. Had his former teacher been able to recognize the indications of giftedness, she could have referred him for services earlier and she would have been better able to help him succeed in the regular classroom.

I would like to cite another real-life example; this time of a 12-year-old girl from Shenandoah, IA named Leah. Leah has two parents with a high school education who work hard to provide for her, but they don't have much discretionary income. Her parents want her to be successful, but they rely on the public school system to meet her educational needs. Leah came to school able to read, but was a very quiet child so no one noticed anything exceptional about her. A year later, the first grade teacher caught Leah reading in the coat closet and realized that she could read exceptionally well. Leah's teacher referred her to the gifted and talented teacher and she has thrived in the gifted and talented program ever since. Leah's experiences have been limited by her circumstances. She lives in a small town in rural south-west Iowa and has not traveled farther than Des Moines or Omaha. Leah hasn't grown up with every advantage, yet she is lucky to have had an astute classroom teacher who recognized her abilities. Leah now has access to a quality gifted education program of services that includes a specially trained teacher available to help Leah develop her gifts.

While Leah is another success story, it is easy to see the important role that teachers played in her experience. It is important to remember that gifted and talented students come from all backgrounds and can be found in any community. A gifted student could be the child of a single mom working three jobs, the child of recent immigrants, or a foster child. I've even heard stories of a gifted child in Iowa who missed school because her parents had her begging for money on the streets. Not all gifted children have parents who are equipped to recognize their child's gifts or have the resources and ability to see that their child gets the services he or she needs to be successful. That is why it is so important that classroom teachers have some understanding of how to identify gifted kids and how to meet their needs while they are in the regular classroom. It is impossible to know how many gifted students are overlooked because their teachers do not know how to recognize the signs of giftedness or are unprepared to deal with the unique needs that gifted kids have. While Iowa requires school districts to provide gifted and talented services, a great many school districts in many States have little or no programs for gifted kids. Moreover, according to the federally funded National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, the large majority of gifted and talented students spend at least 80 percent of their time in a regular education classroom. As a result, it is vital that all teachers have at least basic knowledge and skills to address gifted students' learning needs. However, a national survey of third and fourth grade teachers by the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented found that 61 percent had no training whatsoever in teaching highly able students.

Ultimately, all teachers should have at least some exposure to the characteristics of gifted and talented students and strategies to address their needs. Yet, only one State currently requires regular classroom teachers to have coursework in gifted education. Some of the techniques used in classrooms to accommodate gifted kids include differentiated curriculum, cluster grouping, and accelerated learning. The time to make sure teachers have the necessary knowledge is when prospective teachers are in their pre-service training programs. If teachers aren't exposed to information about the needs of gifted students in their pre-service training, they may never acquire the necessary knowledge. Title II of the Higher Education Act already contains grants designed to enhance the quality of teacher preparation programs. My bill would simply add allowable uses to these existing grants to provide an incentive for States and teacher training programs to incorporate the needs of gifted and talented students into teacher preparation and licensure requirements.

Under current law, Title II State grants are awarded directly to States and are to be used to reform State teacher preparation requirements. The law lists seven potential reforms under the allowable uses for grant funds. The first three allowable uses include: strengthening State requirements for teacher preparation programs to ensure teachers are highly competent in their respective academic content areas, reforming certification and licensure requirements with respect to competency in content areas, and providing alternatives to traditional teacher preparation programs. My legislation would add another allowable use, referencing these three reforms, to encourage States to incorporate a focus on the learning needs of gifted ant talented students into reforms of State requirements for teacher preparation programs, reforms of State certification and licensure requirements, or new alternative teacher preparation programs. In addition, my bill would add a new allowable use so that States could use grant funds to create or expand new-teacher mentoring programs on the needs of gifted and talented students. This way, new teachers could learn from veteran teachers about how to identify classroom indicators of giftedness and provide appropriate instruction to gifted students.

My bill would also add language to the Partnership Grants, which provide funds to partnerships among teacher preparation institutions, school of arts and sciences, and high-need school districts to strengthen new teacher education. These grants come with three required uses, including reforming teacher preparation programs to ensure teachers are highly competent in academic content areas, providing preservice clinical experience, and creating opportunities for enhanced and ongoing professional development. One allowable use for which a partnership may use funds is preparing teachers to work with diverse populations, including individuals with disabilities and limited English proficient individuals. To this section, my legislation would add gifted and talented students. Recognizing that every teacher will have gifted students in his or her classroom, my bill would also add a new allowable use so that teacher preparation programs could use the funds to infuse teacher coursework with units on the characteristics of high-ability learners. In other words, the idea is not to require additional courses, but rather to discuss how to accommodate for the needs of gifted students throughout the teacher preparation curriculum when new teachers are learning how to present lessons.

My bill does not create a new grant program or require new funds. It simply provides an incentive through existing grant programs that will encourage States and teacher preparation programs to improve the knowledge of new teachers about the unique needs of gifted and talented students. New teachers will encounter gifted and talented students. It is important they know how to recognize them and how to help them succeed. As we have seen with Jose and Leah, having a teacher that understands a child's needs can make a huge difference. In fact, it can mean the difference between a child hating school and a child loving school; a child falling behind, and a child succeeding beyond all expectations. When a gifted child is left behind, the loss of human potential is tragic. We may not know what we are missing, but it is more than we can afford to lose. The legislation I have proposed today is a relatively modest step that could have a tremendous impact. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1638

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT TO TITLE II OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.

(a) STATE GRANTS.—Section 202(d) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1022(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(8) GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS.—Incorporating the learning needs of gifted and talented students into the activity described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) in order to ensure that new teachers possess basic knowledge and skills necessary to meet the educational needs of gifted and talented students.

''(9) NEW-TEACHER MENTORING ON THE NEEDS OF GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS.—Establishing or expanding new-teacher mentoring and assessment programs (including induction and evaluation programs) that are a part of the licensure process that includes the development of a portfolio produced by the new teacher, under the supervision and guidance of a veteran teacher mentor, which is designed to demonstrate that the new teacher possesses basic knowledge of the classroom indicators of giftedness, is able to identify student learning differences among gifted students, and is able to provide instruction to accommodate such differences.''.

(b) PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.—Section 203(e) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1023(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and limited English proficient individuals'' and inserting '', limited English proficient individuals, and gifted and talented students''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS.—Increasing the knowledge and skills of preservice teachers participating in activities under subsection (d) in the educational and related needs of gifted and talented students by, among other strategies, infusing teacher coursework with units on the characteristics of high-ability learners, using assessments to identify preexisting knowledge and skills among students, and developing teaching strategies that are driven by the learner's progress.''.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. BURNS, and Mr. ENSIGN):

S. 1639. A bill to amend the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act to extend certain protections to franchised refiners or distributors of lubricating oil; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, during the 103rd Congress in 1994, the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act, PMPA, was amended to protect independent petroleum wholesalers and retailers from arbitrary and unfair termination or nonrenewal of their franchise relationships with major oil companies.

However, this protection was provided only to motor and diesel fuel franchisees.

Franchisees of other petroleum products sold by the major oil companies lack similar protection.

Today, I rise with Senators BURNS and ENSIGN to introduce a bill that extends the same protections enjoyed by the motor fuel industry to the lubricant industry.

I have heard from a constituent in Nevada that his franchise agreement to sell lubricating oils to car dealers in Las Vegas was arbitrarily canceled with 30 days notice.

In essence, he had thirty days to convert all of his customers to a new brand.

This seems grossly unfair and, in fact, if the product sold by my constituent were gasoline or diesel fuel rather than lubricating oil, it would have been illegal.

I have been made aware of similar terminations or non-renewals in other States.

Without equal protection under the law, lubricant franchisees are vulnerable to predatory cancellation by their suppliers. This situation is exacerbated by recent mergers and acquisitions in the petroleum industry.

The merger of oil giants Chevron and Texaco and Shell Oil's recent acquisition of Penzoil-Quaker State will undoubtedly result in the termination of many independent lubricant franchisees.

In New Mexico, there was a lubricant franchisee who had been promoting and distributing a branded lubricant to his customers for over 30 years, only to be canceled with 30 days notice following a merger of refiners.

This unfair practice stifles competition in the marketplace and invariably results in raising the price of the product, which hurts American consumers and small businesses.

This is especially troublesome in rural areas.

Given the increasingly anti-competitive nature of the petroleum industry, the time has come to extend protections under current law for motor fuel marketers to include lubricant franchisees.

There are approximately 3,500 independent distributors and nearly 25,000 commercial retail lube oil outlets that could be impacted by the increasing frequency of lubricant franchise cancellations.

Refiners have not suffered by complying with PMPA in motor fuels.

Consequently, it is hard to believe it would be much of an imposition to include the much smaller segment of lubricant franchisees.

I introduce this bill today because it protects small businesses, benefits consumers and ensures fair competition in the marketplace.

In short, this bill is the right thing to do and I hope my colleagues will support it.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1639

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PROTECTION OF FRANCHISED DISTRIBUTORS OF LUBRICATING OIL.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 101 of the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 2801) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) in clause (ii)(II), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv); and

(C) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

''(iii) any contract under which a refiner authorizes or permits a distributor to use, in connection with the sale, consignment, or distribution of lubricating oil, a trademark that is owned or controlled by the refiner; and'';

(2) in paragraphs (2), (5), and (6), by inserting ''or lubricating oil'' after ''motor fuel'' each place it appears;

(3) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following:

''(3) FRANCHISEE.—The term 'franchisee' means—

''(A) a retailer or distributor that is authorized or permitted, under a franchise, to use a trademark in connection with the sale, consignment, or distribution of motor fuel; or

''(B) a distributor that is authorized or permitted, under a franchise, to use a trademark in connection with the sale, consignment, or distribution of lubricating oil.

''(4) FRANCHISOR.—The term 'franchisor' means—

''(A) a refiner or distributor that authorizes or permits, under a franchise, a retailer or distributor to use a trademark in connection with the sale, consignment, or distribution of motor fuel; or

''(B) a refiner that authorizes or permits, under a franchise, a distributor to use a trademark in connection with the sale, consignment, or distribution of motor fuel.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(20) LUBRICATING OIL.—The term 'lubricating oil' means any grade of paraffinic or naphthenic lubricating oil stock that is refined from crude oil or synthetic lubricants.''.

(b) PROTECTION OF FRANCHISED DISTRIBUTORS OF LUBRICATING OIL.—Section 102(b)(2) of the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 2802(b)(2)) is amended by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

''(F) FRANCHISED DISTRIBUTORS OF LUBRICATING OIL.—In the case of a franchise between a refiner or a distributor for the sale, distribution, or consignment of trademarked lubricating oil, a determination made by the franchisor in good faith and in the normal course of business to withdraw from the marketing of the lubricating oil in the relevant geographic market in which the franchised lubricating oil is distributed, if—

''(i) the determination is made—

''(I) after the date on which the franchise is entered into or renewed; and

''(II) on the basis of a change in relevant facts or circumstances relating to the franchise that occurs after the date specified in subclause (I); and

''(ii) the termination or nonrenewal is not for the purpose of converting any accounts subject to the franchise to the account of the franchisor.''.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BOND, Mr. WARNER, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. ALLARD):

S. 1640. A bill to provide an extension of highway programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President. I am introducing today the Transportation Extension Act of 2003 which will extend the expiring Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century an additional 5 months. Senators, JEFFORDS, BOND, WARNER, VOINOVICH, CRAPO, CHAFEE, CORNYN, MURKOWSKI, THOMAS, and ALLARD join me as original cosponsors on this short-term extension.

As my colleagues may be aware, we are now 7 days from the expiration of TEA–21. Despite the best efforts of Senator BOND and myself, we have been unable to secure the necessary floor time for consideration of a comprehensive 6-year bill.

This bill provide 5 months worth of the $35.5 billion allowed under the Budget Resolution and a corresponding amount of obligation limitation. This is a significant, 7-percent increase in highway funding over 2003, which will translate into over 100,000 new jobs.

Of course, the best thing we can do to create economic opportunity is enact a comprehensive, 6-year reauthorization. As we all know, highway bills are jobs bills. A highway bill drafted at $255 billion over 6 years as proposed by the Environment and Public Works Committee will create about two million new American jobs. This combined with the tax cuts signed by President Bush is the best stimulus the economy can receive.

Let me be very clear that my preference is that we would be completing a 6-year comprehensive bill, not working on a five-month extension, but reality is that the funding needed to do a comprehensive 6-year bill at $255 billion has not yet been identified. Because of that, I believe the best outcome for the long term program is to do a 5-month extension and continue to work on a comprehensive 6-year bill.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I wish to make some brief remarks about the extension of the Transportation Equity Act, often referred to as TEA–21.

Chairman INHOFE and I, along with subcommittee Chairman BOND and ranking member HARRY REID, have been working together on drafting a comprehensive, bipartisan 6-year transportation reauthorization bill. Unfortunately, that reauthorization effort will not be completed before TEA–21 expires on September 30.

Thus, as with the previous reauthorization of ISTEA by TEA–21, we will need to do a short extension of TEA–21. In the interest of time, and to avoid any concerns about potential disruptions, we have used major portions of the same short-extension language used for ISTEA in 1997 for this extension.

It is important that I clarify some aspects of this short extension with the chairman of the committee, Senator INHOFE.

The purpose of this short extension is to continue the Federal surface transportation programs and transportation investment patterns. For that reason, we have provided considerable short-term spending flexibility to the States.

However, in a longer term extension, if any were needed, we should be consistent with Congressional goals set forth in TEA–21. Thus, I want to ensure that if there is a need for another extension we more closely adhere to the flexibility provisions set forth in TEA–21. This would require, for example, changes to the text used in this short-term extension regarding section 133(d).

In a short-term extension there is little risk that investment patterns would be altered in a manner inconsistent with TEA–21 and thus the proposed language is acceptable for the short term.

Senator INHOFE do you agree with my understanding that the bipartisan extension we have proposed works well in the short term but would require some modification to its flexibility provisions if it were to apply for a longer period of time? In addition, will you agree to work with me to make changes to the language if we have to do another extension to address the concerns I have raised?

Mr. INHOFE. Yes, I will work with the Senator on his concerns if we have to do a longer term extension.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 70—SUPPORTING NATIONAL FUNERAL SERVICE EDUCATION WEEK

Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. DEWINE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 70

Whereas the death of a family member, friend, or loved one is a devastating emotional event;

Whereas people must have all of the information necessary to make informed funeral service choices and to maintain total trust in their funeral service provider;

Whereas memorialization and celebration of life are the fabric of the modern funeral service;

Whereas the memorialization of a loved one is important to grieving families and is beneficial to the healing process;

Whereas families have traditionally looked to funeral directors and morticians for consolation, strength, and guidance in the planning and implementation of meaningful funeral ceremonies; and

Whereas national funeral service organizations have designated the week of September 21 through 27, 2003, as National Funeral Service Education Week, a week which reflects the efforts of funeral directors to meet the needs of families who want a meaningful service that celebrates the lives of their loved ones: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress supports efforts to establish National Funeral Service Education Week as a week during which funeral service professionals and consumer advocates work together to provide consumers with timely and detailed information about choices in the planning of a meaningful funeral and the selection of funeral goods and services.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today my colleague Senator DEWINE and I are submitting a concurrent resolution to support the consumer education efforts of the National Funeral Directors Association during National Funeral Services Education Week, September 21 through 27, 2003.

When we are called upon to make funeral arrangements it is often at an emotional time when making important funeral-related decisions are confusing and difficult. In order to help remove confusion and concerns about funeral service planning, the National Funeral Directors Association is beginning a nationwide consumer education effort the week of September 21. The theme of the educational effort is ''For a Life Worth Celebrating'' which reflects funeral directors efforts to meet the needs of families who want a meaningful service that celebrates their loved one's life.

This important week will provide consumers an opportunity to ask questions, obtain information about how to make informed funeral-related decisions. Funeral directors across the country will hold special community events including ''open houses'' and events in local malls, schools or community centers.

I would encourage the public to participate in these activities so they can become informed consumers and I urge the Congress to support this educational effort.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1740. Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. REID) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2691, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

SA 1741. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2691, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1742. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2691, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1743. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2691, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1744. Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself and Mr. DEWINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2691, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1745. Mr. VOINOVICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2691, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1746. Mr. VOINOVICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2691, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1747. Mr. VOINOVICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2691, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1748. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2691, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.