The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Omnipotent God, who hung the stars in their place, put planets in their orbits, and created humankind on this planet in this universe among universes, You are our Creator, Redeemer, and Lord. Everything within us rallies to express our praise. You have created us to love You, and when love for You is the motive of all we do, all of life is worshiped. Today we want our work to be our way of telling You how much we love You. What a privilege You have given us to serve You out of love in this Senate of this Nation You love and have blessed so bountifully!

Therefore, we commit this day to glorify You so that even mundane duties will serve as a magnificent praise to You. Help us to love and care for the people with whom we work as if in them we meet You dressed in the manifold variety of human personalities. May our constant goal be to do our work with excellence as devotion to You. “Oh Yahweh, our Adonai, how excellent is Your name in all the earth. For You have created us a little lower than Elohim, Yourself, and crowned us with glory and honor to assume dominion over the works of Your hands.”—Psalm 8: 1, 5-6. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JOHN ENSIGN, a Senator from the State of Nevada, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, today the Senate will be in a period for morning business until 11 a.m. with Senators DURBIN, MURKOWSKI, and COLLINS in control of the time. At 11 a.m., the Senate will resume consideration of Governor Thompson’s nomination to be Secretary of HHS. There will be up to 30 minutes of debate on the nomination with a vote scheduled to occur at 11:30 a.m. Additional nominations are scheduled for hearings during today’s session, and it is hoped that we can expedite those nominations for full Senate action as early as this afternoon. I thank my colleagues for their attention.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, for the benefit of all Members, I want to advise them that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources just concluded reporting out favorably the nomination of Gale Norton as the President’s nominee for Secretary of the Interior. The committee vote was 18-2. I don’t think there is any question that the nominee, in effect, received a mandate from our committee.

It is interesting to note the thoroughness under which the Energy and Natural Resources Committee conducted 2 days of hearings. I particularly thank Senator BINGAMAN, who
chaired the committee during the time under which control of the Senate was under the other party, and all those on both sides who worked to expedite the material necessary to determine the inquiries that came in.

There will be questions submitted to the nominees for response. All those questions were answered over a matter of a day and a half. Looking at many of the written questions, I did note that she had answered in the open hearing most of the questions. In any event, it is interesting in the light of the former Secretary of the Interior, Bruce Babbitt, the committee reported him out the same day after concluding its hearings. All the questions, of course, were not in on that particular occasion. I point this out for the benefit of those who are students of history and procedure in the Senate.

I join with all our colleagues in congratulating the nominee, Gale Norton. She will be a fine Secretary of the Interior. She is extraordinarily qualified to deal with the public lands and will bring back a balance to the assessment of science and technology, as we look to the development of resources on our public lands.

ENERGY CRISIS IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I rise today to address the situation in California. I want to make sure there is no misunderstanding. We all have a very legitimate concern for the plight of California from the standpoint of the energy crisis that is underway.

Yesterday the Secretary of Energy extended the order which requires that outside providers of power provide power to the State of California for a period of about 2 weeks. This has serious consequences because there may be some in California who see this as relief, which it is, and believe that relief can continue without any significant corrective action by the State to create a vigorous deregulated wholesale power market. And once there was a vigorous wholesale power market, it would create a deregulated retail power market. That sounds good, but the problem is it never happened on the retail side.

The key elements of the California program were, a rate freeze on the retail price of electricity to consumers until the year 2002, or until the stranded costs were paid off. Those are costs associated with, say, a nuclear plant that shut down, never paid for, and you have to pay for it in the rate structure.

Now, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has the authority to regulate wholesale rates. They have seen fit not to put a hard cap on wholesale rates. They say it will harm competition. It is kind of interesting to note that we have seen a bill introduced that would give the authority of FERC to put caps on wholesale rates to the Secretary of Energy. My first reaction to that is you are taking the problem from an objective group that has some expertise in this area and moving it into the political spectrum. I don’t know what you really accomplish on that. My first inclination is that is not a solution to the problem. That is simply transferring the problem into the political realm.

Now, it is kind of interesting because under the California competition program investor owned utilities are required to purchase from the wholesale spot market all of the electricity they sell at retail to consumers. No long-term contracts. The investor owned utilities did not allow the option into electricity contracts to hedge electric prices. The investor owned utilities were directed to divest their fossil fuel fired power plants, but allowed
to retain their nuclear and hydro facilities. So they did not sell their hydro and nuclear facilities. They were mandated to do this under the California program. The investor owned utilities were directed to divest the fossil fuel, but allowed to keep the nuclear and hydro.

But now some are suggesting that the State of California ought to take over the hydro facilities and, in turn, accept the debt associated, which is somewhere in the area of $1 billion to $12 billion. If you are going to do then, have the state run those facilities? Can the State do it better than the private sector? I don’t know. But it is another Band-Aid, in my estimation, that doesn’t really address the problem.

One, there is a credit problem in California because you can’t pay for the power and, B, there is a shortage of generation because the demand has exceeded substantially the generating capacity. California relied on that power company from outside the State, which is fine up to a point; but when the other States’ prosperity and economy increases and their demand increases, they suddenly look to the old adage that obesity begins at home. They want to take care of the people around them. As a consequence, to depend on outside power is very risky, just like it is very dangerous for this Nation to depend so much on outside oil. We are now 56 percent foreign-oil dependent in this country and the year 2004, we will be 64 percent dependent on foreign oil, according to the Department of Energy. In 1973-74, we had an oil embargo. Some people are old enough to remember that. We had lines around the block at gas stations. People were outraged, that this should not happen. Congress set up the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We were 36 percent dependent on imported foreign oil at that time. The parallel is, to what point, what percentage of the capacity. California relied on that power because the demand has exceeded substantially the generating capacity. California, FERC, this administration, and Congress must help. We must all be part of the solution. And, hopefully, from our hearing in the Energy Committee next week we will begin to get some of the answers and recommendations.

Consumers in the State of California, this administration, and the FERC must provide the necessary incentives for new generation and transmission to be built. Consumers in the State of California, FERC, this administration, and Congress must help. We must all be part of the solution. And, hopefully, from our hearing in the Energy Committee next week we will begin to get some of the answers and recommendations.

Consumers in California are going to have to shed their “not in my backyard” mentality. If consumers want power, new powerplants have to be built somewhere. They are not going to appear magically. New transmission lines have to be built. It is unfair for California to ask people in other States to build powerplants necessarily to satisfy California’s demand. Consumers are also going to have to pay for the power they need. Somebody has to pay for it. We are going to have to do a better job encouraging conservation. But there has to be, if you will, some kind of a carrot and stick. If the consumers are encouraged to conserve and buy a new refrigerator that uses less energy, they have to be motivated to do that because of the increased costs to the consumer. It has to be in the price, one way or another, whether it be an air-conditioning unit or some other item.

The government of California is going to have to take leadership in building new generation of transmission facilities, expediting permits, and so forth. They need to expedite those permits and the siting so that the power will be there when it is needed.

In California, for example, 67 percent of the electric powerplants are more than 20 years old, and 37 percent are more than 40 years old. California must also allow consumer prices to rise to reflect the cost of the power. New plants can’t just be built somewhere. They need to be worth his or her while, whether it be an air-conditioning unit or some other item.

The government of California is going to have to take leadership in building new generation of transmission facilities, expediting permits, and so forth. They need to expedite those permits and the siting so that the power will be there when it is needed.

In California, for example, 67 percent of the electric powerplants are more than 20 years old, and 37 percent are more than 40 years old. California must also allow consumer prices to rise to reflect the cost of the power they are consuming. FERC must provide the necessary incentives for new generation and transmission to be built and act more quickly than they have under the previous administration. They have to make decisions to get the facts, and to protect
the public. But you have to make the decision.

This administration must support new generation of transmission and make sure that existing generation continues and is not prematurely shut down.

There are impediments to competition. For example, it is high time that PUHCA and PURPA are repealed. We need to find ways to allow construction of new transmission lines. We need to enact legislation to protect the reliability of the grid.

Finally, the State of California made systematic decisions over a 10-year period to build new power plants in California while at the same time they watched their power consumption grow. The State made deregulation decisions that didn’t remove regulations, it simply changed the regulations, and now, in the face of mounting debt and possibly utility bankruptcy, the State refuses to allow rate increases to pay for expensive non-utility power.

While it would be unrealistic for the State of California to ask the rest of the Nation to pay for its power, notwithstanding the fact that California consumers enjoy—this is a fact—California consumers today enjoy some of the lowest monthly bills in the United States, California needs to make a good-faith effort to accept responsibility in this crisis. It needs to address its credit problems. It must not pursue policies that appear to be intended to bankrupt utilities rather than solve those problems. Then the Federal Government can look at its role in providing assistance. But it is not up to the Federal Government to bail out California from a series of bad decisions. And for the long term, the State needs to be looking at building power plants and transmission facilities to meet its power needs. The situation in California demonstrates that our energy future is in our hands collectively. California has a choice.

We can take the path of least resistance, as California did, and we can suffer the consequences. Or we can take the actions necessary to ensure our energy future—one of oil and natural gas as well as electricity.

That is why President Bush and we are seeking to revitalize our energy industry and to formulate a long-term energy strategy that will ensure that the United States has the energy we need to fuel our economy.

I thank the Chair. I thank my friend from Maine for allowing me additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bunning). The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Ms. Collins and Mr. Keizer to the introduction of S. 162 are located in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

A REPORT ON FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. SPECKER. Mr. President, in the absence of any other Senator on the floor, I think this would be an appropriate time to report on some foreign travel which I recently undertook for a 2-week period in late December and early January, accompanied on part of the trip by Senator VOINOVICE. Our trip took us to a few places where we had the opportunity to confer with Egyptian President Mubarak, and then in Israel, Prime Minister Barak, and Minister Ariel Sharon, who was contesting for the post of Prime Minister in an election to be held in Israel on February 6; and also former Foreign Minister Shimon Peres.

I then continued on to Aqaba in Jordan and had the opportunity to meet with King Abdullah in Jordan. We found the Mideast to be very tense, with the exacerbation of violence inspired by Palestinian youth. The Palestinian Authority has not observed their obligation under the Oslo accords to have an educational system which upholds the traditional incitement to violence of youngsters. Their educational materials in the sixth grade, seventh grade, ninth grade and beyond, urges the young people to engage in violence—a holy jihad for the glory of Allah. This has resulted in many, many, many in their own deaths as martyrs. That has set into motion a sequence of events in the area where the violence has just been extraordinary.

I think we were really looking at a generational problem. Perhaps more than a generational problem, because there is some recognition that the Israelis and Palestinians can live side by side under the terms of the Oslo accord and its implementation, as may be worked out.

When we were there, and to this day, the atmosphere was heavy with doubts as to whether a peace treaty could be reached.

I have complimented President Clinton privately and publicly, and I do so again today, for the efforts he maintained right to the end of his term in office. Now the new administration, I know, will pick up this very difficult issue, this very difficult issue, and will work as best they can to implement the peace process and try to bring stability to that region.

Before traveling to Egypt and Israel, Senator VOINOVICE and I visited Belgrade in Yugoslavia and made a trip into Bosnia. We were enormously impressed with the U.S. military presence in Bosnia, and U.S. soldiers helping to maintain a very fragile peace in that part of the world.

In Yugoslavia, we met the new leaders, who are very impressive men who are carrying forward.

The problem of former President Milosevic is a very big issue in Yugoslavia. The new Yugoslav leaders say they want to try him in Yugoslavia, as he has admitted horrendous crimes against the people of Yugoslavia—beselement which is estimated as high as $1 billion, and stealing the election on election fraud people. And at the same time, there are competing demands from the War Crimes Tribunal at The Hague.

On my return trip, after Senator VOINOVICE had departed in Israel, I had the chance to meet with the chief prosecutor of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, Carla del Ponte, at The Hague. She is insisting on bringing Milosevic to trial at The Hague.

Under the U.N. resolution, there is a priority status accorded to The Hague to try Milosevic.

Perhaps these interests can be reconciled by trying Milosevic first in Yugoslavia, but before he serves a sentence if one is imposed, he goes to The Hague for a trial. Ms. del Ponte was concerned that there not be a long interval because the War Crimes Tribunal is a temporary institution. There have been some suggestions that Milosevic be tried by the War Crimes Tribunal in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, but that remains to be worked out.

One thing which must be accomplished, in my judgment, is that Milosevic must be tried and brought to justice. It is enormously important that a head of state be tried.

I note my distinguished colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, has arrived on the floor, and I will come back with a comment or two on the discussions which were held with the leaders in India and in Pakistan where there has been a problem of nuclear confrontation and the dispute in Kashmir. There were also discussions on the persecution of Christians, which is a very rampant problem.

Mr. President, on December 28, Senator VOINOVICE and I departed from Andrews Air Force Base and flew across the Atlantic landing late in the evening in Munich, Germany. Consul General Bob Boehme and Economic Officer John McCaslin met us in Munich.

The two shared with us their thoughts on a wide variety of subjects ranging from a potential U.S. missile defense system to the current reaper situation in Germany. The next morning we had a working breakfast with representatives of the German/American business community. Our discussions ranged from lack of an educated workforce in Germany, resulting in the need for skilled immigrants to staff many of their high-tech companies to harmonization of a European defense force with NATO to the ever-evolving situation in the Balkans. After our breakfast we departed for Munich and Belgrade, Yugoslavia on Friday, December 29.

My first visit to Yugoslavia was in 1986, when I visited with then President Misojev. I was last in Belgrade in August 1998 in an attempt to visit then President Slobodan Milosevic to urge him to turn over indicted war criminals. Yugoslavia today is a country undergoing dramatic changes. Recently and most notably is the formation of a democratic form of government. The greatest political achievement of the Serbian people has been the democratic revolution. Public protests usually happen before elections are held when the political tensions are at their
greatest. In Yugoslavia, the opposite happened. Mass protests were the only way to guarantee that the popular will expressed at the polls was to be respected by former President Milosevic.

The transfer of power following the elections was not handled particularly well. The immediate challenge ahead for President Kostunica and the Federal Government includes dealing in a clear and transparent way with relations in the Yugoslav federation and, in Serbia, resolving the political and security issues relating to Kosovo. After my discussions with the various officials from the Serbian and Yugoslav Government, it was clear there is a strong desire for Mr. Milosevic to be tried by the Serbian government and to be held to pay for what he has done to the Serbian people before they were willing to turn him over to the officials at The Hague.

We were met at the airport by U.S. Ambassador Bill Montgomery and proceeded to our first meeting with Mr. Vojislav Kostunica, President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Sen. Voinovich and I were the first Congressional leaders to meet with the newly elected President and we congratulated him on his monumental victory. President Kostunica proudly told us that after the recent December 23 elections, democratic party candidates won 176 out of 250 seats in Parliament. Yugoslavia was now ready to push forward with reform. Unfortunately, the new democratic government is now being held to pay for ten years of corruption and mismanagement under the Milosevic regime. Basic public services and health care are lacking as well as energy production resulting in rolling blackouts in Belgrade during the time of our visit. Another internal problem facing the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is a political problem—dealing with the integration of Serbia and Montenegro. President Djukanovic of Montenegro declared that Montenegro should be a separate state loosely aligned with Yugoslavia while Mr. Zoran Djindjic of Serbia, expected to be Prime Minister, desires a more traditional federal alliance with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

During our discussion, I told President Kostunica that I thought Slobodan Milosevic should be turned over to the prosecutors at the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia at The Hague for prosecution. President Kostunica thanked me that while he agreed that Slobodan Milosevic should be held accountable, the Serbian people should first be given the opportunity to prosecute Mr. Milosevic for his many transgressions against them, such as stealing the September elections and stealing approximately $1 billion from the coffers of the Yugoslav government. President Kostunica also told me that he welcomed the office of The Hague Tribunal, which had recently opened in Belgrade, as the first step in the eventual investigation and prosecution of Mr. Milosevic and also other indicted war criminals who were seeking safe harbor in Yugoslavia.

We then met with Professor Miroljub Labus, the Federal Deputy Prime Minister in charge of economic policy as well as Mr. Bozidar Djelic, the Serbian Minister of Finance. Professor Labus as well as Minister Djelic, both were emphatic in their desire to bring pro-market, transparent transactions to the economy of both the federal republic of Yugoslavia as well as Serbia. Two of the major moves the federal government had undertaken that week was to cut defense spending in order to direct more money into infrastructure repairs which had been badly neglected under the Milosevic regime and deregulate foreign trade in order to attract more overseas investment. Both felt that while the new democratic government had a good deal of support of the people behind them, they only had about 3 to 6 months to help get the government on the right track since the people were expecting results extremely soon.

We next met Mr. Zoran Djindjic who won his election only 6 days prior to our arrival. He told us that while he had won the political battle, the battle to undertake the reforms the people of Serbia demanded was just beginning. He said that for the past 50 years the government of Serbia had been a facade and that he intended to have a transparent, functioning democratic government. When we discussed Mr. Milosevic and the war crimes, he said Mr. Milosevic was merely a small time criminal but had been in the position to have the opportunity to commit big time crimes. He further said the will of the Serbian people was to try Mr. Milosevic in the Serbian courts first. On the topic of Montenegro, he said that integration into the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was imperative for the establishment of joint institutions of government so that Yugoslavia Montenegro could gain membership into the EU.

On the morning of December 30, we met with His Holiness Paul, Patriarch of the Serbian Orthodox Church. The elderly Patriarch was a distinguished looking gentleman who served as a priest in Kosovo for 34 years. The Patriarch felt that while the Serbians had done many things wrong during the recent conflicts, others did as well, and the unfortunate result was that many ancient churches and mosques were destroyed. The Patriarch stated that he felt that the Church had assisted in highlighting moral issues during the elections and the Church had always advocated peaceful solutions and a peaceful transfer of power.

After our meeting with the Patriarch we flew to Bosnia to meet soldiers from the multinational peace keeping force in Tuzla. Maj. General Sharp, Commander of the 3rd Infantry Division, headquartered in Tuzla, Bosnia met us at the airport. General Sharp commands over 3900 American soldiers, which help constitute a combined force of over 6700 soldiers including those from Russia, Denmark, Poland, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Sweden and Turkey. We discussed his soldiers' mission, which was supporting implementation of the Dayton Peace Accords and maintaining force protection awareness in the region. We discussed the problem of war criminals and he said that he knew of no indicted war criminals in his area of responsibility but that the orders for his division were to detain and hold any of the personnel that had been indicted for war crimes. We also discussed the increasing role of the National Guard in the peacekeeping role in the Balkans and the fact that the 29th Infantry Division will be taking over that critical peace keeping mission there in 2002.

We then flew by UH-60 Blackhawk helicopters from Tuzla to Camp Dobol to visit with some of the soldiers who are stationed there. During lunch we discussed many issues with the soldiers ranging from the need to continue to reform Tri-Care to the transferability of a soldiers GI bill to his family members. After having lunch we departed in Humvee's and went on a patrol through the towns of Flipovici and Katonovici with the soldiers of the 3rd Infantry Division.

Upon returning from Tuzla late in the afternoon, we met with Yugoslav Minister of Justice Momcilo Grubac who told us that the new Yugoslav state would be formed under the rule of law and the massive legal reform was just beginning. The Minister told us that they were working on harmonizing existing Yugoslav law with EU law in order to comply with international standards and to attract overseas investment and provide legal and economic stability. When we discussed the war crimes, the Minister of Justice felt strongly that Milosevic should first be tried and held accountable in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia before being turned over and tried in The Hague. The Minister of Justice also said that the Ministry of Justice, not the City of Belgrade would be responsible for trying Milosevic. The current DA was a holdover from a Milosevic government and until December parliamentary elections could not have been removed. The Minister anticipated that early in February the DA would be replaced with one that would be able to prosecute Milosevic.
Later that evening we met with Professor Dragoljub Micunovic, the President of the Federal Parliaments Chamber of Citizens “the Republic’s Upper Body” and his colleagues. We met in the same Parliament building that we had visited during our earlier being there we met citizens demanding fair counting of the elected results. These same citizens were hanging out of windows waving the Yugoslav flag after they were successful in forcing Mr. Milosevic to declare President Kostunica the rightful winner in the federal elections. The Parliamentarians told us that they felt they had laid a successful groundwork for reform and that now it was time for them to deliver. They, like all the other officials we talked to in Yugoslavia, felt that Mr. Milosevic should be first tried in Yugoslavia. We were told that they were sure that the prisons in Serbia were much less comfortable than those in The Hague and that Mr. Milosevic would face a much harsher sentence in Serbia than he would in the United States given his time in Serbia. They agreed it would be possible for them to go to The Hague to be tried.

On New Year’s Eve we departed Belgrade for Cairo, Egypt. In Cairo that evening we met with Ambassador Daniel Kurtzer to discuss the status of the negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. My first meeting with President Mubarak. Egypt, a Muslim country, is comprised of Copts and Evangelicals. I had previously discussed the plight of religious minorities with President Mubarak in February of 1998, in January of 1999, and again in January of 1999. I was informed of previous trips as well as back in Washington that both the Copts and other religious minorities faced widespread discrimination and persecution sometimes rising to the level of violence. President Mubarak assured Senator VOINOVICH and me that the Egyptian government would not tolerate such activity. We discussed the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 with President Mubarak who downplayed the significance of the Act in Egypt. He said there was no need for its application because his government would not tolerate religious persecution and that any incidents that did occur were undertaken on an isolated basis and investigated by the governing authorities.

At mid morning on New Year’s day we departed from Cairo and flew to Tel Aviv. Upon reaching Jerusalem, we were briefed by Ambassador Martin Indyk and headed off to our first meeting at the Prime Minister’s residence. The former Prime Minister Shimon Peres. Former Prime Minister Peres was under the impression that there was not sufficient time to conclude the comprehensive negotiations between the Palestinians and the Israelis before the upcoming elections in Israel on February 6 and the end of President Clinton’s term. In Prime Minister Peres’ opinion, there was not enough focus on the economic issues surrounding a comprehensive peace plan. The former Prime Minister held the common opinion that the major stumbling blocks to the current negotiations were Jerusalem, the holy sites and the Palestinian claim to a right of return. He emphasized that there should be no indication on the right of return without endandering the continuation of a “Jewish state” which was the fundamental reason for the creation of Israel after the Holocaust.

Our next meeting was with Prime Minister Barak whose frustration with negotiations was palpable. Barak stated that he had been very flexible in his negotiations with Arafat and that Arafat had taken no risks in the positions he had taken. He stated that the continuing violence between the Palestinians and Israeli’s lead to unrest in the region and did not help the current peace with Egypt and Jordan. The Prime Minister reminded us that last year was the best year in the history of Israel for Israel’s economy. Prime Minister Barak stated that the only reason he had not already ended his negotiations with Arafat was to give President Clinton, who had personally invested so much in the negotiations, one last chance to broker peace in the region.

Our final meeting on New Year’s day was with Prime Minister Sharon. Minister Sharon said that his much maligned visit to the Temple Mount served only as an excuse for the Palestinians by which to mount violence against the Israeli people. He stated that he had visited the Temple Mount in protest of an incident. Minister Sharon told us, if elected as Prime Minister on February 6, he would be willing to immediately talk to Arafat about continued negotiations. Minister Sharon said he was acting in good faith that Prime Minister Barak was willing to “give away” Jerusalem and the holy sites without any debate or discussion with the people of Israel. He felt that the problems of Jerusalem, ensuring there are adequate security zones inside Israel, and the return of refugees were the major stumbling blocks to peace. Minister Sharon said although he was a General, he was committed to peace, not war. He recounted how he started as a young private in the Israeli Defense Force and rose to the level of General, fighting in every battle in the history of the State of Israel. He said that he had experienced all the horrors of war that he had seen many of his friends killed and himself wounded and was intended himself and therefore understood, perhaps more than most, the importance of peace. However, he said, negotiating peace for Israel was almost as painful as war because peace means security for Israel and Israelis before the upcoming elections in Israel on February 6 and the end of President Clinton’s term. In Prime Minister Peres’ opinion, there was not enough focus on the economic issues surrounding a comprehensive peace plan. The former Prime Minister held the common opinion that the major stumbling blocks to the current negotiations were Jerusalem, the holy sites and the Palestinian claim to a right of return. He emphasized that there should be no indication on the right of return without endangering the continuation of a “Jewish state” which was the fundamental reason for the creation of Israel after the Holocaust.

Our next meeting was with Prime Minister Barak whose frustration with negotiations was palpable. Barak stated that he had been very flexible in his negotiations with Arafat and that Arafat had taken no risks in the positions he had taken. He stated that the continuing violence between the Palestinians and Israeli’s lead to unrest in the region and did not help the current peace with Egypt and Jordan. The Prime Minister reminded us that last year was the best year in the history of Israel for Israel’s economy. Prime Minister Barak stated that the only reason he had not already ended his negotiations with Arafat was to give President Clinton, who had personally invested so much in the negotiations, one last chance to broker peace in the region.

Our final meeting on New Year’s day was with Prime Minister Ariel Sharon. Minister Sharon said that his much maligned visit to the Temple Mount served only as an excuse for the Palestinians by which to mount violence against the Israeli people. He stated that he had visited the Temple Mount in protest of an incident. Minister Sharon told us, if elected as Prime Minister on February 6, he would be willing to immediately talk to Arafat about continued negotiations. Minister Sharon said he was acting in good faith that Prime Minister Barak was willing to “give away” Jerusalem and the holy sites without any debate or discussion with the people of Israel. He felt that the problems of Jerusalem, ensuring there are adequate security zones inside Israel, and the return of refugees were the major stumbling blocks to peace. Minister Sharon said although he was a General, he was committed to peace, not war. He recounted how he started as a young private in the Israeli Defense Force and rose to the level of General, fighting in every battle in the history of the State of Israel. He said that he had experienced all the horrors of war that he had seen many of his friends killed and himself wounded and was intended himself and therefore understood, perhaps more than most, the importance of peace. However, he said, negotiating peace for Israel was almost as painful as war because peace means security for Israel and Israelis before the upcoming elections in Israel on February 6 and the end of President Clinton’s term. In Prime Minister Peres’ opinion, there was not enough focus on the economic issues surrounding a comprehensive peace plan. The former Prime Minister held the common opinion that the major stumbling blocks to the current negotiations were Jerusalem, the holy sites and the Palestinian claim to a right of return. He emphasized that there should be no indication on the right of return without endangering the continuation of a “Jewish state” which was the fundamental reason for the creation of Israel after the Holocaust.

Our next meeting was with Prime Minister Barak whose frustration with negotiations was palpable. Barak stated that he had been very flexible in his negotiations with Arafat and that Arafat had taken no risks in the positions he had taken. He stated that the continuing violence between the Palestinians and Israeli’s lead to unrest in the region and did not help the current peace with Egypt and Jordan. The Prime Minister reminded us that last year was the best year in the history of Israel for Israel’s economy. Prime Minister Barak stated that the only reason he had not already ended his negotiations with Arafat was to give President Clinton, who had personally invested so much in the negotiations, one last chance to broker peace in the region.

Our final meeting on New Year’s day was with Prime Minister Ariel Sharon. Minister Sharon said that his much maligned visit to the Temple Mount served only as an excuse for the Palestinians by which to mount violence against the Israeli people. He stated that he had visited the Temple Mount in protest of an incident. Minister Sharon told us, if elected as Prime Minister on February 6, he would be willing to immediately talk to Arafat about continued negotiations. Minister Sharon said he was acting in good faith that Prime Minister Barak was willing to “give away” Jerusalem and the holy sites without any debate or discussion with the people of Israel. He felt that the problems of Jerusalem, ensuring there are adequate security zones inside Israel, and the return of refugees were the major stumbling blocks to peace. Minister Sharon said although he was a General, he was committed to peace, not war. He recounted how he started as a young private in the Israeli Defense Force and rose to the level of General, fighting in every battle in the history of the State of Israel. He said that he had experienced all the horrors of war that he had seen many of his friends killed and himself wounded and was intended himself and therefore understood, perhaps more than most, the importance of peace. However, he said, negotiating peace for Israel was almost as painful as war because peace means security for Israel and Israelis before the upcoming elections in Israel on February 6 and the end of President Clinton’s term. In Prime Minister Peres’ opinion, there was not enough focus on the economic issues surrounding a comprehensive peace plan. The former Prime Minister held the common opinion that the major stumbling blocks to the current negotiations were Jerusalem, the holy sites and the Palestinian claim to a right of return. He emphasized that there should be no indication on the right of return without endangering the continuation of a “Jewish state” which was the fundamental reason for the creation of Israel after the Holocaust.

Our next meeting was with Prime Minister Barak whose frustration with negotiations was palpable. Barak stated that he had been very flexible in his negotiations with Arafat and that Arafat had taken no risks in the positions he had taken. He stated that the continuing violence between the Palestinians and Israeli’s lead to unrest in the region and did not help the current peace with Egypt and Jordan. The Prime Minister reminded us that last year was the best year in the history of Israel for Israel’s economy. Prime Minister Barak stated that the only reason he had not already ended his negotiations with Arafat was to give President Clinton, who had personally invested so much in the negotiations, one last chance to broker peace in the region.
had more control but recently the influence of the Islamic Jihad and Hamas were on the rise. I discussed with the King the possibility of other Arab countries using their influence to publicly persuade Arafat that the Clinton peace proposal was something that should be considered. President Abdullah stated that President Mubarak had by far the most influence on Chairman Arafat. King Abdullah thought that he along with the Crown Prince of Bahrain, President Ben-Ali of Tunisia, Mubarak of Egypt, and King Mohamed of Morocco would consider publicly supporting the Clinton peace proposal.

Later that afternoon we departed for New Delhi. We arrived in New Delhi at 10:15 p.m. and Albert Thibault, the Deputy Chief of Mission and Paul Mailhot, First Secretary, met us at the airport. The following morning we had a working breakfast meeting with members from the U.S. Embassy. At the briefing they touched on the issues that were of concern to India including the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), India-Pakistan relations, and the future of U.S.-India relations under the Bush Administration. President Clinton visit in March of 2000 was the first Presidential visit since President Carter’s visit to India. The main focus of our discussions was the relationship between India and Pakistan.

My first meeting that morning was with Foreign Secretary Lalit Mansingh. I congratulated Foreign Secretary Mansingh on his designation as the next Indian ambassador to the U.S. We spoke briefly about the elections in the U.S. and the Foreign Secretary asked me if I thought that the election would result in some momentum for reform of our system of voting. I responded that reform was on the horizon. The electoral college would not be eliminated. On the issue of the CTBT, the Foreign Secretary expressed his sentiment that the U.S. should not expect India to sign a Treaty that the U.S. itself perceives as flawed. He went on to state that the Indian neighborhood was getting more dangerous and that India had no choice but to “go nuclear” to protect itself against both China and Pakistan “but we want to convince you that India is a responsible country.” I then posed the question to him of what his assessment was of the likelihood was that a nation, excepting those classified as so-called rogue nations, would launch an attack against another country. The foreign secretary promptly responded that unless there was an “act of madness”, one does not anticipate nuclear attacks from democratic regime. India, he said, is producing thousands of graduates every year, whereas Pakistan is producing thousands of terrorists each year. He went on to express his concern in that Pakistan was fostering religious fervor, which manifested themselves into acts of terrorism.

The Foreign Secretary stressed that India shared the United States commitment to reducing nuclear weapons, but have not always agreed in how to reach this common goal. The United States believes that India should forego nuclear weapons. India believes that it needs to maintain a credible minimum nuclear deterrent in keeping with its own assessment of its security needs. Nonetheless, he said, India would be prepared to work with the U.S. to build upon the bilateral dialogue already underway.

Next, I asked the Foreign Secretary the impact of the religious persecution legislation that was enacted in law in 1998. He responded that the legislation had no impact because there is no real problem with discrimination in India. When I asked him what steps the Indian government had taken to protect minority communities and prosecute offenders, the Foreign Secretary responded that there had been isolated incidents of religious persecution in Orissa and Gujarat and that the Government had strongly condemned these murders. Prime Minister Vajpayee had committed that reducing communal violence was one of the main goals of his government. He had spent last week in the state of Kerala focuses on the issue. He went onto note that many religious minorities held seats in Parliament including Defense Minister George Fernandes. That afternoon, Prime Minister Vajpayee personally hosted former Prime Minister Narashima Rao and the architect of India’s economic reform program in the early 1990’s. We discussed a wide range of issues ranging from brain drain in India to the middle-east peace process.

My next meeting that afternoon was with the Leader of the Opposition in India. The Prime Minister Rao and Prime Minister Vajpayee had just returned from meeting with a group of Christian Bishops in the state of Kerala.

The following day I attended a lunchon meeting with the Confederation of Indian Industry. Approximately 40 business leaders participated in a lively question and answer session where I responded to wide array of questions about from bipartisanship in the newly elected Senate, the U.S. economy, China PNTR and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

I left the luncheon and arrived at the Mother Child Welfare Center in Chanakypuri, New Delhi. This Welfare Center also serves as the local polio immunization clinic. Launched in 1988, the global Polio Eradication Initiative is spearheaded by the U.S. Center for Disease Control and Prevention, WHO, Rotary International, National Governments and UNICEF. The Government of India and the United Nations, Germany, Italy, Japan, UK, the European Commission, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, and the UN Foundation and the World Bank have all been supporting the effort to eradicate polio in India by 2002. This would be only the second disease to be eradicated after small pox. Here, I had the opportunity to hold and administer the polio vaccine drops to the infants at the clinic. Later that afternoon, I met with Foreign Minister Jaswant Singh. We discussed issues ranging from the middle east peace process to the balance of power in the newly elect 50-50 Senate to India-Pakistan relationship. Mr. Singh expressed his belief of his part that reestablishing a bilateral dialogue with Pakistan is critical if any progress is to be made in the Kashmir region. I told him that following my visit to the subcontinent in 1995, I wrote a letter to President Clinton summarizing my meetings with then Prime Minister Rao and Prime Minister Bhutto and suggesting that it would be very productive for the United States initiate and broker discussions between India and Pakistan.

My final meeting that evening was with the Leader of the Opposition in India, Sonia Gandhi’s late husband. We met in the room that used to serve as the late Prime Minister Indira Gandhi’s office. Mr. Singh took me to the memorial, which marked the spot that on October 31, 1984, while walking to her office from her nearby residence, Indira Gandhi was assassinated. We discussed issues ranging from the middle east peace process to the balance of power in the newly elect 50-50 Senate to India-Pakistan relationship. Mr. Singh expressed his belief of his part that reestablishing a bilateral dialogue with Pakistan is critical if any progress is to be made in the Kashmir region. I told him that following my visit to the subcontinent in 1995, I wrote a letter to President Clinton summarizing my meetings with then Prime Minister Rao and Prime Minister Bhutto and suggesting that it would be very productive for the United States initiate and broker discussions between India and Pakistan.

My final meeting that evening was with the Leader of the Opposition in India. The Prime Minister Rao and Prime Minister Vajpayee had just returned from meeting with a group of Christian Bishops in the state of Kerala.
weapons program. Kashmir, the problems in Afghanistan with the Taliban. He told me that India was committed towards any hostility in the region and that the CTBT was a meaningless Treaty in their eyes because they have already taken a voluntary moratorium. He went on to stress that India recently signed a treaty with Pakistan that recently no aggressive use of nuclear weapons.

The next morning we departed for Udaipur. That afternoon I met with Professor P.C. Bordia, an expert on India's licit opium poppy production program. India is the world's largest source of opium for pharmaceutical use. However, located between Afghanistan and Burma, the two main world sources of illicitly grown opium, India is a transit point for heroin. Opium is produced illegally in India under strict licensing and control, and the Government of India tries to extract every gram from the 600,000 hectares of Indian opium plantations. India signs an agreement with the United States in March that explicitly prohibits the importation of opium gum from India's poppy cultivation, which would help the Government of India to maintain tight control over its licit poppy production to prevent diversion and ensure an adequate supply for medical needs, the biggest consumer of the drug. The project, scheduled to begin in mid-January 2000, is jointly carried out by the Indian government, the U.S. government and four universities. India's number 100 million state of the art telescope that has been installed in Udaipur under this project. This telescope monitors the Sun automatically, and takes digital velocity images of the sun every minute. This data is then combined with the data from the other five sites at the central facility located in Tucson, Ariz. Dr. Arvind Bhatnagar and Dr. S.C. Tripathy explained that this project enables surveillance of the Sun 24 hours a day. My staff saw first hand the working of the sophisticated $1.5 million state of the art telescope that has been installed in Udaipur under this project. This telescope monitors the Sun automatically, and takes digital velocity images of the sun every minute. This data is then combined with the data from the other five sites at the central facility located in Tucson. Dr. Bhatnagar explained to my staff with tremendous enthusiasm that the GONG project promises to unravel several fundamental problems of solar interior and general astrophysics.

On Sunday, January 7, prior to departing for Islamabad from New Delhi, I met with the Station Chief and agents in-charge of the FBI and DEA in New Delhi. That same morning I also met with Dr. John Fitzsimmons and Dr. Gary Hiday to discuss the National Polio Surveillance Project and to see what might be done to expand that program to cover other illnesses such as measles, rubella, tetanus etc. They told me that polio eradication within Asia was within reach by the year 2002 and that measles was on the horizon. We also discussed ways in which congress could assist the CDC and NIH to develop programs targeted at eradicating these diseases.

It was apparent by comments in both India and Pakistan that the Senate's 1999 vote against ratifying the CTBT was closely watched and that the vote diluted our power to persuade nations like India and Pakistan to support the CTBT. In my discussions with officials, it became evident that securing compliance with the CTBT by these two nations with no U.S. ratification would be problematic.

We departed New Delhi on the morning of January 7, 2001, for Islamabad, Pakistan. I last visited Pakistan in 1995, meeting then Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto who is now living abroad in exile and facing corruption charges in Pakistan. Upon our arrival, the Charge, Michele Sison, met me at the airport and we departed for our first meeting. General Musharraf, the president and chief executive of the Pakistan military, was as well as the country on foreign travel. Our first meeting was with the Foreign Secretary, I. M. H. Qureshi, a member of Pakistan's highest-ranking career diplomatic corps, having previously been posted as Pakistan's Ambassador to the United Nations and as Pakistan's Ambassador to China. Our meeting began with a discussion of Pakistan's nuclear program and enforcement of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The Foreign Secretary told me that General Musharraf and the current government was in favor of ratification of the CTBT. However, I was told that there was a very vocal group in Pakistan which was opposed to Pakistan's ratification of the Treaty and that the Foreign Minister was personally working on persuading opponents of the Treaty and its benefits. The foreign secretary informed me that the Pakistani government closely followed the limited debate and vote in the U.S. Senate regarding the CTBT and that ratification by the U.S. would be very helpful in Pakistan's internal debate on the issue.

Next discussed the procedure by which General Musharraf came to be the current political leader of Pakistan. I was told that after the General's ouster of Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif and ascension to power, a lawsuit was filed against the General in the Supreme Court challenging the legitimacy of his actions. When I asked if the outcome of that suit was predetermined, the foreign secretary informed me that there was a similar situation when a previous General had ousted a previous Prime Minister and a lawsuit was filed challenging the legitimacy of the action. The Supreme Court in that case found the General's actions to be unjustified and returned the Prime Minister to power. I told the Foreign Secretary of the great concern in the United States Congress regarding the return of democracy to Pakistan and that I was hopeful that General Musharraf would honor the October 2002 Supreme Court deadline for restoring democracy.

Our discussion then turned to Kashmir and the ongoing conflict there. The Foreign Secretary stated that his government was pleased with the easing of tensions and was hopeful, but not optimistic, that the Indian government would engage in dialogue regarding Kashmir.

I asked the Foreign Secretary what could or should be done with the Taliban and Osama Bin Laden in Afghanistan. The Foreign Secretary told me Undersecretary of State Pickering had conducted meetings with officials from the Taliban and that they were very grateful for the support of the U.S. provided during their war with the former Soviet Union. The Foreign Secretary felt that the U.S. should continue to provide humanitarian aid to Afghanistan and that perhaps through dialogue with the Taliban some solution regarding Osama Bin Laden could be reached. The Foreign Secretary thought that more sanctions would do more harm than good. The Foreign Secretary told me that Pakistan suffered from more terrorist attacks than any other country and that combating terrorism in Afghanistan worked to Pakistan's benefit as well.

Finally, we discussed the situation facing religious minorities in Pakistan. Pakistan is a predominately Muslim country with roughly 90 percent of its population belonging to the Islamic religion. The remaining religious minorities are roughly 3 percent Hindu, 6 percent Christian and 1 percent Sikh. The major problem facing non-Muslims in Pakistan is the blasphemy law, which allows for the death of anyone who blasphemes the Prophet Mohammed. I was told that the interpretation of the law is very liberal and mere attendance of mass by Catholics is a sufficient basis on which to charge someone for blasphemy. I urged the Foreign Secretary to have his government repeal this law and play a more active role in the protection of religious minorities.

After my meeting with the foreign secretary, we attended a working reception at the ambassador's residence in Islamabad. The attendant's at the reception were leaders from the Government, the Academy, various NGOs, religious and American communities. During the course of the evening, we engaged in spirited debate on topics such as the CTBT, missile defense, religious tolerance and the importance of democracy.
The next morning I had the opportunity to sit down with Mr. Shahbaz Bhatti, Founder and President of the Christian Liberation Front of Pakistan whom I had met in Philadelphia earlier this year. His group is an umbrella organization of described mission is the “liberation of the oppressed from social subjugation, economic deprivation, religious discrimination, religious intolerance and expression.” Mr. Bhatti and I discussed Pakistan’s blasphemy law, which he told me is broadly interpreted, and states that anyone who blasphemes the Prophet Mohammed is to be sentenced to death. Mr. Bhatti told me that there were many individuals currently being detained in Pakistani jails under the law and he provided me with a list of names. I asked Mr. Bhatti if he thought that the religious persecution act the Congress had passed had any effect on his situation in Pakistan.

He told me that he thought the Act was a useful instrument for the enhancement of interfaith harmony and religious tolerance, not only in Pakistan, but also all over the world. Mr. Bhatti told me that he felt that the U.S. State Department needed to do more to prevent persecution in Pakistan in the coming year. Mr. Bhatti said that while he had met with the U.S. Ambassador when he had visited Pakistan and that he had met with the Ambassador again in Washington, he felt that Pakistan should be elevated to a country of special concern in the State Department’s annual report. Mr. Bhatti felt that Islamic militants inside Pakistan were pressuring the government to be even less tolerant of religious minorities. Mr. Bhatti told me that he had received telephonic threats at his home and that vandalism had done property damage to his office. He told me that he had a meeting with General Musharruff to discuss religious tolerance and the General seemed to be genuinely concerned about the plight of the religious minorities, he told Mr. Bhatti that he had to deal with a constituency, which did not share his tolerant views.

After my discussion with Mr. Bhatti I called the Foreign Secretary to discuss the plight of the religious minorities and the detention of certain individuals under the blasphemy law. The Foreign Secretary told me that he would look into the matter and tell him I would send him a list of those imprisoned because of their religion which Mr. Bhatti provided me.

We departed Islamabad and arrived into Istanbul on the night of January 8. The next morning we had a working breakfast with the Ambassador, his wife, Station Chief and the regional head of the DEA. Our discussions at breakfast covered a wide range of issues from resolution of Turkey’s long-standing conflict with Cyprus, Syria-Turkey relations, Turkey’s application for entry into the European Union, and the strong political and military ties between Turkey and the United States.

After departing Istanbul, we traveled to Mons, Belgium to meet with General Ralston, the Supreme Allied Commander of all NATO forces in Europe. General Ralston and I discussed the United States’ proposed National Missile Defense System and how it would fit into our European allies’ plan. General Ralston told me that he felt that the European’s felt vulnerable to strategic missile attack under the U.S. plan which just proposed to protect the United States. We discussed the stand-alone European defense force in addition to NATO. General Ralston had high praise NATO’s new members, Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary and in fact was headed to the Czech Republic that afternoon.

General Ralston told me that his forces were ready, willing and able to assist the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in effectuating the arrest and return to The Hague of persons indicted for war crimes as soon as his political leadership instructed him to do so.

After our meeting with General Ralston, we traveled to The Hague to meet with the Chief Prosecutor of the ICTY, Carla Del Ponte. She expressed her strong sentiment to me that Slobodan Milosevic must be returned to The Hague for trial at the ICTY before standing trial in Belgrade. Madam del Ponte felt very strongly about bringing Milosevic to trial in Belgrade for a number of reasons. First of all, she said, the ICTY had a clear mandate and enjoyed primacy over domestic courts—this was a Security Council mandate. Secondly, she expressed her fear that the Milosevic regime would still retain some power—even behind the scenes—for a long time; Further, she stressed that The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia must first establish its credibility before it takes on the daunting task of judging a former head of state. She said that the whole basis of the ICTY was to tackle those difficult, painful cases for which domestic courts are ill-equipped. I told the Chief Prosecutor that I shared her desire to have Mr. Milosevic prosecuted at The Hague but was doubtful that Mr. Milosevic would be turned over to The Hague after my recent meeting in Belgrade.

The Chief Prosecutor and I also discussed the ongoing negotiations to establish a U.N. Resolutions and should not have to negotiate. She further expressed her concern that Yugoslavia could not be trusted to prosecute Milosevic due to problems of witness intimidation and the Milosevic regime still retaining influence in the Justice system. It is a difficult problem with no easy solution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now go into executive session and resume consideration of the nomination of Tommy G. Thompson, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Tommy G. Thompson, of Wisconsin, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services—Resumed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now go into executive session and resume consideration of the nomination of Tommy G. Thompson, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Tommy G. Thompson, of Wisconsin, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now be 10 minutes each under the control of the Senator from Iowa, Mr. Grassley; the Senator from Montana, Mr. Baucus;
and the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY.

The Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. President, I, as I did yesterday, urge my colleagues to vote to confirm President Bush’s nominee for Secretary of Health and Human Services, the outstanding Governor of the State of Wisconsin, Tommy Thompson.

Statements made during yesterday’s session by Senators from both sides of the aisle made it apparent that the quality and the manner in which Governor Thompson so successful in Wisconsin also made him an ideal choice to lead this very all-encompassing Department of Health and Human Services.

Governor Thompson is a problem solver. He is an innovator and really is a leader with a record of success, particularly during the 14 years he has served as Governor of the State of Wisconsin.

His record as Governor of the State of Wisconsin should show everybody that he is a person committed to improving the lives of real people. The impressive results he has brought about in his home state should impress all of us. In fact, his success in welfare reform there inspired Congress to pass the Welfare Reform Act of 1996. He was, even while Governor, an advisor to many Members of the Congress who felt we ought to move people from welfare to work, move people from the fringe of our economic society to the center, to the mainstream of that society so they can benefit, as others do, from the dynamics of our economy.

Most Wisconsinites—84 percent—have health insurance because of his leadership. The disabled and elderly persons needing long-term care have a state-of-the-art support system to turn to, thanks to Governor Thompson’s leadership.

Programs such as Pathways to Independence and Family Care are efficient and effective and are part of a reliable safety net. They call this program he instituted in Wisconsin the Wisconsin Works Welfare Reform Program. It has helped the State reduce its welfare caseload by nearly 95 percent. Think of that: reducing the welfare caseload by 95 percent. This is good for government, but, most important, we do not have welfare reform to help government; we have welfare reform to help people.

The program that has been before the country for the last 4 years is not doing everything we want it to do. It is not good to have people on the fringe of our society, people who know no other life than a public check coming from the welfare office. That is not a humane way to treat people. It is humane in our society to help people who cannot help themselves, but for those people who can help themselves—and people generally do want to help themselves—we have the responsibility to move them from the edge of society into the mainstream of society. That is exactly what happened in Wisconsin.

More specifically, there was a program in place in Wisconsin before we adopted ours in Washington, DC, for the entire nation. That program reduced the caseload by 95 percent.

Governor Thompson’s record in Wisconsin is, indeed, impressive, and we are prepared, I believe, to confirm his nomination. He will bring a wealth of knowledge, a very positive outlook, and an innovative style to the national debate on welfare reform and to Medicare improvements, including prescription drug coverage.

Governor Thompson made it clear during his nomination hearings that he welcomes the opportunity to work with any Member, Republican or Democrat, who has a special interest or special concern. One only needs to listen to the glowing recommendations from the distinguished Senators from Wisconsin, both Democrats, to be assured of his commitment to bipartisanship. Such commitment to bipartisanship, if anything is going to get done, is dictated by the makeup of the Senate and the closeness of the Presidential election.

More importantly, it is the way that Governor Thompson has worked in Wisconsin. Obviously, it is the way he is going to work with us. I look forward to his collaborative approach to job done and urge my colleagues to join me in approving this nomination.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time. Just in case there is an interest in speeding this nomination along, I am prepared to yield back any time I have left.

Before I sit down, Mr. President, I have this request from the leader.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—NOMINATION OF NORMAN MINETA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following be placed on the calendar:

A further ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to its consideration and a vote on the confirmation of the nomination. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that following the vote, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action, and the Senate then resume consideration.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Therefore, Mr. President, I am announcing for the leader, there will then be two back-to-back votes beginning at 11:30 a.m. today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered on both nominations.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?
of discarding them, it seems most appropriate to use them to save lives.

The stem cells are a veritable Fountain of Youth, with stem cells already having been very useful in efforts to cure Parkinson's and spinal cord injuries. I add the promise of stem cells on Alzheimer's, perhaps in heart ailments to replace cells in the circulatory system and in the heart, and perhaps even on cancer. That is an issue which Senator LOTT, our distinguished majority leader, has promised listing on a free-standing bill.

Governor Thompson will also be a key player in implementing the distribution of organ transplants. We will, perhaps, call on him to implement a system which has been put into effect that he personally disagreed with as Governor of Wisconsin but now, as a national officeholder looking after the interests of 50 States, there is obviously going to be a different perspective.

In Wisconsin, there had been great success in encouraging people to donate organs so there was an abundance of organs. Perhaps those techniques can be implemented by the new Secretary of Health and Human Services to correct everywhere with the response to have more organs donated so we need not have the controversy we have on the distribution of organs. As the chairman, for the past two Congresses, of the subcommittee on Labor, Health, Human Services and Education, I have had the role of working on the legislation of organ transplants, which we finally have worked out. It is my hope we will retain the policy which we have in effect.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of Governor Tommy G. Thompson, the nominee for Secretary of Health and Human Services. I am extremely pleased with President Clinton's choice to be the next Secretary of Health and Human Services because I believe Governor Thompson's extensive background will bring a fresh approach to an agency that has a history of underachievement.

Unfortunately, the Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, has far too often operated with a Washington knows best mentality, instead of taking into account what a state or local community might actually need. As Governor, Secretary Thompson, will bring an invaluable wealth of experience to HHS and more importantly the practical experience of having confronted and addressed the unique problems and needs that arise at the local level.

Governor Thompson has gained a reputation for his innovative approaches to implementing Welfare and Medicaid reform during his tenure as the Governor of Wisconsin. Moreover, during that time he dealt with the Health Care Finance Administration, HCFA, on a regular basis and I believe that experience will serve him well, as he also knows first hand the frustrations shared by many Members of Congress in dealing with HCFA.

While Governor, he completely overhauled Wisconsin's Welfare system and reduced welfare rolls by 93 percent and additionally, he attempted to provide individual welfare recipients the assistance they needed by increasing subsidies for child care, health insurance, and job training.

Governor Thompson also created Wisconsin's State Children's Health Insurance Program, SCHIP, "BadgerCare" and eighteen months ago the program became the first state in the nation to offer health coverage to the parents of eligible children.

I also believe that New Mexico stands to benefit from the leadership of Secretary Thompson. For instance, HCFA has previously denied several waiver requests by the New Mexico Department of Human Services to obtain greater flexibility regarding the use of unspent SCHIP funds and I am hopeful Secretary Thompson will review any similar request submitted by New Mexico.

I am also looking forward to working with Secretary Thompson on the issue of Medicare reimbursement disparity between states like New Mexico and states which pay more. Last year Congress took a first step to address this issue by passing the "Medicare Geographic Fair Payment Act of 2000." Specifically, the law raises the reimbursement rates for historically underpaid areas under the Medicare-Choice program.

In closing, I think we all begin the 107th Congress with unlimited opportunities to improve our nation's health through a prescription drug benefit for Medicare, Medicare reform, and a continued commitment to medical research.

I believe there is a lot of agreement on the need to emphasize these issues and I look forward to working with Secretary Thompson to address these important issues for not only New Mexico, but our country.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, few appointees in the Cabinet are more important than the Secretary of Health and Human Services. The agency's 63,000 dedicated employees serve America well. With its budget of $427 billion, if it were a country, HHS would have a GNP larger than all but 14 of the nations in the world.

As the Department of Health and Human Services is the nation's primary agency dedicated to protecting the health of all Americans, the Department is responsible for stewardship of Medicare, which along with Social Security, states the promise of our society to our senior citizens that their golden years will be as healthy and secure as possible. Medicare is a compact between the American people and their government. It says work hard and contribute to your country during your working years—and you will have good medical care in your senior years.

For the very young, the Secretary has an equally profound responsibility. The Secretary is the leader of Head Start, one of the most effective government programs to help disadvantaged children join the mainstream of American life. It brings help and hope for millions of children who would otherwise have no chance at the American dream—but it still serves only half of all those who are eligible.

Whether the issue is health care for the disadvantaged or assistance for low-income families, HHS is the lead federal agency for some of the most serious challenges the nation faces. HHS safety net programs are the protection resort for Americans, and other HHS programs are also vital to the well-being of affluent and average Americans alike.

Without the Food and Drug Administration, Americans could not go to the grocery store with the confidence that the food they buy is safe and healthy.

No American could be confident that their prescription drugs are safe and effective, and no American needing a medical device could be sure that the device will do more good than harm.

Biomedical research supported by the National Institutes of Health is unequaled by any other country. NIH leads the world in the effort to conquer cancer, heart disease, mental illness and other dread diseases that threaten the life and happiness of American families.

We all know the important challenges that the new Congress, the new President, and the new Secretary of Health and Human Services will face this year. We need to enact prescription drug coverage under Medicare, to assure that the promise of health security in retirement will finally be fulfilled. We must expand health insurance, so that the right to health care can be a reality for every American, not just an expensive privilege for the few. We must pass a strong, enforceable Patients' Bill of Rights to end the abuses of managed care and give every patient the confidence that their health insurance will be there when they need it.

We should expand quality day care, child care, and Head Start, so that we mean what we say when we state that no child shall be left behind. We must maintain our biomedical research at the NIH, to reap the benefits of the century of the life sciences that has just begun, and increase our commitment to research on health care quality and the delivery and utilization of health services.

I hope we can move forward together in a spirit of bipartisanship to address each of these great challenges. But it is
also important that we do not move backward by advancing partisan and divisive proposals that would undermine the accomplishments of the past.

We must not undermine the federal commitment to guaranteed health care for poor children, poor parents, senior citizens, and the disabled. A new effort to enact a Medicaid block grant would be counterproductive. And so would an attempt to repeal the Medicaid commitment by stealth, through the use of the waiver process in a way that undermines the Medicaid entitlement, rather than providing services in new and better ways.

Congress approved the CHIP program for children’s health by an overwhelming bipartisan majority, because it struck the right balance between state flexibility and achievement of national goals. Steps to provide additional flexibility should be carefully considered—and should not be undertaken without congressional review. I know Governor Thompson is interested in expanding coverage to parents of the children covered by Medicaid and CHIP. I hope that he will support our bipartisan efforts to provide new funds and clear authority to support parent coverage to accomplish this important objective, rather than using the waiver process and limited Title XXI funds to cover parents at the expense of children.

We must be more sensitive to ethical concerns in federally financed medical research—but we must also not roll back existing research commitments because of ideology—and certainly not without congressional action to guarantee that the commitment to such research is bipartisan.

We must maintain our commitment to comprehensive family planning services—and not return to the old days of “gag rules” and harassment of family planning clinics.

We must not politicize the scientific judgments of the Food and Drug Administration.

We must do more—much more—to reduce youth smoking, and protect as many children as possible from the dangers of tobacco.

We should improve Medicare, in addition to prescription drug coverage, by adding measures to assure the highest quality care to senior citizens and the disabled. We must place a new emphasis on keeping beneficiaries healthy rather than simply caring for them after they become ill. We can expedite Medicare’s coverage of beneficial new products and procedures, and provide more adequate financial support for the nation’s great teaching hospitals, its community hospitals, its nursing homes, and its home health agencies. But reform should not be an excuse to undermine Medicare’s commitment, to impose additional financial burdens on the elderly, or to force citizens to give up conventional Medicare and join HMOs. And the failure to reach rapid consensus on Medicare reforms should not be an excuse for failure to act promptly on the most important reform of all—Medicare coverage of prescription drugs.

Finally, responsible leadership at HHS requires support for new measures and new ideas to meet the challenges facing our country. To stand still is to fall behind in all these ongoing battles of our time.

Governor Thompson comes to us with a genuinely outstanding record of accomplishment in Wisconsin. He recognizes the importance of health insurance, child care, job training and transportation services are critically important if families are to successfully leave welfare for work. Wisconsin’s Badger Care health insurance program is a path-breaking model for the nation. Governor Thompson was an early and active supporter of the Jeffords-Kennedy work incentives legislation to help persons with disabilities work without fear of losing their health insurance, and he has created a long-term commitment to help families the freedom to choose the best forum for their long-term care needs—whether in the home or in the community.

Governor Thompson is a hard worker, and a man of strong convictions. But he is also pragmatic and willing to work with others who have different views in order to achieve a common goal.

Though the Senate is voting today, members of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee are submitting written questions to Governor Thompson on issues that were unable to be fully explored at last Friday’s hearing.

I intend to vote for Governor Thompson’s confirmation, and I look forward to working with him in the years ahead to improve and protect the nation’s health and welfare.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise today to support the nomination of Gov. Tommy Thompson to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, and also to speak to a vital public health issue on which I know many of my colleagues are looking forward to working with him: namely, the implementation and enforcement of policies to improve our nation’s organ procurement and allocation system.

I hold Governor Thompson in very high regard for his expertise in health policy and his distinguished record on innovations in health care delivery in the state of Wisconsin, and I am optimistic that in his new role as guardian of public health laws and regulations for the country we can work together toward ensuring that national interests triumph over parochial ones.

As my colleagues well know, over the past several years Congress has been unable to reach consensus on reauthorizing the National Organ Transplant Act. Nevertheless, I look forward to working with Governor Thompson this Congress to reauthorize this important public law, and especially to develop a clear mandate and strategies for increasing organ donation. But in the absence of NOTA reauthorization, the country has benefitted immensely from the credible scholarship of the Institute of Medicine’s 1999 study which underscored not only the need for reforming organ procurement and allocation, but also the proper role that the federal government should play in overseeing and enforcing such reforms. I cannot fathom an American public would countenance that a life-and-death issue such as organ allocation would be based on principles of geographic happenstance, instead of medical necessity. But it is just this outdated paradigm that has largely contributed to the fact that about 4,000 Americans die each year—at least 11 per day—while awaiting organ transplants. Of those, it is estimated that 1,000 Americans—more than 1 each day as I have often said—do not have access to a source of affordable, quality, and accessible health care.

In light of harrowing statistics such as these, following the release of the IOM study and in the absence of NOTA reauthorization, the Department of Health and Human Services last year put forth a Final Rule which enjoyed bipartisan support here in Congress and which engendered the primary recommendation of the IOM study: to establish an independent organ procurement and allocation system for the OPTN, to make changes that would assure equity with regard to patient access to organs.

On March 16, 2000 the Final Rule governing the OPTN took effect, establishing that the medical and allocation policies of the OPTN remain the responsibility of transplant professionals, in cooperation with transplant centers, patients and donor families and the National Organ Transplant Act, the OPTN, to make changes that would assure equity with regard to patient access to organs.

Toward the goal of public accountability, the Final Rule requires the National’s OPTN contractor to submit to the Secretary new policies governing liver allocation to needy patients, in order to achieve the following performance goals: utilize standardized, objective criteria to determine medical urgency; give highest priority to the most medically urgent candidates, based upon such new criteria; and distribute organs over as broad a geographic area as is feasible.

I am pleased that the current contractor has submitted a proposal to the Department that meets many of the criteria stipulated in the Final Rule and the recently renewed OPTN contract. The contractor’s proposal would create a more precise scale for determining how sick waiting patients are, thereby allowing the network to direct the more livers to the sickest patients. However, the proposal would do nothing to break down the geographic barriers that dictate organ distribution,
which was one of the pivotal tenets of both the Final Rule and the new OPTN contract.

Mr. President, I share the belief of many of my colleagues that Governor Thompson is eminently qualified to meet the myriad varied policy challenges that will be incumbent on the next Health and Human Services Secretary, ranging from sustaining and expanding the successes to date of welfare reform, to assessing options on how best to put Medicare on sound financial and actuarial footing for the long-term. I have confidence that Governor Thompson will approach the duties of his office with probity and rectitude. I am hopeful that the Governor will work with Congress to reauthorize NOTA and to support and ensure compliance with the regulations put forth last year relating to the operation of the organ procurement and transplantation network in the United States.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, if it is necessary for me to yield back my time, I will, but I did not want to yield back time until I knew exactly where we were with other people who had time.

Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having beenield back, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Tommy G. Thompson, of Wisconsin, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services?

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The result was announced—youes 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 4 Ex.]

YEAS—100

Akaka  Durbin  McCain
Allard  Edwards  McConnell
Allen  Ensign  Mikulski
Baucus  Enzi  Miller
Bayh  Feingold  Markowski
Bennett  Feinstein  Murray
Biden  Fitzgerald  Nelson (FL)
Bingaman  Frist  Nelson (NM)
Bond  Graham  Nickles
Boxer  Grassley  Reid
Breaux  Grassley  Reid
Brownback  Gregg  Roberts
Bunning  Hagel  Rockefeller
Burns  Harkin  Santorum
Byrd  Hatch  Sarbanes
Campbell  Helms  Schumer
Cantwell  Hollings  Sessions
Carabshah  Hutchinson  Shelby
Carper  Huttoon  Smith (NH)
Chafee  Inhofe  Smith (OK)
Cleland  Inouye  Snowe
Clinton  Jeffords  Specter
Coehran  Johnson  Stabenow
Collins  Kennedy  Stevens
Conrad  Kohl  Thomas
Corzine  Kohl  Thompson
Craig  Kyl  Thurmond
Cramer  Landrieu  Torricelli
Daschle  Leahy  Voinovich
Dayton  Voinovich  Warner
DeWine  Lieberman  Wellstone
Dodd  Lincoln  Wyden
Domenici  Lott  Wyden

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF NORMAN Y. MINETA TO BE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I strongly support the nomination of Norman Mi-

neta to be the next Secretary of Trans-

portation. Throughout his very lengthy career in public service, Norman Mi-

neta has demonstrated a true commit-

ment to improving the quality of life for all Americans and a strong under-

standing of the elemental role that transportation plays in our national pros-

perity.

Mr. Mineta began his public career in 1967 as the Mayor of the San Jose City Council in California. In 1971, he was elected Mayor of San Jose. Most of us know Mr. Mineta, however, from his very distinguished career in the House of Representatives, where he served for 21 years representing the Silicon Valley area. At the culmination of his career in the House, Mr. Mineta served as the Chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation—the committee we now know as the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Once we succeed in confirming Nor-

man Mineta today, we will usher in a Secretary with a very extensive ground-

ing in both politics and transpor-

tation policy. Many of Mr. Mineta's most significant legislative accom-

plishments in the House were in the area of transportation. During the drafting of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, Mr. Mineta served as Chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee on Ground Transportation. He has also been very involved in aviation policy, both dur-

ing and after his career in Congress. President Clinton asked him to chair the National Civil Aviation Review Commission. This “Mineta Commission” made several significant recom-

mendations for revamping the Fed-

eral Aviation Administration. At the request of Secretary of Transportation Rodney Slater, Mr. Mineta also chaired an ad hoc advisory committee on truck safety.

Much has been accomplished in these two areas, but so much more remains to be done. Aviation delays have reached an all-time high. Secretary Mi-

neta was quite frank with the members of the Commerce, Science, and Trans-

portation Committee during his con-

firmation hearing in telling them that they should not expect to see these delays diminish any time soon. Many of us have read some frightening rev-

elations regarding the inadequate en-

forcement efforts made by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration in maintaining truck safety. These are two areas where Secretary Mineta has committed himself to moving out quickly to implement a comprehensive series of improvements, and I support him in that effort.

When President-elect Bush an-

nounced his selection of Norman Mi-

neta to be his Transportation Sec-

retary, then-Commerce Secretary Mi-

neta stated “Inadequate infrastructure is one of the chief threats to a thriving econ-

omy.” This is a point that I have sought to make on the floor of the United States Senate numerous times, and Members can expect me to con-

tinue to make this case time and time again. I am glad that I will have an ally in Secretary Mineta in convincing my colleagues that we need to reverse the overall disinvestment in our na-

tion’s infrastructure that we have ex-

perienced over the last few years. We have begun to make some progress by honoring the funding guarantees that I and other Senators included in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. However, much more needs to be done, and I look forward to working with Norman Mineta to see to it that we take a more aggressive approach in investing in America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Norman Y. Mineta of California to be Secretary of Transpor-

tation? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 5 Ex.]

YEAS—100

Akaka  Durbin  McCain
Allard  Edwards  McConnell
Allen  Ensign  Mikulski
Baucus  Enzi  Miller
Bayh  Feingold  Markowski
Bennett  Feinstein  Murray
Biden  Fitzgerald  Nelson (FL)
Bingaman  Frist  Nelson (NM)
Bond  Graham  Nickles
Boxer  Grassley  Reid
Breaux  Grassley  Reid
Brownback  Gregg  Roberts
Bunning  Hagel  Rockefeller
Burns  Harkin  Santorum
Byrd  Hatch  Sarbanes
Campbell  Helms  Schumer
Cantwell  Hollings  Sessions
Carabshah  Hutchinson  Shelby
Carper  Huttoon  Smith (NH)
Chafee  Inhofe  Smith (OK)
Cleland  Inouye  Snowe
Clinton  Jeffords  Specter
Coehran  Johnson  Stabenow
Collins  Kennedy  Stevens
Conrad  Kohl  Thomas
Corzine  Kohl  Thompson
Craig  Kyl  Thurmond
Cramer  Landrieu  Torricelli
Daschle  Leahy  Voinovich
Dayton  Voinovich  Warner
DeWine  Lieberman  Wellstone
Dodd  Lincoln  Wyden
Domenici  Lott  Wyden
Dorgan  Lugar

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORZINE). Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-

ator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I want to say a few words about our former colleague, Sen-

ator Alan Cranston. I ask unanimous

consent that following my statement, Senator Domenici be recognized to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON

Mr. RINGMAN. Mr. President, Alan Cranston was here in the Senate when I first arrived in 1983. He was a staunch advocate not only for California but also for a host of progressive policies at the national level. He was dedicated to protecting the environment, to expanding voter opportunities for all Americans, to closing the gap in our society between the rich and the poor. He was a champion of equal rights for all. He was a foe of bigotry in all its forms.

Perhaps his greatest passion during the years he served in the Senate was reducing the threat of nuclear war. He led the fight for arms control. Even after he left the Senate, he continued his work and spoke out for arms control and for the de-alerting of nuclear weapons.

I remember meeting with Alan last year at Ricky’s Hyatt House in Mountainview, CA. I was in the Bay area, and I called ahead to see if he was available. As I said it was near his home and that he would meet me there.

He was a little less vigorous during that breakfast than he had been in earlier visits, but his commitment to arms reduction was undiminished. I remember thinking at the time how impressive it was to see someone who felt strongly enough about his views to find a way to continue advocacy of those views after leaving public office. It was clear that he had left public office, he had not left public service.

Alan Cranston lived a remarkable life, and we are all fortunate that he devoted so much of that life to public service. I, for one, will miss Alan’s wise counsel and his passionate commitment to making the world a better place.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a subject that brings me great sorrow—the passing of my old friend and colleague, former California Senator Alan Cranston.

Senator Cranston passed away suddenly last New Year’s Eve, at the age of 86. His sudden death came as a shock to all of us who remember him for his abundant energy and enthusiasm.

Alan was elected to this body for the first of four terms in 1968. He was already a legend in the Senate when I arrived here for the first time almost eighteen years after him, and I consider myself very fortunate to have had the opportunity to serve alongside him. I will always remember him fondly, both for the kind of person he was, and the kind of Senator he was.

Alan was elected Democratic whip an unprecedented seven straight times, and served in that role in both the majority and minority. Having now served as my party’s whip for two years, I can say that nobody who holds that office can know the long shadow that he still casts over it.

Recently, the Senate approved an historic power-sharing agreement under which both parties would have an equal number of seats in each committee. It remains to be seen how this arrangement will work in practice, and whether the split will create more cooperation, or more gridlock.

But I do not believe that in the Senate are to make it work, we would do well to follow the model set by Senator Cranston. Those of my colleagues who did not know him personally, would do well to study the lessons of his life and his career.

The press called him “Colorless Cranston,” a nickname he wore with pride, because it reflected his fundamental belief that legislative accomplishment was far more important than crafting sound bites or scoring political points. When you needed to find Alan, you didn’t look in the press gallery or the recording studio—you looked for him in the cloakroom, where he was always busy negotiating a compromise or finding ways to move legislation over obstacles.

Although he was known as one of the last true liberals, he never let his ideology get in the way of getting things done. He regularly reached out across the aisle and his close friends included some of his most vigorous and outspoken political opponents. He was a workhorse who lived by the maxim that a leader can accomplish great things if he doesn’t mind who gets the credit.

Some of his greatest accomplishments found him in alliances that left outsiders scratching their heads—for example, teaming with STRÖM THURMOND to improve veterans’ programs, with Alfonse D’Amato on public housing measures, with Barry Goldwater to protect first amendment press freedoms. Outsiders wondered whether he had sold out his old liberal beliefs, but the truth was that he was just finding ways to get things done with as little fuss as possible.

During his 24 years in the Senate, no legislation that touched on his passions—veterans’ benefits, disarmament, environmental protection, human rights, or civil rights—passed this body without his fingerprints on it, although more often than not, only those closest to him realized the extent of his contribution.

During his long and colorful career, he crossed paths with some of the most famous men in history and was present many times while history was being made. He was a track star at Stanford and member of a record-setting relay sprint team. As a young journalist, he reported on the rise of Nazism in Germany, and was sued by Adolph Hitler for publishing an unsanitized version of “Mein Kampf” and revealing Hitler’s true ambitions to the world. His lifelong commitment to halting the use of nuclear weapons began after he was introduced to Albert Einstein in 1946. As a young journalist, he established a think tank with Mikhail Gorbachev to promote world peace, where he worked until his death. He counted Groucho Marx among his supporters.

Yet despite these brushes with fame and the long list of bills that bear his name, he will always be best remembered in this body for the things that he didn’t accomplish. He never replaced his humility, his leadership, and his devotion to his son Kim and his granddaughter. He will be missed.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring our friend and former colleague, the late Senator Alan Cranston, who died on December 31, 2000 at the age of 86 in his native California.

While Alan Cranston was elected to the United States Senate in 1968, his public service began years before when he served in the Executive Offices of the President in 1942 as Chief of the Foreign Language Division of the Office of War Information. Declining a deferment, he enlisted as a private in the United States Army in 1944. First assigned to an infantry division, he became editor of “Army Talk” and was a Sergeant by V-J Day. He went on to serve two terms as State Controller of California before being elected to the United States Senate.

Senator Cranston served the people of California with distinction in the U.S. Senate for 24 years. He chaired the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, providing invaluable assistance to our Nation’s servicemen and women. He was in the forefront in the U.S. Senate on numerous issues of national importance, including mass transit, civil rights, the environment, women’s rights, housing and education.

I was privileged to serve with Senator Cranston on the Foreign Relations Committee where he played an important role during Senate consideration of the SALT II and START treaties, and was active in efforts to promote peace in the Middle East. Senator Cranston was a tireless advocate for world peace and the defense of democratic institutions.

Throughout his Senate service, Alan Cranston worked diligently to promote the reduction and, ultimately, the elimination of nuclear weapons. After retiring in 1993, he continued his extraordinary commitment and devotion to these critical efforts. He chaired the State of the World Forum, a widely respected organization for the discussion of global problems based in San Francisco. He was also founder and President of the Global Security Institute, concentrating on a world-wide effort to reduce, marginalize and eliminate nuclear weapons.

Mr. President, Alan Cranston was a leader in the U.S. Senate, a well-respected member of this body. He had a unique ability to achieve consensus under difficult circumstances and his wise counsel will be missed by every senator with whom he served. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to him and to extend my deepest sympathies to his family.
Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.
Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for as much time as the Senate will allow.
Mr. President, Alan Cranston was a Senator in this Chamber for some long while. In fact, in recent months he visited this Chamber, and I had an opportunity to say a few words to him. He was someone who left a significant mark, especially in the area of fighting for a policy in this country that would put this country in a leadership position to reduce the threat of nuclear war.

Mr. Cranston worked diligently on that issue here in Congress, but after he left his service in the Senate, he especially was interested, and active all around this country, in trying to mobilize the energy and interest for this country to lead in a range of areas dealing with stopping the spread of nuclear weapons. I recall, perhaps 6 months ago, driving down a rural highway in North Dakota, and receiving a call on my cell phone. The call was from former Senator Alan Cranston, and he was calling from California. What he was calling about was what he always talked about in recent years. He was trying to find ways to continue our country’s obligation to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons and the threat of nuclear war.

He felt passionately about the comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty and was disappointed when the treaty was voted down in the Senate last year or a year and a half ago. But he never stopped working. He always believed that our country, as strong and as big as it is, had a leadership responsibility in the world to mobilize its energy and commitment to find ways to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

So today we pay honor to his memory. We should be thankful that there was an Alan Cranston involved in public service for his family that our sympathies go to them. We will all miss his commitment in dealing with this issue of nuclear arms reduction.

(The remarks of Mr. DORGAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 165 are located in today’s Record under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.
Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the question be considered.
Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is conducting morning business.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I listened attentively to President Bush on Saturday when he called on all Americans to unite in a spirit of civility and common purpose. Those are sentiments we all share. I, for one, intend to make every effort, guided by conscience and my constituents, to work with the new administration for the good of the country.

I was also impressed by some of the things he said yesterday to his staff about the importance of decency and respect and never taking the White House for granted. Those are important messages, and I commend the President for setting a tone of civility.

I also take the President at his word when he spoke together to unite the country.

But that doesn’t happen simply by making a speech. Actions speak louder than words. On his first day in office, President Bush, by executive order, with no prior consultation with Congress, reinstated the controversial Mexico City policy on international family planning.

President explained his decision with these words: “It is my conviction that taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for or advocate or actively promote abortion, either here or abroad. It is therefore my belief that the Mexico City policy should be restored.”

Madam President, if current law did, in fact, permit taxpayer funds to be used to pay for or promote abortions overseas, then the President might have a point. But our law does not allow that. Our law clearly prohibits any U.S. funds from being used for abortion or to promote abortion.

That is the settled law of the United States. It was passed by the Congress and signed into law by President Clinton. It is something we have all supported. In fact, it has been the law for as long as I can remember, even during past administrations.

It is already against the law to use taxpayer funds for purposes related to abortion. Somebody should have told that to the new President.

In fact, the Mexico City policy, which he has reinstated, goes much, much further. Many have called it a “global gag rule.” It prohibits taxpayer funds from being used to support private family planning organizations like the International Planned Parenthood Federation. These organizations use a small portion of their own private funds to operate private funds—to provide services, counseling, and information about abortions, and to advocate for safe abortion practices in countries where tens of thousands of women suffer injuries or die from complications from unsafe abortions.

If we tried to impose the Mexico City policy on any family planning organization within our borders, it would clearly violate the First Amendment. It would be illegal. But we impose it on those same organizations when they work overseas beyond the reach of our Constitution.

Proponents of the Mexico City policy maintain that it will reduce the number of abortions. The reality is the opposite. The distinguished Presiding Officer strongly favors this very controversial International Planned Parenthood Federation, which is now going to be cut off from U.S. Government support, has used every tax dollar it received in the past to provide voluntary family planning services, like contraceptives, to couples who lack them. By providing for the first time modern birth control methods to people in countries where abortion was the primary method of birth control, the number of abortions goes down.

Now, taxpayer funds to the International Planned Parenthood Federation, which is comprised of dozens of family planning organizations around the world, are cut off.

I remember the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, former Senator Mark Hatfield, a dear friend of mine, one of the most revered Members of this body, who became chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Senator Hatfield was fervently pro-life, opposed to abortion. He was in his beliefs. I remember a debate on the Mexico City policy when he stood here—and he probably said it best. I will quote what he said: “It is a proven fact that when contraceptive services are not available to women throughout the world, abortion rates increase. The Mexico City policy is unacceptable to me as someone who is strongly opposed to abortion.”

President Bush’s decision was not unexpected, based on what he said during the campaign. But I am disappointed because one would have hoped that after pledging to change the way we do business in Washington, after years of successive Congresses and administrations tying themselves in knots over this issue, his advisers would have taken the time to consult with the Congress about how to avoid the quagmire the Mexico City policy has produced in the past. How did they do that, would an agreement have been possible? Who knows? There are strong passions on both sides of this issue, but they should
at least have asked whether maybe, before unilaterally turning back the clock, there is a way to find common ground.

President Bush has made much of his abilities as a consensus builder. Frankly, I doubt that he would have found a willingness to compromise, because contrary to the President’s statement and contrary to a lot of the press reports, this issue is about far more than abortion.

It is about promoting the health of women in desperately poor countries where more than half a million women die each year from complications relating to pregnancy, and where women have little control over their own bodies or their lives. We have the opportunity, at very little expense, to help. Instead—not to save money but to make a political point—we cut off that help.

The Mexico City policy has been the subject of much political posturing, more press releases, more fund raising letters, more debates, more votes, and more Presidential vetoes, than virtually any other issue I can think of.

I remember when President Clinton did the right thing by repealing the Mexico City policy 8 years ago. When he did that, a Republican Congress responded by sharply cutting funding for voluntary family planning—not funding for abortions but for voluntary family planning. The predictable, tragic result of that misguided, politically motivated act was an increase in the number of abortions and of deaths of women from botched abortions.

Again, the evidence is indisputable that when family planning services are available, the number of abortions goes down. But apparently that didn’t matter. Mexico City proponents cared more about scoring political points than preventing abortions or saving women’s lives.

President Bush has made a decision. He has a right to do that. But I believe it was the wrong decision—wrong because the Mexico City policy is not about taxpayer dollars, wrong because he ignored the bipartisan majority in the Senate that opposes the Mexico City policy, wrong because it will likely result in more abortions, not less, in poor countries where abortions are often unsafe.

The irony is that if we had a vote a majority of Senators—Republicans and Democrats—would vote the other way. I do appreciate that the administration has said it will provide the full $415 million the Congress appropriated for family planning this year. That is critically important, and we should discuss how to significantly increase that amount in future years. But by reinstating the Mexico City policy, by cutting off support for some of the most effective organizations involved in family planning and women’s health, the President is setting us on a course we can now expect extended debates that we have all heard countless times before, votes to repeal the policy, vetoes of appropriations bill, and on and on.

I hope this is not what the President meant when he spoke of working together. We can do better. We have to do better if we are going to avoid the pitfalls that divided us in the past on this issue.

Madam President, we have moved foreign aid bills through this body in record time in the last few years. Senator McCaIN of Kentucky and I have been the floor leaders year after year. But it used to take many days, and one of the reasons was that we got bogged down in debates on the Mexico City policy.

The President could have waited until February 15 to make his decision. There was time to consult with Republicans and Democrats. He could have said: Look, I know this issue is divisive. Let us work together, come back and sit down again in a few days and work through this—because one thing is clear: that with the abysmal state of women’s health in so many parts of the world, we can make it better. That should not be a Republican or a Democrat or pro-choice or right-to-life issue. That is a human issue and a moral issue. This would be a good year to forget the political point making, and solve this.

I have traveled to many parts of the world. My wife is a registered nurse. She has traveled with me. We have seen how bad the situation is. We have seen how a little help can move women in many parts of the world generations ahead of where they are today.

The distinguished occupant of the chair has visited some of those same places, and many more. I know I preach to the converted.

We have enough other ways to make political points, on either side. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, we do have an essential agreement here that will allow us to move through three more nominations. I would like to go through this and then also give the Senate some indication of the idea as to how we might proceed beyond this next week.

As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 on Tuesday the Senate proceed to the consideration of Elaine Chao to be Secretary of Labor, and that there be 15 minutes for debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, and 15 minutes under the control of Senator MURKOWSKI.

Further, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 on Tuesday the Senate proceed to the consideration of Gale Norton to be Secretary of Interior, and that be followed by a vote on the confirmation of Gale Norton to be Secretary of Interior, and that be followed by a vote on the confirmation of Governor Whitman to be the head of EPA.

I further ask unanimous consent that following the three back-to-back votes, the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action and the Senate resume legislative session.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that either leader may vitiate the agreement with respect to the Chao agreement prior to the vote and that in no case shall it proceed if the Senate has not yet received the nomination and the accompanying papers.

Mr. REID. Madam President, reserving the right to object, as I understand what just transpired and will have transpired by next Tuesday early in the afternoon, is that all of the President’s nominees for his Cabinet will have been approved with only one selection still to be debated. It is our intention to try to bring this to a final vote without undue delay. I hope we can do that expeditiously.
Mr. LOTT. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Nevada. I also note with regard to the last paragraph, we do not anticipate there will be a need to vitiate the agreement with regard to the Chao agreement. It is just that we have not received all of the papers yet. We do not expect there to be any problem, but because we do not have it all, it was necessary to put this in.

Also—and I appreciate Senator Reed's comments—it is our anticipa-
tion to proceed after these three stacked votes Tuesday afternoon, on the debate with regard to the Attorney General nomination, and it is at least my hope, and I believe everybody's hope, that we will be able to complete action on that nomination next week.

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

Mr. LOTT. In light of this agreement then, the next votes will occur back to back at 2:45 p.m. on Tuesday next.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now be in a period for morning business, permitting to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

NOMINATIONS

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to comment on several of the nominations on which we have voted in the last few days.

I am pleased the Senate is acting responsibly and quickly to put the President's cabinet in place. While I am sure I will not always agree with everything proposed by the nominees we have confirmed, I stand ready to work with them toward our common goal of the United State's best interest.

I especially want to welcome Governor Tommy Thompson, of my State of Wisconsin, to his new position as Secretary of Health and Human Services. I had the honor of presenting the Governor at his hearings before the Senate Finance and Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committees. As I said there, the Administration is truly fortunate to have a man of his energy, creativity, and intelligence in this extremely important position.

I also want to comment on some of the other nominations on which the Senate has already acted.

I am pleased to lend my support to the nomination of General Colin L. Powell to be Secretary of State. There are many foreign policy challenges facing the next Administration including the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, our peacekeeping commitments abroad, instability in the Middle East and in other hot spots, and the continuing threat to our relationships with Russia and China. I am confident that General Powell brings a wealth of experience, a formidable intellect, and a level head to the challenges ahead. I look forward to working with Secretary Powell in forging a truly bipartisan foreign policy.

I am also pleased with President Bush's decision to appoint Donald Rumsfeld as Secretary of Defense. He is an experienced voice on defense issues, and one that the Congress has come to rely on for outside analysis. He recently addressed the threat of ballistic missiles in a special report to Congress that now should be debated on share ballistic missile defense. His years of public service and expertise will give him the credibility inside the Pentagon to make the tough choices that face the new administration, and they will face many, I feel confident that Secretary Rumsfeld is qualified to help the President shape our armed forces to meet the evolving threats of the new century.

And finally, I support the nomination of Rodney Paige to be the Secretary of Education. Dr. Paige has received overwhelming praise since his nomination was announced, and in my opinion, there is good reason for that. He understands the need to change the system when the old way is not working, like they should. He is willing to work with all sides—from teachers to parents to principals to school board members. And he brings with him to Washington an important lesson from his time in Houston: If you set high standards for students and require them to meet them, they will strive to succeed.

Mr. President, there are many worthy nominees who deserve comment and support, but I will reserve further remarks until we engage later in the year in what I hope will be bipartisan legislating.

NOMINATION OF ANTHONY PRINCIPI

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate unanimously approved the nomination of Anthony Principi to be President Bush's Secretary of Veterans Affairs. In my judgment, Secretary Principi is supremely qualified to take on the challenges that will face the next Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and I fully supported his confirmation.

Secretary Principi will bring a wealth of experience in a broad-range of capacities pertaining to veterans and veterans health to his work at the VA. A graduate of the United States Naval Academy, and decorated veteran of the Vietnam War, Secretary Principi is personally aware of our veterans needs and concerns. He was appointed deputy secretary of Veterans Affairs by President George Bush in 1989 and served as Acting Secretary during 1992—providing him with a working knowledge of the VA's structure and an understanding of how to make the system work for our veterans. Most recently, Secretary Principi served as president of a California-based health system and president of the board of a public and private service. Secretary Principi has assembled an impressive track record and compiled the type of practical experience that will serve him well at the VA.

I was pleased to hear during Secretary Principi's nomination hearing that he plans to focus on veterans benefits, among other concerns, I agree strongly with this priority. Through dedicated service and sacrifice, generations of veterans and their families have answered the call to serve this nation in her darkest hours and most shining moments alike. Kept the solemn covenant established by honored patriots past and have earned the gratitude of a grateful nation.

With 139 facilities serving 3.5 million veterans and survivors, however, the task at hand is a daunting one. While broadly speaking, the VA provides high-quality health-care and services to our veteran community, ensuring that such a standard is maintained requires constant attention and a firm guiding hand. I am confident that Secretary Principi has the leadership and managerial skill, and perhaps more importantly, the compassion, to serve well our veterans and their families, as they have served our country.

I commend President Bush for putting forth such a quality and qualified nominee. Secretary Principi will be a credit to this Administration. I am pleased that the Senate has moved emphatically to confirm him as Secretary of Veterans Affairs. I look forward to working closely with him on issues of mutual concern, and I wish him well.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am very pleased to support the nomination of Anthony Principi to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs. Principi is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, and a combat-decorated veteran who commanded a River Patrol Unit in the Mekong Delta during the Vietnam War.

Since completing his service in the U.S. Navy, Mr. Principi has had a distinguished career in public service serving as staff director of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs for several years until he was appointed Acting Secretary of Veterans Affairs by President Bush in 1992. Now, as Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Anthony Principi will have responsibility for a $10 billion budget in the Federal Government's second largest department, coordinating a nationwide system of health care services and benefits to serve America's more than 25 million veterans.

As we begin the 107th Congress, there are few challenges we face more important than ensuring that America's veterans receive the health care and benefits that they so justly deserve. The challenges include adequate funding for veterans health care services, ensuring access to VA health care for homeless veterans and veterans living in rural areas, providing timely access to specialized medical care, and responding to the many concerns of Persian Gulf Veterans as well as veterans with service in the Balkans. Secretary Principi, as a combat veteran in
Vietnam, is well aware of these challenges. He has been a strong advocate on behalf of veterans during his service in the Senate and as Acting Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

As ranking member of the Senate Budget Committee, I look forward to working with Secretary Principi to ensure that the FY 2002 budget for veterans health care services and benefits are sufficient to meet the growing needs of our veterans population, particularly our aging veterans. We must also ensure that the Department of Veterans Affairs is equipped to meet the many new challenges that are emerging as a result of the activities of our military personnel in peacekeeping operations and more non-traditional assignments around the world. I congratulate Secretary Principi on his appointment and commend him for his commitment to serve our Nation’s veterans. No individual has a more solemn responsibility than the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

RETIREMENT OF MAJOR GENERAL DRENNAN A. CLARK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to honor an outstanding individual, patriot and friend, Major General Drennan A. “Tony” Clark from my home state of Nevada. Major General Clark is retiring from the Nevada National Guard after more than 40 years of loyal and dedicated service.

Major General Clark first joined the Nevada National Guard as a young photo lab technician in 1960, and eventually rose to Adjutant General, the highest position in the Nevada Guard—a position he held for 14 years, a remarkably long time. It speaks volumes of the respect that General Clark commands in Nevada that he was re-appointed to that position four times, by Governors from both parties.

During his 14 years as Adjutant General, Tony Clark led the Guard through many upheavals, ranging from floods, to earthquakes, to civic emergencies, to the war on drugs. Units of the Nevada Guard fought in the Persian Gulf War. Hundreds of Nevadans owe their lives to the timely assistance of the Guard in all manner of emergencies.

The face of Nevada has changed dramatically since General Clark first assumed command—the state’s population doubled in the last decade alone, small towns have exploded into cities, and Las Vegas has become an attraction to the world—and the Guard’s military role has also shifted, from reconnaissance, to airlift, to Medevac, to tank-busting—but through it all, Tony Clark kept the Guard constantly vigilant, ready and able to answer any call. General Clark has led the Guard so capably and for so long that it will be hard to imagine the Nevada Guard without him in command.

General Clark grew up in Reno, Nevada and graduated from Bishop Manogue High School in 1955. He studied political science at the University of San Francisco, joined the Nevada Air National Guard shortly after graduation, and served in the Guard while attending law school.

After receiving his law degree in 1964, he began a budding career as a lawyer. But fate had something different in mind, and in 1968, young Second Lieutenan Clark was called to active duty during the Pueblo Crisis and served as the Commander of the 654th Troop Carrier Squadron at Suwon Air Base and Osan Air Base, Korea.

He was released from active duty in 1969, and returned to Nevada and his career as a rising young lawyer. But a few years later, he sacrificed what in all probability would have been a distinguished and lucrative career in the legal profession to accept assignment as the Nevada Guard’s Staff Judge Advocate, where he handled the Guard’s Equal Matters. Only a few years later was appointed the State Judge Advocate. After only a year as the State Judge Advocate, Tony Clark was appointed Assistant Adjutant General in 1984, and the next Adjutant General in 1986. In 1987, he was formally appointed Adjutant General and held that position until his retirement last week.

During his tenure as the Adjutant General for the state of Nevada, General Clark was responsible for enhancing the National Guard nationally and within the state. General Clark was appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force to the Air Reserve Forces Policy Committee, served on the Reserve Forces Policy Board, as chairman of the Advisory Board to Air National Guard Professional Military Educational Center, and chairman of the National Guard Bureau Executive Committee.

In each of these critical and prestigious assignments, General Clark played a key role in enriching and highlighting the National Guard.

General Clark’s military awards and decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal with one bronze oak leaf cluster, Air Force Commendation Medal with two bronze oak leaf clusters, Army Commendation Medal, Air Force Achievement Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Air Force Outstanding Unit Award with one silver oak leaf cluster, Air Force Organizational Excellence Award with four bronze oak leaf clusters, Air Reserve Meritorious Service Medal, National Defense Service Medal with one bronze star, Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, Humanitarian Service Medal, Military Outstanding Volunteer Service Medal, Air Force Longevity Service Award Ribbon with one silver and three bronze oak leaf clusters, Armed Forces Reserve Medal with one silver hourglass device, Small Arms Expert Marksmanship Ribbon with one bronze star, and many others.

Yet in spite of his long list of accomplishments and the many hours he spent working to improve the Guard and ensure the safety of Nevada, Tony Clark never lost sight of the things that are truly important in life—his wife Andrea, his six children, and his many friends.

Many years ago, General Clark sacrificed a lucrative career as a lawyer to serve the people of his state and his country, and we are all better for his choice. And although he retired from the Guard last week and could have done many things with his career, General Clark chose to remain in public service, as Nevada’s Solicitor General, where he will continue to serve the people of Nevada.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and all of Nevada, I want to thank Tony Clark for his long years of sacrifice and service in the Nevada National Guard, and to wish him the best in his new career.

PIPELINE SAFETY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am pleased to have co-sponsored a bill to modernize our Nation’s pipeline safety programs. The issue of our country’s pipeline safety came to the forefront after tragic explosions in Bellingham, Washington, and later, in my own state of New Mexico.

Just after midnight, August 19, 2000, an El Paso Natural Gas pipeline exploded on the Pecos River near Carlsbad, New Mexico. Twelve members of an extended family were camping near the explosion, which sent a 350 foot high ball of flame into the air. Six of the campers died instantly, and the remaining six later died from their horrific injuries.

Pipelines carry nearly all of the natural gas and about 65 percent of the crude oil and refined oil products. Three primary types of pipelines form a network of nearly 500,000 miles, 7,000 miles of which lie throughout New Mexico.

Last Congress, the Senate unanimously passed similar legislation. Our colleagues in the other Chamber voiced serious concerns regarding that bill. Many of their criticisms related to the Office of Pipeline Safety, the Office within the Department of Transportation charged with keeping our Nation’s pipelines safe. Unfortunately, the Office of Pipeline Safety has had a poor history of regulation and enforcement. It is true that the Office has traditionally been slow to act.

That said, we should not allow a former executive agency’s failures to dictate our failure to act in accordance with our legislative mandate. In that regard, I intend to discuss the issue with our current Secretary of Transportation nominee, Mr. Mineta. I am confident that he will address our concerns regarding the Office of Pipeline Safety record of cooperation with the new Director of the Office when he or she is nominated by our new President.
Mr. President, this bill; significantly increases States’ role in oversight, inspection, and investigation of pipelines; improves and expands the public’s right to know about pipeline hazards; dramatically increases civil penalties for safety and reporting violations from $25,000 to $500,000, and increases the maximum civil penalty for a related series of violations to $1 million; increases reporting requirements of releases of hazardous liquids from 50 barrels to five gallons; provides important protections prohibiting discrimination by pipeline operators, contractors or subcontractors; furthermore, the legislation would provide much needed funding for research and development in pipeline safety technologies. In fact, technology currently exists that might have detected weaknesses in pipelines around Carlsbad. Unfortunately, due to insufficient funding for their products to reach the market; La Sen Corporation in my own State of New Mexico has developed technology that can detect faulty pipelines where current pipeline inspection technology is not useable. La Sen’s Electronic Mapping system can be very effective even in pipelines where conventional pig devices cannot be used; pipeline inspection is costly and slow. Innovative new technologies could allow us to inspect all 2.2 million miles of pipeline each year in a cost effective manner. Today, pipeline inspection technology only covers 5–10 miles per day a few miles a year. La Sen’s technology can survey 500 miles per day at a cost of $32 per mile; ensuring the safety and integrity of our nation’s pipelines is important to all of us.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL MARJORIE A. JACKSON

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, it is a privilege to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Colonel Marjorie A. Jackson, United States Army Medical Service Corps, on her retirement after 26 years of distinguished and dedicated service to the nation.

Colonel Jackson is a native of Louisiana. She graduated from Walter L. Cohen High School in New Orleans, earned her bachelor’s degree from Xavier University and earned her M.A. in Executive Development from Ball State University. In 1974, she enlisted in the Army as a Pharmacy Technician serving in Fort McPherson, Georgia. In 1975, she was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant and went on to serve in a variety of key operational and staff positions including Assistant Inspector General, U.S. Army Health Services Command and Clinical Pharmacist, Hematology/Oncology Service at Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington, D.C. Colonel Jackson has been honored with the Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, the Order of Military Medical Merit by the Army and was selected as the College of Pharmacy Alumnus of the Year in 1996 by Xavier University for her achievements in the field.

Colonel Jackson has been a groundbreaker her entire career. She was the first woman to serve as Chief of Staff, Administrative Services at the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, the first African-American woman promoted to the rank of Colonel in the U.S. Army Medical Service Corps, the first African-American female pharmacist in the history of the U.S. Army Pharmacy Service and the first woman to direct an Army major medical center pharmacy.

For twenty-six years, seven months and eighteen days, Colonel Jackson has served her country on the forefront of military medicine completing exemplary military career is ending, but her contributions and achievements will continue to be felt throughout the Army and the Department of Defense.

Colonel Marjorie J. Jackson served her country with great ability, valor, loyalty and integrity. On the occasion of her retirement from the United States Army, I commend her for her outstanding service. She is one of Louisiana’s finest, represents all that is special about our nation, and I wish her well in the years ahead.

IN HONOR OF DR. MICHAEL MULLIN, PHD AND DR. MIA JEAN TEGNER, PHD.

Ms. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to recognize and honor two exceptional research scientists from one of the world’s finest oceanographic research facilities who lost their lives in recent weeks. Both were two of the brightest stars at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, in La Jolla, California.

Dr. Michael Mullin, a research biologist at Scripps, and undergraduate professor at the University of California, San Diego, died December 19th of complications following surgery. He was 63 years old.

His research over the past 36 years at Scripps has included the study of phytoplankton, zooplankton and larval fish in the marine food web.

He was the author of more than 70 scientific publications, including his own book “Webs and Scales.” He also served as chief editor of the scientific journal “Fisheries Oceanography.”

Also socially active and committed to the practice of science and he will be greatly missed.

Dr. Mia Jean Tegner, a research marine biologist at Scripps Institution of Oceanography since 1969, died Sunday, January 7th in a scuba diving accident off the San Diego coast. She was 53 years old.

An experienced scuba diver, Dr. Tegner made more than 4,000 dives throughout the world during her 31 years at Scripps. Her research focused on the ecology of kelp forest communities and near shore marine resources. Her most recent research included studies of the effects of El Nino and La Nina events on the coastal ecosystem. Also socially active and committed to the marine environment, Mia Tegner helped to guide the City of San Diego in developing public policy based on science as it related to ocean pollution. Her work led the way in focusing the nation’s attention to the true impacts of human development on the health of our marine environment.

As we take the time to honor the work of Dr. Michael Mullin and Dr. Mia Tegner we must also reflect on their commitment to providing us with a better understanding of our world and our relationship with it. I am pleased to recognize and salute these great scientists as two of our nation’s outstanding citizens and noble public servants.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE RECEIVED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination.

(The nomination received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–355. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning the Unfinished Work of Building One America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–356. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the American Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–357. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report related to the Colorado River System Reservoirs for calendar year 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.
EC-358. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to trade and employment effects of the Andean Trade Preference Act for the calendar year 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-359. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report related to Russian nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-360. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Security Strategy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-361. A communication from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report related to Mevinphos; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-362. A communication from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report related to Phostebupirim; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-363. A communication from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report related to Profenofos; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-364. A communication from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report related to Propetamphos; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-365. A communication from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report related to Mevinphos; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-366. A communication from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report related to Mevinphos; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-367. A communication from the Acting Executive Director of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Extension of Time to File Annual Reports for Commodity Pools” received on January 10, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-368. A communication from the Acting Executive Director of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Infants and Children (NS-1) – Nondiscretionary Funding Modifications of P. L. 106-249” (RIN0584-A936) received on January 10, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-369. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Final rule—Up-Date 2000”; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-370. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pesticide Registration Notice” (RIN0569-AF43) received on January 4, 2001; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-371. A communication from the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Administration of the Forest Transportation System; Prohibitions; Use of Motor Vehicles Off Forest Service Roads” (RIN0596-AB67) received on January 10, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-372. A communication from the Administrator of the Price Support Division, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Farm Storage Facility Loan Program” (RIN0560-AG00) received on January 16, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-373. A communication from the Associate Chief for Natural Resources, Forest and Woodland Resources, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Special Areas; Roadless Area Conservation” (RIN0596-AB77) received on January 16, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-374. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “West Indian Fruit Fly” (Docket No. 00-119-1) received on January 17, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-375. A communication from the Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “7 CFR Part 1773, Policy on Audits of RUS Borrowers; Management Letter” (RIN0572-AB66) received on January 17, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-376. A communication from the Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “7 CFR Part 1773, Policy on Audits of RUS Borrowers; GAGAS Amendments” (RIN0572-AB62) received on January 17, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-377. A communication from the Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “7 CFR Part 1744, Post-Loan Policies and Procedures Common to Guaranteed and Insured Loans” (RIN0572-AB48) received on January 17, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-378. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Change in Disease Status of the Republic of South Africa Because of Foot-and-Mouth Disease” (Docket No. 00-122-1) received on January 23, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-379. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Final rule—Prompt Payment” (5 CFR 1315) received on December 19, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-380. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Policy, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Retirement Benefits Under Certain District of Columbia Retirement Plans” (31 CFR 29) received on January 4, 2001; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-381. A communication from the Acting Director of the Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Final rule—Up-Date 2000”; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-382. A communication from the Director of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report related to peacekeeping policy decision-making; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-383. A communication from the Special Counsel of Planning and Advice Division, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Technical Amendment: Change of Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of surplus real property for educational institutions; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-384. A communication from the Chief Operating Officer, Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the revised Annual Performance Plan for fiscal year 2001; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-385. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of surplus real property for educational institutions; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-386. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the revised Annual Performance Plan for fiscal year 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-387. A communication from the Chief Counsel for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board’s report under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-388. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report concerning internal controls and financial systems for fiscal year 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-389. A communication from the Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Electronic Purchasing and Payment Card Program—Report to Congress—Fiscal Year 2000”; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-390. A communication from the Chairmen of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the internal, accounting, and management control systems for fiscal year 2001; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-391. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Information—International Broadcasters” (22 CFR 42) received on January 5, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-392. A communicating from the Director of the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning loans and guarantees under the Arms Export Control Act as of September 30, 2000; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-393. A communication from the Acting Director of the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Final rule—Up-Date 2000”; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-394. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning the activities of the Trade and Development Agency
with respect to the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-396. A communication from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Waivers of Rights and Claims; Tender Back of Consideration” (RIN6004-AD8) received on January 5, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-397. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “State Vocational Rehabilitation Services Program (Extended Employment/Employment Outcome)” (RIN820-AB52) received on January 23, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-398. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on appropriations legislation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-399. A communication from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Sequestration Update Report for Fiscal Year 2003; referring jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975 as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committees on Appropriations; the Budget; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Armed Services; Bankruptcy, Housing, and Urban Affairs; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Finance; Foreign Relations; Governmental Affairs; the Judiciary; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Small Business; Veterans Affairs; Intelligence; Indian Affairs; and Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of committee was submitted:

By Mr. MURKOWSKI for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

Gale Ann Norton, of Colorado, to be Secretary of the Interior.

The above nomination was reported with the recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee’s commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WELLSTONE:

S. 161. A bill to establish the Violence Against Women Office within the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a business credit against income for the purchase of fishing safety equipment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. absence, Mrs. Feinberg, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. Torricelli):

S. 163. A bill to amend certain Federal civil rights statutes to prevent the involuntary confinement of individuals claiming to be mental patients that arise from unlawful employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. Cochran, and Mr. Rockefeller):

S. 164. A bill to improve teachers' use of technology through pre-service and in-service training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DORGAN:

S. 165. A bill to amend the Agriculture Market Transition Act to increase loan rates for marketing assistance loans for each of the 2001 and 2002 crops, to make nonrecourse marketing assistance loans and loan deficiency payments available to producers of dry peas, lentils, chickpeas, and rye, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. Sessions):

S. 166. A bill to limit access to body armor by violent felons and to facilitate the donation of Federal body armor to State and local law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. al-Lard, Mr. Brownback, Ms. Collins, Mr. Craig, Mr. Domenici, Mr. Hagel, Mr. Helms, Mrs. Hutchinson, Mr. Hutchison, Mr. Kyl, Mr. Lott, and Mr. Sessions)

S. 167. A bill to allow a State to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of all its students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself and Mr. Hagel):

S. 168. A bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Kazakhstan; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KYL (for himself, Mr. McCain, Mrs. Hutchison, Mr. Domenici, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Bingaman, and Mrs. Boxer):

S. 169. A bill to provide Federal reimbursement for indirect costs relating to the incarceration of illegal criminal aliens and for emergency health services furnished to undocumented aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. Hutchinson, Ms. Landrieu, Mr. Dorgan, Mr. Conrad, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McCain, Mr. Bingaman, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Shelby, Ms. Snowe, and Mr. Boxer):

S. 170. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay by reason of their years of military service and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. Baucus, and Mr. Dorgan):

S. 171. A bill to repeal certain travel provisions with respect to Cuba and certain trade sanctions with respect to Cuba, Iran, Libya, North Korea, and Sudan; for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
and effects of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. As a result of the office’s high profile work, the urgent issue of violence against women has come into much sharper public focus.

Making permanent the Violence Against Women Office in the Department of Justice is necessary to extend VAWA’s benefits to all corners of the country. The office has been the leader in promoting a multi-disciplinary, community-coordinated system responsive against women. Additionally, it has a specialized knowledge of the best practices in the field to ensure that the grant funds are well utilized. A statutory mandate would guarantee that the Violence Against Women Office will continue this specialized work in future Administrations, ensuring that Congress’ goals regarding domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking will be carried out with the same professional expertise that we have grown to appreciate over the past years.

This office is needed now more than ever. Violence against women continues to ravage our society. In my own state, 40 women were murdered by their partners in the year 2000 alone. This is more than any other year on record. Nationally, a woman is battered every 15 seconds and 25 percent of women surveyed reported rape or physical abuse by a current or former spouse, partner or dating partner.

The effects of these crimes extend far beyond the moment when they occur. One of the most compelling marks that violence against women leaves on our children is in the home. It is estimated that between 3 and 10 million children witness violence in the home each year, and much of this violence is persistent.

Studies indicate that children who witness their fathers beating their mothers suffer emotional problems, including slowed development and feelings of hopelessness, depression and anxiety. Many of these children exhibit more aggressive, anti-social, and fearful behaviors. Even one episode of violence can produce post-traumatic stress disorder in children. It is indisputable that even one incident of abuse inflicts a pain on our children that is unimaginable and often unenduring. It is also indisputable that domestic violence is devastating to the economic and physical well-being of their families. For example, a study reported on in the St. Paul Pioneer Press found that 57 percent of the women surveyed said they had been threatened to the point that they were afraid to go to school or work. Thirty percent were fired or left a job because of abuse. 22 percent of homeless people on any given night are women and children fleeing domestic abuse. 800,000 women per year seek medical care as a result of injuries sustained in a sexual or physical assault.

As this research indicates, violence against women permeates our society. It feeds on itself and it repeats itself generation after generation. People who try to keep family violence quiet and hidden behind the walls of the home ignore its tragic echoes in our schools, in the workplace and on the streets. The Federal Government must always play a role in combating this insidious epidemic. In the fight against domestic violence in their homes, we can continue to play in the fight against domestic violence, and I urge them to cosponsor this important measure.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a business credit against income for the purchase of fishing safety equipment; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Commercial Fishermen Safety Act of 2001, a bill to help fishermen purchase the life-saving safety equipment they need to survive in the face of disaster strikes. I am very pleased to be joined by my colleague from Massachusetts, Senator JOE KERRY, in introducing this legislation. Senator KERRY is a true friend of fishermen and, as ranking member of the Oceans and Fisheries Subcommittee, a supporter of the leadership of our fishers and maintain the proud fishing tradition that exists in his State and in mine. The release last summer of the movie “The Perfect Storm” provided millions of Americans with a glimpse of the challenges and the dangers associated with earning a living in the fishing industry. Based on a true story, this movie, while very compelling, merely scratches the surface of what it is like to be a modern-day fisherman.

Every year, thousands of commercial fishermen face disaster. The challenge of keeping alive and maintaining their vessels and equipment. Added to these challenges are the dangers associated with fishing where disaster can strike in conditions that are far less extreme than those depicted by the movie.

Year in and year out, commercial fishing is among our Nation’s most dangerous occupations. According to the National Marine Fisherman’s Safety Credit, 536 fishermen have lost their lives at sea since 1994. In fact, with an annual fatality rate of about 140 deaths per 100,000 workers, fishing is 30 times more dangerous than the average occupation.

The year 2000 will always be remembered in Maine’s fishing communities as a year marked by tragedy. The year began with the loss of the trawler Two Friends, 12 miles off the coast of York, ME, on January 25. Two of the three crew members died in icy waters after their vessel capsize in the seas. The year concluded with yet another tragedy, the loss of the scallop dragger Little Rapsy on December 14. Three fishermen died when the 30-foot vessel sank in Chandler Bay near Jonesport, ME. All told, nine commercial fishermen lost their lives off the coast of Maine last year. That exceeded the combined casualties of the 3 previous years.

The death of a 27-year-old fisherman just a few days ago in the Gulf of Maine adds to the grief endured by those in Maine’s small, close-knit fishing communities still trying to cope with the tragedies of the last year. As tragic as the year was, it could have been even worse. Heroic acts by the Coast Guard and other fishermen resulted in the rescue of 13 commercial fishermen off the coast of Maine in the year 2000. In most of these circumstances, the fishermen were returned to their loved ones and families because they had access to safety equipment that made all the difference between life and death.

Shawn Rich, the surviving crew member of the vessel Two Friends, was found wearing an immersion suit and clinging to the vessel’s emergency position indicating radio beacon, or EPIRB. That equipment is what made the difference for him and allowed him to be rescued. The EPIRB strobe light was spotted by a Coast Guard helicopter despite visibility that was less than a quarter of a mile. His immersion suit, which can extend survival to as many as 6 hours in the icy waters of the North Atlantic, saved the fisherman from water temperatures that would have resulted in death by hypothermia after less than 10 minutes of unprotected exposure.

Coast Guard regulations require all fishing vessels to carry safety equipment. These requirements vary depending on factors such as the size of the vessel, the temperature of the water, and the distance the boat is traveling from shore to fish. Required equipment can include a life raft that automatically inflates and floats free should the vessel sink; personal flotation devices, or immersion suits which can help protect fishermen from exposure, as well as EPIRBs, which relay a downed vessel’s position to the Coast Guard search and rescue personnel; visual distress signals; and fire extinguishers.

This equipment is absolutely critical to surviving an emergency at sea. Maggie Raymond of South Berwick, ME, the owner of the fishing vessel Olympia, put it well when she said:
It is just not possible to overstate the importance of the safety equipment. Along the coast of Maine, fishing communities continue to mourn the nine fishermen lost last year. At the same time, 13 fishermen were saved because they were able to get into a survival suit on time or to get into the life raft, or because they were found clinging to debris. Without this safety equipment, the casualty toll would have been much higher.

When an emergency arises, safety equipment is priceless. At all other times, however, the cost of purchasing or maintaining liferafts, immersion suits, and EPIRBs must compete with essential expenses such as loan payments, wages, fuel, maintenance, and insurance. Meeting all of these obligations is made more difficult by a regulatory framework that limits the amount of time a fisherman can spend at sea and gear alterations that are used to manage our marine resources.

Most of the fishermen whom I know are more than willing to do their part to sustain our marine resources. But the reality is that when fishermen are required to limit their catch, they are also limited in their ability to generate sufficient revenue to meet the costs associated with maintaining their vessels. The bill I am introducing today makes it clear that fishermen should not have to compromise their safety in order to make a living in their chosen occupation.

The Commercial Fishermen Safety Act of 2001 lends fisherman a helping hand in preparing in case disaster strikes. My legislation provides a tax credit equal to 75 percent of the amount paid by fishermen to purchase safety equipment, the casualty toll would have been much higher.

When an emergency arises, safety equipment is priceless. At all other times, however, the cost of purchasing or maintaining liferafts, immersion suits, and EPIRBs must compete with essential expenses such as loan payments, wages, fuel, maintenance, and insurance. Meeting all of these obligations is made more difficult by a regulatory framework that limits the amount of time a fisherman can spend at sea and gear alterations that are used to manage our marine resources.

Most of the fishermen whom I know are more than willing to do their part to sustain our marine resources. But the reality is that when fishermen are required to limit their catch, they are also limited in their ability to generate sufficient revenue to meet the costs associated with maintaining their vessels. The bill I am introducing today makes it clear that fishermen should not have to compromise their safety in order to make a living in their chosen occupation.

The Commercial Fishermen Safety Act of 2001 lends fisherman a helping hand in preparing in case disaster strikes. My legislation provides a tax credit equal to 75 percent of the amount paid by fishermen to purchase safety equipment, the casualty toll would have been much higher.

When an emergency arises, safety equipment is priceless. At all other times, however, the cost of purchasing or maintaining liferafts, immersion suits, and EPIRBs must compete with essential expenses such as loan payments, wages, fuel, maintenance, and insurance. Meeting all of these obligations is made more difficult by a regulatory framework that limits the amount of time a fisherman can spend at sea and gear alterations that are used to manage our marine resources.

Most of the fishermen whom I know are more than willing to do their part to sustain our marine resources. But the reality is that when fishermen are required to limit their catch, they are also limited in their ability to generate sufficient revenue to meet the costs associated with maintaining their vessels. The bill I am introducing today makes it clear that fishermen should not have to compromise their safety in order to make a living in their chosen occupation.
certain rights in order to “get in the front door.” As a nation which values work and deplores discrimination, we should not allow this practice to continue.

How then does the practice of mandatory, binding arbitration comport with the purpose and spirit of our nation’s civil rights and sexual harassment laws? The answer is simply that it does not. To address the growing incidents of compulsory arbitration, the Civil Rights Procedures Protection Act of 2001 amends seven civil rights statutes to guarantee that a federal civil rights or sexual harassment plaintiff can still seek the protection of the U.S. courts rather than be forced into mandatory, binding arbitration. Specifically, this legislation affects claims raised under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1965, Section 505 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 1977 of the Revised Statutes, the Equal Pay Act, the Family and Medical Leave Act and the Federal Arbitration Act, FAA. By amending the Federal Arbitration Act, the protections of this legislation are extended to claims of unlawful discrimination arising under State or local law and other Federal laws that prohibit job discrimination.

This bill is not anti-arbitration, anti-mediation, or anti-alternative dispute resolution. I have long been and will remain a strong supporter of voluntary, alternative methods of dispute resolution that allow the parties to choose whether to go to court. Rather, this bill targets only mandatory, binding arbitration clauses in employment contracts entered into by the employer and employee before a dispute has even arisen.

The 107th Congress marks the fifth successive Congress in which I have introduced this important legislation. In recent years, we have made some advances in addressing the unfair use of mandatory, binding arbitration clauses. As a result of a hearing in the Banking Committee in 1998 and a series of articles and editorials in prominent periodicals, the National Association of Securities Dealers, NASD, agreed to remove the mandatory binding arbitration clause from its Form U-4, which all prospective securities dealers sign as a condition of employment. The NASD’s decision to remove the binding arbitration clause, however, does not prohibit its constituent organizations from including a mandatory, binding arbitration clause in their own employment agreements, even if it is not mandated by the industry as a whole. Last spring, the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, chaired by my distinguished colleague from Iowa, Senator Grassley, held a hearing on contractual mandatory, binding arbitration and highlighted the problem in the employment context. We heard more positive developments, but the trend toward the use of mandatory, binding arbitration clauses continues. A legislative fix is needed.

The Civil Rights Procedures Protection Act restores the right of working men and women to pursue their claims in the venue that they choose, which, in turn, restores the spirit of our nation’s civil rights and sexual harassment laws. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 163
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Civil Rights Procedures Protection Act of 2001.”

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 USC 2000e et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

SEC. 719. EXCLUSIVITY OF POWERS AND PROCEDURES.

“Notwithstanding any Federal law (other than a Federal law that expressly refers to this title) that would otherwise modify any of the powers and procedures expressly applicable to such right or such claim unless after such right or such claim arises the claimant voluntarily enters into an agreement to enforce such right or resolve such claim through arbitration or another procedure.”

SEC. 3. AMENDMENT TO THE AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967.
The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesigning sections 16 and 17 as sections 17 and 18, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 15 the following new section:

SEC. 16. EXCLUSIVITY OF POWERS AND PROCEDURES.

“Notwithstanding any Federal law (other than a Federal law that expressly refers to this Act) that would otherwise modify any of the powers and procedures expressly applicable to a right or claim arising under this Act, such powers and procedures shall be the exclusive powers and procedures applicable to such right or such claim unless after such right or such claim arises the claimant voluntarily enters into an agreement to enforce such right or resolve such claim through arbitration or other procedure.”

Section 505 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 USC 794a) is amended by adding at the end—

(1) by redesignating section 405 as section 405(b); and

(2) by inserting after section 405(b) the following new section:

SEC. 405. EXCLUSIVITY OF REMEDIES.

“Notwithstanding any Federal law (other than a Federal law that expressly refers to this Act) that would otherwise modify any of the powers and procedures expressly applicable to a right or claim arising under this Act, such powers and procedures shall be the exclusive powers and procedures applicable to such right or such claim unless after such right or such claim arises the claimant voluntarily enters into an agreement to enforce such right or resolve such claim through arbitration or another procedure.”

SEC. 5. AMENDMENT TO THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990.
Section 107 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12117) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) Notwithstanding any Federal law (other than a Federal law that expressly refers to this Act) that would otherwise modify any of the powers and procedures expressly applicable to a right or claim based on a violation described in subsection (a), such powers and procedures shall be the exclusive powers and procedures applicable to such right or such claim unless after such right or such claim arises the claimant voluntarily enters into an agreement to enforce such right or resolve such claim through arbitration or another procedure.”

SEC. 6. AMENDMENT TO SECTION 1977 OF THE REVISED STATUTES.
Section 1977 of the Revised Statutes (24 U.S.C. 1981) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) Notwithstanding any Federal law (other than a Federal law that expressly refers to this section) that would otherwise modify any of the powers and procedures expressly applicable to a right or claim concerning making and enforcing a contract of employment under this section, such powers and procedures shall be the exclusive powers and procedures applicable to such right or such claim unless after such right or such claim arises the claimant voluntarily enters into an agreement to enforce such right or resolve such claim through arbitration or another procedure.”

SEC. 7. AMENDMENT TO THE EQUAL PAY REQUIREMENT UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938.
Section 206 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) Notwithstanding any Federal law (other than a Federal law that expressly refers to this Act) that would otherwise modify any of the powers and procedures expressly applicable to a right or claim arising under this subsection, such powers and procedures shall be the exclusive powers and procedures applicable to such right or such claim unless after such right or such claim arises the claimant voluntarily enters into an agreement to enforce such right or resolve such claim through arbitration or another procedure.”

SEC. 8. AMENDMENT TO THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT OF 1993.
Title IV of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2651 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesigning section 405 as section 405(b); and

(2) by inserting after section 404 the following new section:

SEC. 405. EXCLUSIVITY OF REMEDIES.

“Notwithstanding any Federal law (other than a Federal law that expressly refers to this Act) that would otherwise modify any of the powers and procedures expressly applicable to a right or claim arising under this Act, such powers and procedures shall be the exclusive powers and procedures applicable to such right or such claim unless after such right or such claim arises the claimant voluntarily enters into an agreement to enforce such right or resolve such claim through arbitration or another procedure.”

SEC. 9. AMENDMENT TO TITLE 9, UNITED STATES CODE.
Section 14 of title 9, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a)” before “This”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) This chapter shall not apply with respect to a claim of unlawful discrimination
By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 164. A bill to prepare tomorrow's teachers to use technology through pre-service and in-service training and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce a bill for consideration in the context of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Earlier this week, I introduced my accountability bill designed to ensure that the tax-week, I introduced my accountability

In order to ensure that our children are well-prepared to meet the challenges of an increasingly complex and challenging world, it is critical to address improving our Nation's schools with a comprehensive effort. The bills I have introduced have designed to build on the progress we have made in the past few years to raise standards and increase accountability in America's schools. This bill seeks to provide educators with the resources to meet these increased demands. I urge my colleagues to carefully consider supporting passage of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the Record.

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

S. 164

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Technology for Teachers Act 2001".

SEC. 2. LOCAL APPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL TECHNOLOGY RESOURCE GRANTS.

Section 3135 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6845) is amended—

(a) IN GENERAL.—before "Each local educational agency";

(b) in subsection (a) (as so redesignated) (A) in paragraph (1), by inserting "as subsections (b) and (c) respectively; and"

(c) in subsection (a) (as so redesignated) (B) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting a semicolon;

(d) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end of (4) ; and;

(e) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

"(5) demonstrate the manner in which the local educational agency will utilize at least 30 percent of the amounts provided to the agency under this subpart in each fiscal year to provide in-service teacher training, or that the agency is using at least 30 percent of its technology funding on in-service training for teachers with the skills to use technology in the classroom;"

SEC. 3. TEACHER PREPARATION.

Part A of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6811 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Subpart 5—Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers To Use Technology

SEC. 3141. PURPOSE, PROGRAM AUTHORITY.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this subpart to assist consortia of public and private entities in carrying out programs that prepare prospective teachers to use advanced technology to create learning environments conducive to preparing all students to achieve to challenging State and local content and student performance standards.

(b) PROGRAMS

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized, through the Office of Educational Technology, to award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements on a competitive basis to eligible applicants in order to assist them in developing or redesigning teacher preparation programs that enable prospective teachers to use technology effectively in their classrooms.

(2) PERIOD OF AWARD.—The Secretary may award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under this subpart for a period of not more than 5 years.

SEC. 3162. ELIGIBILITY.

(a) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—In order to receive an award under this subpart, an applicant shall be a consortium that includes—

(1) at least 1 institution of higher education that offers a baccalaureate degree and prepares teachers for their initial entry into teaching;

(2) at least 1 State educational agency or local educational agency; and

(3) 1 or more of the following entities:

(A) an institution of higher education (other than the institution described in paragraph (1));

(B) a school or department of education at an institution of higher education;

(C) a school or college of arts and sciences at an institution of higher education;

(D) a professional association, foundation, museum, library, for-profit business, public or private nonprofit organization, community-based organization with the capacity to contribute to the technology-related reform of teacher preparation programs.

(b) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—In order to receive an award under this subpart, an eligible applicant shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time and in such form as the Secretary may require. Such application shall include—

(1) a description of the proposed project, including how the project would ensure that individuals participating in the project would be prepared to use technology to create learning environments conducive to preparing all students, including girls and students who have economic and educational disadvantages, to achieve to challenging State and local content and student performance standards;

(2) a demonstration of—

(A) the commitment, including the financial commitment, of each of the members of the consortium; and

(B) the active support of the leadership of each member of the consortium for the proposed project;

(3) a description of how each member of the consortium would be included in project activities;

(4) a description of how the proposed project would be continued once the Federal funds awarded under this subpart end; and

(5) a plan for the evaluation of the program, which shall include benchmarks to measure progress toward specific project objectives.

(c) MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of any project funded under this subpart shall not exceed 50 percent. Except as provided in paragraph (2) of the non-Federal share of the project may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including services.

(2) ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT.—Not more than 10 percent of the funds awarded for a project under this subpart may be used to acquire equipment, networking capabilities, or infrastructure, and the non-Federal share of the cost of any such acquisition shall be in cash.

SEC. 3163. USE OF FUNDS.

(a) REQUIRED USES.—A recipient shall use funds under this subpart for—
(1) creating programs that enable prospective teachers to use advanced technology to create learning environments conducive to preparing all students, including girls and students with learning, physical and emotional disadvantages, to achieve to challenging State and local content and student performance standards; and
(2) evaluating the effectiveness of the project.
(b) PERMISSIBLE USES.—A recipient may use funds under this subpart for activities, described in its application, that carry out the purposes of this subpart, such as—
(1) developing and implementing high-quality teacher preparation programs that enable educators to—
(A) learn the full range of resources that can be accessed through the use of technology;
(B) integrate a variety of technologies into the classroom in order to expand students’ knowledge;
(C) evaluate educational technologies and their potential for use in instruction; and
(D) help students develop their own technical skills and digital learning environments;
(2) developing alternative teacher development paths that provide elementary schools and secondary schools with well-prepared and efficient educators;
(3) developing performance-based standards and aligned assessments to measure the capacity of prospective teachers to use technology effectively in their classrooms;
(4) providing technical assistance to other teacher preparation programs;
(5) developing and disseminating resources and information in order to assist institutions of higher education to prepare teachers to use technology effectively in their classrooms; and
(6) subject to section 3162(c)(2), acquiring equipment, networking capabilities, and infrastructure to carry out the project.
SEC. 3164. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.
“For purposes of carrying out this subpart, there is authorized to be appropriated $150,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.”

By Mr. DORGAN.
S. 165. A bill to amend the Agriculture Market Transition Act to increase loan rates for marketing assistance loans for each of the 2001 and 2002 crops, to make nonrecourse marketing assistance loans and loan deficiency payments available to producers of dry peas, lentils, chickpeas, and rye, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.
Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, today, I have come to the floor today to talk about farming. The pages of the calendar have now turned. It is a new year, but our family farmers face the same struggle, and in fact, in many ways, the struggle gets worse.
Mr. President, today, I am introducing legislation titled the FARM Equity Act of 2001 that is designed to equalize the presently disparate commodity Marketing Assistance Loan rates of the current farm bill, commonly referred to as Freedom to Farm. The Biodiesel Act increase all commodity loan rates up to soybeans and minor oilseed loan levels based on historical price ratios amongst the commodities. The FARM Equity Act would also treat all commodities equally in that it would place a price floor under all commodity loan rates, not just a select few.

The FARM Equity Act will leave soybeans at the current loan level—$5.26 per bushel. This price is about 85 percent of the Olympic Average of soybean market prices from the years 1994 to 1998. All other crops will be equalized up to the $5.26 per bushel related to each crops respective Olympic Average during the same time period. Equalized loan rates for wheat would be $3.14 per bushel, for corn—$2.09 per bushel, for rice—7.8 cents per pound and for cotton—52.6 cents per pound. All these loan levels would become minimum loan levels.

When Freedom to Farm was passed, supporters intended that this new farm legislation would remove all government restrictions on farm planting decisions. “Let farmers take their cues from the market place”, was heard often during the debate. “From now on, farmers will not plant their crops with an eye towards Washington—they will plant what the market tells them to plant.”

I doubt anyone believes, let alone supports, that we did that. I doubt anyone believes, let alone supports, that anyone wants to just be out there getting swarmed by the corn Projekt tells them to plant.

I don’t want to debate the point with a straight face, that this major premise of Freedom to Farm—the notion of market based planting decisions—has become a reality. To the contrary, at the present time, the major influence on what type of seed goes into the ground on our nation’s farms is the level of Market Assistance Loan rates available for the various program crops.

There can be no dispute that soybeans, and the other minor oilseed crops, have a much higher loan rate—when compared to historical price ratios—than wheat, corn and the other minor grain seeds, rice, and barley. Likewise, there can be no dispute that the unprecedented increase in soybeans and oilseeds acreage seen the last couple of years, is due in large part, to these arbitrage loan rates. Farmers have little choice but to plant more acres of oilseeds for the higher loan value, even thought the present loan values are seen the last couple of years, is due in large part, to these arbitrage loan rates. Farmers have little choice but to plant more acres of oilseeds for the higher loan value, even though the national average loan rates and foreign markets clearly signal for them to do otherwise.

Does anyone remember “Green Acres,” the old TV show from the sixties that poked fun of the city slicker— and country folks, for that matter— and the notion of market interference or influences from the farm sector? From Albert Wendell Douglas, we have the event that poked fun of the city slicker— and country folks, for that matter— and the notion of market interference or influences from the farm sector? From Albert Wendell Douglas, we have the event that poked fun of the city slicker— and country folks, for that matter. I can’t remember the exact order of events, but the gist of it was this. Oliver Wendell Douglas—played by Eddie Albert—listened to the market report while his wife, Lisa, was going to start spring planting. The price of corn was up, while soybean prices were down, so Oliver finished breakfast and away he went to the general store to buy some corn seed from Sam Drucker. Oliver then headed back to his farm to plant corn.

About noon, Oliver came home for dinner. Now I know to most this meal is lunch, but trust me, on the farm—it is called dinner; farmers also have a meal called supper that takes place in the evening. But, let’s get back to Oliver. While he was eating his dinner, the noon markets came on, and wouldn’t you know it, corn was down, and soybeans were up. When Oliver was all upset, since he had already planted some of the corn.

Lisa, Oliver’s wife, told him just exchange the seed for a different kind, “I always return what I buy back to the store; why can’t you do the same.” Oliver agreed with his wife, and went out and dug up the corn seed, put it back in the sack, and headed back to the supply store to trade it in for soybeans. Sam Drucker thought he was a nut, of course, and everyone had a good laugh.

Preposterous, of course this is a story of farmer indecision when the feed cutter is knocked out of the ground, but I mention this episode only because today, Oliver Wendell Douglas wouldn’t have his ear turned to the market reports to decide what to plant. He would simply seed soybeans because everyone knows that the loan price is the only price that matters these days.

In fact, one market advisor in the Midwest is promoting a “Plan B” this year that encourages farmers to plant even more soybeans than last years record acreage because of the high loan rates in hopes of decreasing corn acres enough to increase those prices. Probably not a bad idea, given the present market prices and high nitrogen costs. But, it’s a clear indication of how skewed the present loan levels actually are.

Just how much effect on U.S. corn acres are these unequal loan rates having? We need look no further than the annual acreage reports issued by USDA. In 1994, U.S. corn acres yielded a little over 61.6 million acres of soybeans. This year, a record 74.5 million acres were planted to soybeans, an increase of over 20 percent.

For all wheat, USDA tells us the complete opposite is taking place. The acreage planted in the U.S. has declined over 12 percent during this same period, from 70.3 million acres down to 62.5 acres. A few weeks ago, USDA reported that the winter wheat acreage season last fall was down 3 percent from the fall before. The 41.3 million acres planted for harvest this coming summer is the smallest acreage devoted to winter wheat since 1971.

To those who will say that we shouldn’t change the components of the present Farm Bill in mid-stream, I say, we have repeatedly changed it each of the last three years now. We have had three emergency spending bills due to the low commodity prices. We have changed payment limits on the LDP and, as we might add, equalizing loan rates will do more for medium sized family farms than uncapping LDP limits.
Former Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman also used his administrative authority to keep the loan levels at current levels. Just last month, he froze commodity loans at 2000 levels for the 2001 crop. Had he not, the loan for wheat would have fallen to $2.46 per bushel. Corn would have fallen to $1.76. Even soybeans would have fallen, although not to what the formula calls for. You see, soybeans have a price floor at $4.92 a bushel. If not for this mandated floor specified in the law, the formula in Freedom to Farm would have called for a price of $4.58 per bushel.

Now, I am pleased that the Secretary of Agriculture did this. I found it interesting that I received a few calls from angry farmers when the former Agriculture Secretary froze loan rates for the coming year at 2000 levels. They thought he should have raised them and had determined his actions were vindictive and meant only to keep commodity loans at these low levels. As I said in the opening, the former Secretary Glickman prevented present law from driving loan prices even further.

I don’t want to see anymore reductions in loan levels for any of our crops. I want all crops to be treated fairly. I want all crops to have the same relative level of price protection. And if one or two crops have a loan floor that prevents further erosion in loan protection, then all crops should enjoy such a loan floor. That is why I have introduced this legislation.

This is not to say that the loan levels in this legislation are adequate. They are not. This is only the first step in many that we need to take to fix broken farm policy. And this legislation will put all crops on equal footing as we enter the debate on what will eventually replace Freedom to Farm. I would prefer that loan levels would be higher, that they would reflect the cost of production. But later we can have some common sense farm policy that would do such a thing, but for now. I think this is the least that we should do, as far as loan rates are concerned.

Although it is not mentioned in this legislation, as part of this interim step to preserve our farms, I believe we should restore the automatic 20 percent reduction in Agricultural Market Transition Payments that will take place this year. It should be restored to the 2000 levels for the remaining two years of Freedom to Farm, or until we replace this legislation altogether. I know others are thinking this needs to be done, and I want to go on record as supporting this restoration of AMTA payments.

Before I close, I want to point out the steady erosion of the loan levels for most crops over the years. This year, 2001, if this legislation isn’t enacted, the national loan for wheat will stand at $2.58 per bushel. In 1983, the wheat loan was $3.65 per bushel. For corn, the present loan rate is $1.89. While in 1983 it was $2.65 per bushel. For rice, this year’s loan is $6.50 per cwt. In 1983, the rice loan was $8.13 per cwt. Cotton’s loan this year stands at 52.9 cents per lb. 1982 saw a cotton loan rate of a little over 57 cents per lb.

Now, I saved soybeans until last, for good reason. Of all the major crops, soybeans stand alone in that it has a higher loan rate today than in the early 1980’s. The soybean loan stood at $5.02 twenty years ago, while today, the loan is $5.26. All the other crops dropped, some more than others, percentage wise. All, except for soybeans. I want to point out that the cost of production has skyrocketed for all crops the past twenty years. This year alone, farmers are facing an astronomical increase in anhydrous ammonia prices—the major form of nitrogen fertilizer—due to the skyrocketing natural gas prices. As you may know, natural gas comprises 78 percent of anhydrous’ cost of production. Because of this, family farmers in North Dakota, and across the country, have faced the unpalatable decision of their nitrogen fertilizer costs, from the low $200’s per ton last year to well over $400 per ton this year.

The cost of fertilizer is just one of many examples where farm costs have increased. We have a cycle where their crop protection products, insurance costs, machinery costs, etc. The list goes on. No other segment of our economy has been asked to take less and less for their labors.

As I have stated earlier, this legislation, the FARM Equity Act of 2001, is only an interim step. It is not a new farm bill, nor is it the answer to the problems. But I believe we should take action now to equalize the loan rates. Let’s pass this legislation that would leave soybeans and other oilseeds at their present loan level while raising other crops up to the same relative level, based on historical market price relationships as soybeans. It is fair. It is equitable. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. President, we have families living all across this country out in the country trying to make a go of it on a family farm: Plant some seeds, raise a crop, then harvest that crop, take it to the grain elevator, and try to raise enough money to keep going and pay the bills.

In addition to having collapsed prices for that which they produce, farmers now see the cost of their inputs dramatically increasing. The cost of anhydrous ammonia, the most common form of nitrogen fertilizer, is up dramatically because of the spike in natural gas costs.

Farmers are beset in every direction: Monopolies in transportation, near monopolies in the grain trade business, and a collapse of the prices for that which farmers produce. It is an awfully difficult time.

So what can be done about this? My first hope would be that the Congress would rewrite the current farm bill. I do not think it works very well. I do not think we ought to get rid of all of it. The planting flexibility makes sense. Let’s keep it. But clearly the current farm bill has not worked very well. Let’s rewrite it and provide a price support or a bridge across price valleys for family farmers that give them some hope that if they do a good job, and work hard, they have a chance to succeed.

But I am told that rewriting the farm bill is not going to happen this year because it expires at the end of next year. I understand that the chairman of the Agriculture Committee in the Senate wants to hold hearings on trying to rewrite the farm bill this year. He certainly has the capability of blocking that. I respect him, but I would disagree with him about this issue. But it is likely we will not see progress in rewriting the farm bill this year.

So then, what should we do? In my judgment, we ought to at least take an interim step that would restore some balance to the current price protection programs. You can see what has happened. We ought to provide some balance and equality to that price protection with respect to those of us who come from the part of the country that produces mostly wheat and feed grains.

I am going to show you how the current price support, which is, in my judgment, too low, nonetheless has an inequity about it that offers a price support substantially higher for oil seeds than it does for wheat and feed grains. I am not here to say that that is fair. What we should do is that we take the price support for oil seeds down. I am suggesting that it is unfair to wheat and feed grains and we ought to bring their price support up to provide some equity and fairness. And there is a way to do that.

I would like to show a couple charts of what has been happening. This chart shows crop acres. You can see, going back to 1994, that soybean acreage is increasing and wheat acreage is declining substantially.

What is happening this year is, a number of farmers are making decisions about what to plant, and it has nothing to do with what the markets suggest they should plant. It has to do with what their lender would calculate is best for them to plant given the farm program price support loan levels of the various crops. The loan deficiency payment for oil seeds is much higher than for wheat and feed grains on a per ton basis. These levels that determine the loan deficiency payments are, likewise, much higher for oil seeds than the other crops. So the result is, they are making planting decisions, once again, based on the farm bill rather than on the market. It is because we have inequitable price support programs. You can see what has happened with the loan rates over time. With soybeans, loan rates have increased slightly over the last twenty years, while wheat, corn and other feed grains loan rates have declined substantially during the same time period.

My point is this. We ought to be able to provide equity in these loan rates by...
bringing the loan rate for wheat and feed grains up to an equitable level relative to oilseed levels. Doing so would, likewise, provide an equitable loan deficiency payment for all crops and would stop this calculation of, What should we plant next? It is unfair to what the farm program thinks I should plant?

As Freedom to Farm passed, its supporters were saying: Let’s have the market system send signals on what ought to be planted. That is not happening at this moment. It is the farm program that is determining what is being planted because of the skewed loan support prices. It is the farm program that is actually promoting that incentive to plant one thing versus another thing. I am not suggesting we fix it by reducing the loan rate or the loan deficiency payment for oilseeds. We ought not to do that. We ought to bring the loan rate for the others up because those levels are too low, when compared to the current market.

Some will remember the old television program “Green Acres” from long ago in the 1960s. Eddie Albert played a character named Oliver Wendell, and he had a big name in ‘Oncold. He was a city slicker who moved to the country. It was a television program that poked fun at both the city slicker and maybe also at country folks. It was a comedy.

In one episode, Oliver is having breakfast one morning. He is trying to figure out what to plant. He hears the morning grain market report on the radio, and the price of soybeans was going down and the price of corn was going up. Olivia, his wife, said not to go down to the general store and get himself some corn seed. All morning he planted corn. At noon, Oliver came in for dinner. Back home they call it dinner in the middle of the day; some people call it lunch, but we call it dinner. He came back for dinner and discovered on the radio that the price of corn was down and the price of soybeans was up, according to the noon market report. And to his wife: It is kind of hard to figure out what to do here. I just planted corn because the radio said corn was up. Now corn is down, soybeans are up.

His wife said: When I go to the store and get something that doesn’t work, I take it back.

So this old character on “Green Acres” went out to the field, walked down the furrows and pulled out all of his corn seeds and went back to the store to trade them in for soybean seed. Of course, the old boy who ran the store that sold him the seed thought he was pretty goofy.

My point about this story is, Oliver Douglas had to listen, under today’s circumstances, to the radio market reports to evaluate what he ought to plant, to find out what is down or what is up. In today’s circumstances, when you take a look at the farm program, what is up is a better loan rate for oilseeds, and what is down is an anemic loan rate for wheat and feed grains.

What can be done about that? Bring wheat and feed grain loan rates up to where they ought to be. That only brings wheat to $3.14 a bushel, but it is a far sight better than where it is today, at $2.58.

So today, I am introducing a piece of legislation that equalizes loan rates. It will not penalize oilseeds. It will leave them where they are. Good for them; I want that. I support that and will fight for that. But it will take the loan rate for other crops—wheat, corn, and rice, cotton, and put those loan rates where they ought to be relative to some equity vis-a-vis oilseeds.

I am going to include in the RECORD a list of all the program crops and where I propose we establish their loan rates. The loan rates for the various crops were determined by fixing them at the same percentage of their 1994–1998 5-year Olympic Average of market prices as the soybean loan rate is with respect to its 1994–98 Olympic Average of market prices.

This is only an interim step. We must do much more, and I have other ideas on what we ought to do. But for now, at least as a first step, let’s provide some fairness for those who are producing wheat and feed grains.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the Olympic Average price data to which I referred.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>1994–98 Olympic Average prices</th>
<th>Equalized loan rates</th>
<th>Equalized loan rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>$2.58</td>
<td>$3.14</td>
<td>$3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Sorghum (bus)</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley (bus)</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats (bus)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaxseed (lb)</td>
<td>0.0930</td>
<td>0.1259</td>
<td>0.1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safflower (lb)</td>
<td>0.0930</td>
<td>0.1487</td>
<td>0.1487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland Cotton (lb)</td>
<td>0.9852</td>
<td>0.9056</td>
<td>0.9056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice (cwt)</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>9.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybeans (bus)</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Sunflower (lb)</td>
<td>0.5192</td>
<td>0.6883</td>
<td>0.6883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoil Sunflower (lb)</td>
<td>0.5930</td>
<td>0.7207</td>
<td>0.7207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canola (lb)</td>
<td>0.9340</td>
<td>1.1176</td>
<td>1.1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapeseed (lb)</td>
<td>0.9196</td>
<td>1.0814</td>
<td>1.0814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safflower (lb)</td>
<td>0.8916</td>
<td>1.0487</td>
<td>1.0487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustard Seed (lb)</td>
<td>0.8916</td>
<td>1.0487</td>
<td>1.0487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Peas (bus)</td>
<td>0.9030</td>
<td>1.0370</td>
<td>1.0370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye (bus)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durum Seed (bus)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lentils (cwt)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickpeas (cwt)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. DORGAN. It is all about fairness and equity. Under the current program, even though all of the support prices are too low, wheat and feed grains are being treated unfairly and ought to be brought up to where they should be and we would have a right to expect them to be. I have included all of the significant numbers and support price proposals in the RECORD. I hope my colleagues will join me in seeing if we can at least take an interim step and pass this legislation.

Mr. President, 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:

**SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Family Agriculture Recovery and Market (FARM) Equity Act of 2001”.

**SEC. 2. LOAN RATES FOR MARKETING ASSISTANCE LOANS.**

Section 132 of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7223) is amended to read as follows:

"**SEC. 132. LOAN RATES FOR MARKETING ASSISTANCE LOANS.**"

(a) Wheat. The loan rate for a marketing assistance loan under section 131 for wheat shall be not less than—
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“(1) 85 percent of the simple average price received by producers of corn, as determined by the Secretary, during the marketing years for the immediately preceding 5 crops of corn, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest; or

“(2) $2.09 per bushel.

“(2) OTHER FEED GRAINS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the loan rate for a marketing assistance loan under section 131 for grain sorghum, barley, and oats, individually, shall be established at such level as the Secretary determines is fair and reasonable in relation to the rate at which loans are made available for corn, taking into consideration the feeding value of the commodity in relation to corn.

“(B) MINIMUM LOAN RATES.—The loan rate for a marketing assistance loan under section 131 for grain sorghum, barley, and oats, individually, shall be not less than—

“(i) 85 percent of the simple average price received by producers of grain sorghum, barley, and oats, respectively, as determined by the Secretary, during the marketing years for the immediately preceding 5 crops of grain sorghum, barley, and oats, respectively, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest; or

“(ii)(I) in the case of grain sorghum, $1.89 per bushel;

“(II) in the case of barley, $2.01 per bushel; and

“(III) in the case of oats, $1.27 per bushel.

“(c) UPLAND COTTON.—

“(1) LOAN RATE.—Subject to paragraph (2), the loan rate for a marketing assistance loan under section 131 for upland cotton shall be established by the Secretary at such loan rate, per pound, as will reflect for the base quality of upland cotton, as determined by the Secretary, at average locations in the United States, a rate that is not less than the lesser of—

“(A) 85 percent of the average price (weighted by market and month) of the base quality of cotton as quoted in the designated United States spot markets during 3 years of the 5-year period ending July 31 of the year preceding the year in which the crop is planted, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest; or

“(B) 90 percent of the average, for the 15-week period beginning July 1 of the year preceding the year in which the crop is planted, of the 5 lowest-priced growths of the growths quoted for Middling 1%-inch cotton C.I.F. Northern Europe (adjusted downward by the average difference, during the period April 15 through October 31 of the year preceding the year in which the crop is planted, between the average Northern European price quotation of that quality of cotton and the market price of the designated United States spot markets for the base quality of upland cotton), as determined by the Secretary.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—The loan rate for a marketing assistance loan for upland cotton shall not be less than $0.5826 per pound.

“(d) EXTRA LONG STAPLE COTTON.—The loan rate for a marketing assistance loan under section 131 for extra long staple cotton shall not be less than—

“(1) 85 percent of the simple average price received by producers of extra long staple cotton, as determined by the Secretary, during 3 years of the 5-year period ending July 31 of the year in which the crop is planted, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest; or

“(2) $0.8768 per pound.

“(e) RICE.—The loan rate for a marketing assistance loan under section 131 for rice shall be not less than—

“(1) 85 percent of the simple average price received by producers of rice, as determined by the Secretary, during 3 years of the 5-year period ending July 31 of the year in which the crop is planted, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest; or

“(2) $7.81 per hundredweight.

“(f) OILSEEDS.—

“(1) SOYBEANS.—The loan rate for a marketing assistance loan under section 131 for soybeans shall not be less than—

“(A) 85 percent of the simple average price received by producers of soybeans, as determined by the Secretary, during the marketing years for the immediately preceding 5 crops of soybeans, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest; or

“(B) $5.26 per bushel.

“(2) SUNFLOWER SEED, CANOLA, RAPESEED, SAFFLOWER, MUSTARD SEED, AND FLAXSEED.—The loan rate for a marketing assistance loan under section 131 for sunflower seed, canola, rapeseed, safflower, mustard seed, and flaxseed, individually, shall be not less than—

“(A) 85 percent of the simple average price received by producers of sunflower seed, canola, rapeseed, safflower, mustard seed, and flaxseed, as determined by the Secretary, during the marketing years for the immediately preceding 5 crops of sunflower seed, canola, rapeseed, safflower, mustard seed, and flaxseed, respectively, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest; or

“(B)(i) in the case of oil sunflower seed, $0.0953 per pound;

“(ii) in the case of nonoil sunflower seed, $0.1076 per pound; and

“(iii) in the case of canola, $0.0945 per pound;

“(iv) in the case of rapeseed, $0.1001 per pound;

“(v) in the case of safflower, $0.1259 per pound;

“(vi) in the case of mustard seed, $0.1176 per pound; and

“(vii) in the case of flaxseed, $0.0953 per pound.

“(2) OTHER OILSEEDS.—The loan rates for a marketing assistance loan under section 131 for other oilseeds shall be established at such level as the Secretary determines is fair and reasonable in relation to the loan rate available for soybeans, except that the rate for the oilseeds (other than cottonseed) shall not be less than the rate established for soybeans on a per-pound basis for the same crop.

SEC. 3. NONRECOURSE MARKETING ASSISTANCE LOANS AND LOAN DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS FOR DRY PEAS, LENTILS, CHICKPEAS, AND RYE.

(a) DEFINITION OF LOAN COMMODITY.—Section 10201(10) of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7202(10)) is amended by striking “and oilseed” and inserting “oilseed, dry peas, lentils, chickpeas, and rye”.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF NONRECOURSE LOANS.—Section 131(a) of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7234(a)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting after “each loan commodity” the following: “(other than dry peas, lentils, chickpeas, and rye) and each 2001 and 2002 crops of dry peas, lentils, chickpeas, and rye”.

(c) LOAN RATES.—Section 132 of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7234(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) DRY PEAS, LENTILS, CHICKPEAS, AND RYE.—The loan rate for a marketing assistance loan under section 131 for dry peas, lentils, chickpeas, and rye, individually, shall be not less than—

“(1) 85 percent of the simple average price received by producers of dry peas, lentils, chickpeas, and rye, respectively, as determined by the Secretary, during the marketing years for the immediately preceding 5 crops of dry peas, lentils, chickpeas, and rye, respectively, excluding the year in which the average price was the highest and the year in which the average price was the lowest; or

“(2) $7.00 per hundredweight.

“(B) in the case of lentils, $12.00 per hundredweight;

“(C) in the case of chickpeas, $15.00 per hundredweight; and

“(D) in the case of rye, $2.80 per bushel.”.

(d) REIMBURSEMENT OF LOANS.—Section 134(a) of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7234(c)(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(j)” and “(k)” and inserting “(j), (k), (l), and (m)”;

(2) by striking and inserting “(n)”;

(3) by striking “(o)” and inserting “(o), (p), and (q)”;

(4) by striking “(r)” and inserting “(r), (s), and (t)”;

(5) by striking “(u)” and inserting “(u), (v), and (w)”;

(6) by striking “(x)” and inserting “(x), (y), and (z)”;

(e) PAYMENT LIMITATION.—Section 1001(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1906(b)(2)) is amended by striking “contract commodities and oilseeds” and inserting “contract commodities, oilseeds, dry peas, lentils, chickpeas, and rye”.

SEC. 4. APPLICABILITY.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall apply to each of the 2001 and 2002 crops of a loan commodity (as defined in section 102 of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7232) (as amended by section 3(a))).

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 168. A bill to limit access to body armor by violent felons and to facilitate the donation of Federal surplus body armor to State and local law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased today, along with Senator Sessions of Alabama, to reintroduce the James Gueff Body Armor Act for the fourth consecutive Congress.

This bill closes a glaring gap in our criminal law that permits individuals with even the grimmest history of criminal violence to use body armor. It is unquestionable that criminals with violent intentions are more dangerous when they are wearing body armor, and are more difficult for police to disarm and disable.

This bill is named in memory of San Francisco Police Officer James Gueff. On November 13, 1994, Officer Gueff was shot to death in a fire-fight by a
heavily armed gunman wearing a bullet-proof vest and kevlar helmet on a major street corner in San Francisco. Because of his protective gear, the assailant was subsequently able to hold off over a hundred police officers.

California is not the only state where heavily armed criminals have assaulted police officers and the community.

In 1999, Officer James Snedigar of the Chandler, Arizona Police department was shot and killed by a gunman firing an AK-47 who was also protected by a kevlar vest.

In March of 2000, Deputy Ricky Kinchen of Atlanta, Georgia, was killed in a shootout with a gunman who wore a bulletproof vest.

On July 15, 2000, Sergeant Todd Stamper of the Crandon, Wisconsin Police department, was killed in a gun fight by a heavily armed man wearing a kevlar helmet and body armor.

Lee Guelff, James Guelff’s brother, wrote to me about the need to remind the public relating to body armor. His words eloquently explain the need for the legislation:

It’s bad enough when officers have to face gunmen in possession of superior firepower. But to have to confront suspects shielded by equal or better defensive protection as well goes beyond the bounds of acceptable risk for officers and citizens alike. No officer should have to face the same set of deadly circumstances again.

Our laws need to recognize that body armor in the possession of a criminal is an offensive weapon. Police officers serving on the streets should have ready access to body armor, and hardened criminals need to be deterred from using it.

The James Guelff Body Armor Act of 2001 has three key provisions. First, it directs the United States Sentencing Commission to develop a penalty enhancement for criminals who commit violent crimes while wearing body armor. Second, it prohibits violent felons from purchasing, using, or possessing body armor. Third, this bill enables Federal law enforcement agencies to directly donate surplus body armor to local police departments.

Far too many local police officers do not have access to bullet-proof vests. The United States Department of Justice estimates that 25% of State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers, approximately 150,000 officers, are not issued body armor.

Supplying local police officers with more body armor will save lives. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, greater than 30% of the approximately 1,300 officers killed by guns in the line of duty since 1980 could have been saved by body armor, and the risk of dying from gunfire is 14 times higher for an officer without a bulletproof vest. Body armor saves an estimated 150 police officers’ lives each year.

The James Guelff Body Armor Act is backed by law enforcement officers all across America. Organizations representing over 500,000 police officers have endorsed the legislation. These organizations include the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriff’s Association, the National Association of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the National Police Officers Coalition, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Police Executive Research Forum, the National Association of Police Organizations, and the International Association of Police Chiefs.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact this legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, in sponsoring the James Guelff Body Armor Act of 2001.

This legislation is intended to deter criminals from wearing body armor and to empower Federal law enforcement agencies to donate surplus body armor to State and local police departments.

This bipartisan legislation is named in honor of James Guelff, a California police officer who was murdered in the line of duty by an assailant wearing body armor and a bulletproof helmet.

As a Federal prosecutor for fifteen years, I developed a deep appreciation for the threats that our law enforcement officers face day to day as they wage the war on crime. In my home State of Alabama, Etowah County Officer Chris McCurley was murdered and Officer Gary Entviken was critically injured in 1997 during a shootout with criminals shielded by body armor. This bill will make criminals like these pay an extra price for using body armor while harming innocent, law-abiding people.

The James Guelff Body Armor Act addresses the abuse of body armor in three ways:

First, the bill directs the United States Sentencing Commission to amend the Sentencing Guidelines to include an enhancement for the use of body armor during a violent crime or a drug crime. Thus, criminals who use body armor while attacking law enforcement officers or civilians will spend longer terms in prison.

Second, the bill prohibits a person with a criminal record from wearing body armor while engaged in violent crimes.

This bill will make criminals like these pay an extra price for using body armor while harming innocent, law-abiding people.

The James Guelff Body Armor Act of 2001 also empowers Federal agencies to expedite the donation of body armor to local police departments.

In a survey of American voters in 1999, the National Association of Police Organizations, 83 percent supported passing laws to keep felons from wearing body armor during the commission of crimes. This is why a broad bipartisan group of law enforcement organizations support this bill including: the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, the National Police Officers Coalition, the International Association of Police Organizations, and the National Sheriffs Association.

Last year, a very similar bill passed the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously. It passed the entire Senate unanimously. It is time for Congress to act and to protect our law enforcement officers.

I call on my colleagues in the Senate, including Senator FEINSTEIN, to join me, and the law enforcement community in supporting this important legislation that will save lives and provide
law enforcement officers with more protection in their fight against the most violent criminals.

By Mr. Frist (for himself, Mr. Aldrich, Mr. Brownback, Mr. Collins, Mr. Craig, Mr. Domenici, Mr. Hagel, Mr. Helms, Mrs. Hutchinson, Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Kyl, Mr. Lott, and Mr. Sessions):

S. 167. A bill to allow a State to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of all its students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. Frist. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Academic Achievement for All Act. I am honored to introduce this legislation.

We begin this 107th Congress with the great opportunity to dramatically shape and change the federal government’s role in education. Never before have the American people been so focused on the education system. With that focus comes great expectations. As a Congress, we must seize this opportunity and work together to creatively determine how the federal government addresses education within our country.

We must continue the push to cut red tape and remove overly-prescriptive federal mandates on federal education funding. At the same time, we must hold states and local schools accountable for increasing student achievement. Flexibility combined with accountability, must be our objective. The end result of our reform effort must spark innovation—invention designed to provide all students a world-class education.

As the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee Task Force on Education, I heard from almost every witness, both Democrats and Republicans alike, how the sprawling, duplicative and unfocused behemoth that is the current federal education establishment ties the hands of state and local school administrators, teachers and principals with its burdensome regulations and rigidity. As a result, the very principles with its burdensome regulations and rigidity. As a result, the very

In light of the continuing proliferation of federal categorical programs, the Task Force recommends that federal education programs be consolidated... The Task Force particularly favors providing states flexibility to consolidate all federal funds into an integrated state strategic plan to achieve national educational objectives for which the states would be accountable.

In hopes of improving federal regulation of education as we currently know it, Senators Gorton, Gregg, Hutchinson, Sessions and I worked last year to create this bill. We decided to combine all of our good ideas into Straight A’s, not to restrict states to having the option of submitting a performance agreement, setting specific and measurable performance goals that could be reached at the end of five years, in exchange for flexibility.

Straight A’s is an optional program. States would still be free to administer federal education programs under the current system if they so desired. If states choose to participate in the program, they would be allowed to combine Federal K-12 funds in exchange for flexibility upon approval of their performance agreement. States can focus more funds on disadvantaged students, teacher professional development, reducing class size, technology, or improved school facilities. At the end of five years, however, the state’s efforts must increase the achievement of all students, including the lowest performing students.

If states do not substantially meet those goals, they would lose their Straight A’s status, and they would have to return to the less flexible regulated approach available under current law. If states do well and significantly outperform higher performing parent school districts, low and performing students, they will be rewarded with additional funds. Additionally, school districts would not lose any Title I funding. If Title I is included by a state, each school district in the state would receive at least as much money as they received in the preceding fiscal year.

States and local school districts are innovative. Without question, it is states and localities that today are serving as the engines for change in education. The groundwork for success is already in place at the local level—teachers, parents, principals, and communities demonstrate on a daily basis the enthusiasm and desire to succeed. However, flexibility at the state and local level is critical to the success of our schools.

Although the federal government is prepared to assist in improving America’s schools, it is worth remembering the limitations of the federal role in education. The federal government provides just 7 percent of education funding. The federal government can provide the resources to increase the collective energy of all Americans, and it can commit resources to the states to supplement their efforts.

But along with the resources, the federal government must also give states and localities the freedom to pursue their own strategies for implementation. With respect to education, tactics and implementation procedures are virtually dictated by the federal government. The rationale for expanding an already overly large and burdensome federal education establishment is simply not discernible. Instead, the states should have the flexibility to put together state strategic plans. Under such a system, states would establish concrete educational goals and timetables for achievement. In return, they would be allowed to pool federal funds from categorical programs and spend these consolidated resources on state established priorities.

But, along with flexibility comes accountability. When we give states and local education agencies the freedom to use federal funds in the way that best meets the needs of their students, we must expect from them increased student performance. For too long accountability has been measured by quantitative measures rather than qualitative ones. We know that you are spending $8 billion on Title I, the nation’s largest federal education program—to help disadvantaged children. But we do not know if that money is helping those students to learn. This must change.

Our current system simply requires that you send the money to poor schools. I believe that there is no better catalyst for reform, no better way to ensure that poor children receive the same quality of education as their wealthier counterparts—than requiring that states demonstrate that their poor children are achieving.

The flexibility is needed to allow states to use whatever means necessary to increase poor students’ expectations. Our current system is not producing the results we need. Unfortunately, after 34 years and $120 billion spent on Title I, 70 percent of children in high poverty schools score below even the most basic level of reading. In math, 4th graders in high poverty schools remain 2 grade levels behind their peers in low poverty schools. In reading, they remain 3 to 4 grade levels behind.

As a scientist, I know the value of looking for new way to solve problems, and America has long had a proud tradition of innovation. This bill will create a whole new generation of inventors in the field of education—in particular, Governors, local school boards, teachers, and parents will be better able to put good ideas into practice.

If this Congress passes this important piece of legislation.

Mr. President, 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. 167

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Academic Achievement for All Act” or “Straight A’s Act.”

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to create options for States and communities—

(1) to improve the academic achievement of all students, and to fund their teacher education programs of the Federal Government upon such achievement;

(2) to improve teacher quality and subject mastery, especially in mathematics and science, and reading, and science;

(3) to empower parents and schools to effectively address the needs of their children and students;

(4) to give States and communities maximum freedom in determining how to boost
cations programs;

(6) to hold States and communities accountable for boosting the academic achievement of all students, especially disadvantaged, low-achieving students;

(7) to narrow achievement gaps between the lowest and highest performing groups of students so that no child is left behind.

SEC. 2. PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—States may, at their option, execute a performance agreement with the Secretary under which the provisions of law described in section 4(a) shall apply to the State effective upon receipt of the performance agreement unless the Secretary, before the expiration of the 60-day period, provides a written determination to the State that the performance agreement fails to satisfy the requirements of this Act.

(b) LOCAL INPUT.—States shall provide parents, teachers, and local schools and school districts notice and opportunity to comment on any proposed performance agreement prior to submission to the Secretary as provided under general State law notice and comment provisions.

(c) APPROVAL OF PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT.—A performance agreement submitted to the Secretary under this section shall be considered as approved by the Secretary within 60 days of receipt of the performance agreement unless the Secretary, before the expiration of the 60-day period, provides a written determination to the State that the performance agreement fails to satisfy the requirements of this Act.

(d) TERMS OF PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT.—Each performance agreement executed pursuant to this Act shall comply with the following provisions:

(1) TERM.—The performance agreement shall contain a statement that the term of the performance agreement shall be 5 years.

(2) APPLICATION OF PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—The performance agreement shall contain a statement that no program requirements of any program included by the State in the performance agreement shall apply, except as otherwise provided in this Act.

(3) LIST OF PROGRAMS.—The performance agreement shall provide a list of the programs that the State wishes to include in the performance agreement.

(4) USE OF FUNDS TO IMPROVE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.—The performance agreement shall contain a 5-year plan describing how the State intends to use the funds from programs included in the performance agreement to advance the education priorities of the State, improve student achievement, and narrow achievement gaps between students.

(5) ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS.—If the State includes any of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) in the State's performance agreement, the performance agreement shall include a certification that the State:

(A) (i) developed and implemented the challenging State student performance standards, challenging State student performance standards, and aligned indicators described in section 1111(b) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)); or

(ii) developed and implemented a system to measure the degree of change from one school year to the next in student performance;

(B) developed and is implementing a statewide accountability system that has or is reasonably expected to be effective in substantially increasing the numbers and percentages of all students who meet the State’s proficient and advanced levels of performance for the academic year; and

(C) established a system under which assessment information may be disaggregated within each State, local educational agency, and school by each major racial and ethnic group, gender, English proficiency status, migrant status, and by economically disadvantaged students as compared to students who are not economically disadvantaged (except that such disaggregation shall not be required in cases in which the number of students in any such group is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or will reveal the identity of an individual student);

(D) established specific, measurable, numerical performance objectives for student achievement, including a definition of performance considered to be proficient by the State on the academic assessment instruments described in subparagraph (A); and

(E) developed and implemented a statewide system for holding its local educational agencies and schools accountable for student performance that includes—

(i) a procedure for identifying local educational agencies and schools for improvement, using the assessments described in subparagraph (A);

(ii) assisting and building capacity in local educational agencies and schools identified for improvement to improve teaching and learning; and

(iii) implementing corrective actions after not more than 3 years if the assistance and capacity building under clause (ii) is not effective.

(F) PERFORMANCE GOALS.—

(1) STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT.—Each State that includes part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) in its performance agreement shall establish annual student performance goals for the 5-year term of the performance agreement that, at a minimum—

(i) establish a single high standard of performance for all students;

(ii) take into account the progress of students from every local educational agency and school in the State;

(iii) are based primarily upon the State’s challenging content and student performance standards and assessments described in accordance with paragraph (5);

(iv) include specific annual improvement goals in each subject and grade included in the State’s accountability system that shall include, at a minimum, reading or language arts and mathematics;

(v) exclude any proportions of students at levels of performance (as defined by the State) with the proportions of students at the levels in the same grade in the previous school year;

(vi) include annual numerical goals for improving the performance of each group specified in paragraph (5)(C) and narrowing gaps in performance for all students and lowest performing students in accordance with section 10(b); and

(vii) require all students in the State to make substantial gains in achievement.

(B) ADDITIONAL INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.—A State may identify in the performance agreement any additional indicators of performance such as graduation, dropout, or attendance rates.

(C) CONSISTENCY OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—A State shall maintain, at a minimum, the same level of challenging State student performance standards and assessments throughout the term of the performance agreement.

(G) PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.—The performance agreement shall contain an assurance that the State will use fiscal control and fund accounting procedures that will ensure that not more than 3 years after receipt of Federal funds paid to the State under this Act.

(H) CIVIL RIGHTS.—The performance agreement shall contain an assurance that the State will meet the requirements of applicable Federal civil rights laws.

(I) PRIVATE SCHOOL PARTICIPATION.—The performance agreement shall contain assurances that—

(A) that the State will provide for the equitable participation of students and professional staff in private schools.

(B) that sections 10104, 10105, and 10106 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6004-6006) shall apply to all services and assistance provided under this Act in the same manner as such sections apply to services and assistance provided in accordance with section 10103 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6003).

(10) STATE FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION.—The performance agreement shall contain an assurance that the State will not reduce the level of spending of State funds for elementary and secondary education during the term of the performance agreement.

(11) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The performance agreement shall contain an assurance that the State will, not later than 1 year after the execution of the performance agreement, and annually thereafter, each State shall disseminate with parents and the general public, submit to the Secretary, distribute to print and broadcast media, and post on the Internet, a report that includes—

(A) summary of student academic performance data, disaggregated as provided in paragraph (5)(C); and

(B) a detailed description of how the State has used Federal funds to improve student academic performance and reduce achievement gaps to meet the terms of the performance agreement.

(e) SPECIAL RULES.—If a State does not include part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) in its performance agreement, the State shall—

(1) certify that the State developed a system to measure the academic performance of all students; and

(2) establish challenging academic performance goals for such other programs in accordance with paragraph (6)(A) of subsection (d), except that clause (vi) of such paragraph shall not apply to such performance agreement.

(f) AMENDMENT TO PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT.—A State may submit an amendment to the performance agreement to the Secretary under the following circumstances:

(1) REDUCTION IN SCOPE OF PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the execution of the performance agreement, a State may amend the performance agreement through a request to withdraw a program from such agreement. If the Secretary approves the amendment, the requirements of existing law shall apply for any program withdrawn from the performance agreement.

(2) EXPANSION OF SCOPE OF PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the execution of the performance agreement, a State may amend its performance agreement to include additional programs and performance indicators for which the State will be held accountable.

(3) APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT.—An amendment submitted to the Secretary under this subsection shall be considered as approved by the Secretary within 60 days after receipt of the amendment unless the Secretary provides written notice to the State that the amendment will not be approved.
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by the amendment, will fail to satisfy the re-

requirements of this Act.

SEC. 4. ELIGIBLE PROGRAMS.

(a) ELIGIBLE PROGRAMS.—The provisions of law referred to in section 3(a) except as other-

wise provided in subsection (b), are as fol-

lows:

(1) Part A of title I of the Elementary and Sec-

ondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.).

(2) Part B of title I of the Elementary and Sec-

ondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6316 et seq.).

(3) Part C of title I of the Elementary and Sec-

ondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6317 et seq.).

(4) Part D of title I of the Elementary and Sec-

ondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6421 et seq.).

(5) Section 1302 of part E of title I of the Ele-


(6) Part B of title II of the Elementary and Sec-

ondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6641 et seq.).

(7) Section 3132 of the Elementary and Sec-


(8) Title IV of the Elementary and Sec-

ondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.).

(9) Title VI of the Elementary and Sec-

ondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.).

(10) Part C of title VII of the Elementary and Sec-

ondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7541 et seq.).

(11) Section 279 of the Department of Edu-


(b) LOCAL HOLD HARMLESS OF PART A TITLE I FUNDS.

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a State that

includes part A of title I of the Elementary and

Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) in the performance agree-

ment, the agreement shall provide an assur-

ance that local educational agencies shall re-

ceive the same amount as they had before the

fiscal year in which the performance agree-

ment was made. If the Secretary determines that

such an agreement is in the public interest,

such an agreement may be included in the per-

cformance agreement.

(b) CONDITIONS OF PERFORMANCE REWARD.

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a State chooses not to

submit a performance agreement under this sec-

tion, the performance agreement for such a State

shall be made, at the local educational agency's option, to submit to the Secretary

a performance agreement in accordance with this section.

(2) AGREEMENT.—The terms of a perform-

ance agreement between an eligible local educational agency and the Secretary shall

include part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) to

such agency for the preceding fiscal year, the State shall reduce the amount each local educational agency receives by a uniform percentage.

SEC. 6. LOCAL PARTICIPATION.

(a) NONPARTICIPATING STATE.

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a State does not partici-

pate in the performance agreement, the Secretary shall, after notice and opportunity for a hear-

ing, terminate the performance agreement and the State shall be required to comply with

the program requirements at the time of termination, for each program included in the

performance agreement.

(b) PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO IMPROVE STU-

DENT PERFORMANCE.—If a State fails to make no progress toward achieving its performance

goals by the end of the term of the agree-

ment, the Secretary may reduce funds for the

 titular program included in the performance agreement by up to 50 percent for each year of the 2-year period following the end of the term of the performance agreement.

SEC. 7. RENEWAL OF PERFORMANCE Agree-

MENT.

(a) NOTIFICATION.—A State that wishes to

renovate its performance agreement shall noti-

fy the Secretary of its renewal request not less than 6 months prior to the end of the

term of the performance agreement.

(b) RENEWAL REQUIREMENTS.—A State that has met or has substantially met its per-

formance goals submitted in the perform-

ance agreement at the end of the 5-year term may apply to the Secretary to renew its per-

formance agreement for an additional 5-year period. Upon the completion of the 5-year term of the perform-

ance agreement or as soon thereafter as the State submits data re-

quired under the agreement, the Secretary shall review, for an additional 5-year term, the performance agreement of any State that has met or has substantially met its performance goals.

SEC. 8. PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND PENALTIES.

(a) MID-TERM PERFORMANCE REVIEW.—If, during the 5-year term of the performance agree-

ment, student achievement significantly declines for 3 consecutive years in the area of

performance goals met in the performance agreement, the Secretary may, after notice and opportunity for a hear-

ing, terminate the agreement.

(b) FAILURE TO MEET PERFORMANCE GOALS.

If, at the end of the 5-year term of the performance agreement, a State has not substantially met the performance goals submitted in the performance agreement, the Secretary shall, after notice and an opportunity for a hear-

ing, terminate the performance agreement and the State shall be required to comply with

the program requirements at the time of termination, for each program included in the

performance agreement.

(c) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—A local educational agency participating in this Act

shall be construed to supersede or modify

more than 4 percent of the total amount of funds allocated to such agency under the programs included in the performance agreement.

SEC. 9. RENEWAL OF PERFORMANCE Agree-

MENT.

(a) NOTIFICATION.—A State that wishes to

renovate its performance agreement shall noti-

fy the Secretary of its renewal request not less than 6 months prior to the end of the

term of the performance agreement.

(b) RENEWAL REQUIREMENTS.—A State that has met or has substantially met its per-

formance goals submitted in the perform-

ance agreement at the end of the 5-year term may apply to the Secretary to renew its per-

formance agreement for an additional 5-year period. Upon the completion of the 5-year term of the perform-

ance agreement or as soon thereafter as the State submits data re-

quired under the agreement, the Secretary shall review, for an additional 5-year term, the performance agreement of any State that has met or has substantially met its performance goals.

SEC. 10. ACHIEVEMENT GAP REDUCTION RE-

WARDS.

(a) CLOSING THE GAP REWARD FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To reward States that make significant progress in eliminating achievement gaps by raising the achieve-

ment levels of the lowest performing students, the Secretary shall set aside sufficient funds in the Fund for the Improvement of Education under part A of title X of the Ele-

mentary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8001 et seq.) to grant a reward to States that meet the conditions set forth in subsection (b) by the end of their 5-year performance agreement.

(2) REWARD AMOUNT.—The amount of the reward referred to in paragraph (1) shall be not less than 5 percent of funds allocated to the State during the first year of the per-

formance agreement for programs included in the performance agreement.

(b) CONDITIONS OF PERFORMANCE REWARD.—

Subject to paragraph (3), a State is eligible to receive a reward under this section as fol-

lowing:

(1) A State is eligible for such an award if the State reduces by not less than 25 percent,
over the 5-year term of the performance agreement, the difference between the percentage of highest and lowest performing groups of students described in section 3(d)(5)(C) that meet the State’s proficient level of performance.

(2) A State is eligible for such an award if a State increases the proportion of 2 or more groups that meet the State’s proficient level of performance by 5 percentage points or more over the 5-year term of the performance agreement.

(3) A State shall receive such an award if the following requirements are met:

(A) CONTENT AREAS.—The reduction in the achievement gap or improvement in achievement shall include not less than 2 content areas, 1 of which shall be mathematics or reading.

(B) GRADING TEST.—The reduction in the achievement gap or improvement in achievement shall occur in at least 2 grade levels.

(SEC. 11. STRAIGHT A’S PERFORMANCE REPORT. The Secretary shall make the annual State report required under section 3(d)(11) available to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate not later than 90 days after the Secretary receives the report.

(SEC. 12. APPLICABILITY OF TITLE X. To the extent that the provisions of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8001 et seq.) are inconsistent with this Act, this Act shall be construed as superseding such provisions.

(SEC. 13. APPLICABILITY OF GENERAL EDUCATION PROVISIONS ACT. To the extent that the provisions of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.) are inconsistent with this Act, this Act shall be construed as superseding such provisions, except where relating to civil rights, withholding of funds and enforcement authority, and family educational and privacy right.

(SEC. 14. APPLICABILITY TO HOME SCHOOLS. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect home schools regardless of whether a home school is treated as a private school or home school under State law.

(SEC. 15. GENERAL PROVISIONS REGARDING NON-RECIPIENT, NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to permit, allow, encourage, or authorize any Federal control over any aspect of any private, religious, or home school, regardless of whether a home school is treated as a private school or home school under State law.

(SEC. 16. DEFINITIONS. In this Act:

(1) ALL STUDENTS.—The term “all students” means all students attending public schools or charter schools that are participating in the State’s accountability and assessment system.

(2) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term “local educational agency” has the same meaning given such term in section 1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8901).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Education.

(4) STATE.—The term “State” means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa.

(SEC. 17. EFFECTIVE DATE. This Act shall take effect with respect to funds appropriated for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 2001.

Mr. MURkowski. Mr. President, today I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from Tennesee, Senator Frist, in introducing the Academic Achievement for All Act known as Straight A’s.

Our education system is in need of serious reform. Thirty-five years ago, Congress enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Today, over $120 billion has been spent on Title I—the program that is the cornerstone of the federal investment in K through 12 education for disadvantaged children. However, only 13 percent of low-income 4th graders score at or above the “proficient” level on national reading tests, and one-third of all incoming college freshman must enroll in remedial reading, writing, or mathematics classes before taking regular courses. Even worse, no progress has been made in achieving the program’s fundamental goal, narrowing the achievement gap between low-income and upper-income students.

More fundamentally, the Federal role in education has been at best irrelevant in some states, and a serious barrier to reform in States that are far ahead of the curve in implementing serious reforms. It is time that parents, teachers, principals, and school board members decide what is best for our children. It is important that we return to our States and local communities the right to set priorities that reflect the unique needs of their students. The Straight A’s Act offers such an option. It leaves the basic construct of Federal education programs intact, but offers some states the opportunity to experiment. Straight A’s would allow states or school districts to spend their share of Federal dollars on reforms of their choice in exchange for the achievement gap.

More fundamentally, the Federal role in education has been at best irrelevant in some states, and a serious barrier to reform in States that are far ahead of the curve in implementing serious reforms. It is time that parents, teachers, principals, and school board members decide what is best for our children. It is important that we return to our States and local communities the right to set priorities that reflect the unique needs of their students. The Straight A’s Act offers such an option. It leaves the basic construct of Federal education programs intact, but offers some states the opportunity to experiment. Straight A’s would allow states or school districts to spend their share of Federal dollars on reforms of their choice in exchange for the achievement gap.

By Mr. KYL (for himself, Mr. McCaIN, Mrs. HutchiSON, Mr. DOMENICI, Mrs. FeINSTEIN, Mr. BingAman, and Mrs. Boxer).

S. 169. A bill to provide Federal reimbursement for indirect costs relating to the incarceration of illegal criminal aliens and for emergency health services furnished to undocumented aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce the Straight Criminal Alien Assistance Program II and Local Medical Emergency Reimbursement Act. Senators McCaIN, HutchiSON, Gramm, DomEnici, BingAman, FeINSTEIN, and Boxer join me. This bill, which is identical to the bill I introduced in the 106th Congress, will be of great importance to Arizona’s future fiscal soundness and that of the other southwest border states.

The bill will reimburse states and localities for the costs they incur to process criminal illegal aliens through their criminal justice systems. It will also provide reimbursement for the uncompensated care that states, localities, and hospitals provide, as required by federal law, to undocumented aliens for medical emergencies.

It is unclear what the true expense for providing these services is, but it is believed to be even greater than the level of reimbursement provided for in the bill we introduce today. Title I of our bill will provide $200 million each year for four years for the criminal justice costs associated with processing criminal illegal aliens. Title II will provide $200 million each year for four years for the costs that states, localities, and hospitals incur to provide emergency medical treatment to undocumented aliens.

We will soon have a better idea of what these overwhelming costs are to those jurisdictions clearly affected, the four southwest states—Arizona, Texas, California, and New Mexico. Last year I successfully secured funding for a study which should be completed this week and will detail the expenses that border communities in all four southwest states incur to process criminal illegal aliens. That study is already complete. In the four border counties of Arizona, $18 million in unreimbursed costs are incurred to process criminal illegal aliens.

Preventing illegal immigration is the responsibility of the Federal Government. When it fails to protect our border communities, it has a responsibility to reimburse jurisdictions that provide federally-mandated services that (1) protect citizens and legal residents from criminal illegal aliens, or (2) provide emergency medical attention to undocumented immigrants. These two services have a tremendous effect on the budgets of these relatively small jurisdictions. When illegal immigrants commit crimes and are then caught, they drain the budgets of a locality’s sheriff, detention facilities, justice court, county attorney, clerks of the court, and juvenile detention facilities, justice court, county attorney, clerks of the court, and juvenile detention facilities, as well as the county’s indigent defense budget. States and local jurisdictions all along the southwest border have incurred 100 percent of these processing-related costs to date. Our bill will change that.

Another study I was able to secure funding for in the 106th Congress will soon begin. That study will detail the overwhelming and again unreimbursed, costs that certain localities
and hospitals are incurring to treat illegal immigrants for medical emergencies. The federal government is obligated to fully reimburse states, localities, and hospitals for the emergency medical treatment of illegal immigrants.

According to a preliminary Congressional Budget Office estimate provided two years ago, the total annual cost to treat illegal immigrants for medical emergencies is roughly $2.6 billion a year. It roughly estimated that the federal government reimburses states for approximately half of that amount. That means states must pay the remaining $1.4 billion. The state of Arizona estimates that it incurs unreimbursed costs of $30 million annually to treat undocumented immigrants on an emergency basis.

The bill we introduce today will provide states, localities, and hospitals an additional $200 million per year to help absorb the costs of adhering to Federal law, which requires that all individuals, regardless of immigration status or ability to pay, must be provided with medical treatment in a medical emergency.

Mr. President, I hope we can address these very pressing issues in the coming months, and that Members will consider joining my cosponsors and me in support of this bill.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of legislation Senator Kyl and I are introducing with a number of our border-state colleagues to provide appropriate Federal reimbursement to states and localities whose budgets are disproportionately affected by the costs associated with illegal immigration. The premise of our bill, and of current law governing this type of federal reimbursement to the states, is that controlling illegal immigration is principally the responsibility of the Federal government, not the states.

Our legislation would expand the amount and scope of federal funding to the states for incarceration and medical costs that arise from the detention or treatment of illegal immigrants. Such funding currently flows to all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and several U.S. territories. In Fiscal Year 2000, approximately 360 local jurisdictions across the United States applied for these Federal monies. Although our bill gives special consideration to border states with unauthorized illegal alien populations concentrated in one-quarter and one-third of their criminal justice systems in one-quarter of the states.

In my State of Arizona, Santa Cruz County spent 33 percent of its total criminal justice budget in Fiscal Year 1999 to process criminal illegal aliens, of which over half was not reimbursed by the Federal Government. Arizona’s Cochise County spent roughly 32 percent of its total law enforcement and criminal justice budget to apprehend and process criminal illegal aliens but received Federal payments to cover fewer than half of these costs. Similar shortfalls in Federal funding plague states and counties all along our border with Mexico.

The legislation we are introducing today would actually expand the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program by authorizing funding for state and local needs that currently go unmet. Although states receive Federal reimbursement for part of the cost of incarcerating illegal adult aliens, the Federal Government does not reimburse states for expenditures for illegal juvenile aliens. Nor does it reimburse states and localities for costs associated with processing criminal illegal aliens, including court costs, county attorney costs, costs for criminal proceedings that do not involve prison, hospital, or indigent defense costs, and unsupervised probation costs.

Our legislation would authorize the Federal Government to reimburse such costs to States and localities that suffer a substantially disproportionate share of illegal illegal aliens on their law enforcement and criminal justice systems. It would also authorize additional Federal reimbursement for emergency health services furnished by states and localities to undocumented aliens.

Reimbursement to States and localities for criminal alien incarceration is woefully underfunded according to the existing limited criteria for SCAAP, which do not take into account the full deterrence and processing costs for illegal aliens. Nor does the existing SCAAP provide necessary support to local communities for the cost of emergency care for illegal immigrants, a growing problem in the Southwest, and one exacerbated by the increasingly desperate measures taken by undocumented aliens to cross our border with Mexico. Our legislation thus authorizes the expansion of SCAAP to cover costs wrongly borne by local communities under existing law which are a Federal responsibility and should not be shirked by those in Washington.

As my colleagues know, illegal immigrants who successfully transit our Southwest border rapidly disperse throughout the United States. That SCAAP funds flow to all 50 States reflects the pressures such aliens place on public services around the country. I hope the Senate will act expeditiously on this important legislation to alleviate those pressures by compensating states and localities uniformly for the costs they incur as unwitting hosts to undocumented aliens, even as we continue to fund border enforcement measures.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. JOHN-

S, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BINGA-

man, Mr. DASCHLE, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 170. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay by virtue of their years of active serv-

ice and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, last Congress I, along with Senator INOUYE, introduced S. 2357, "The Armed Forces Concurrent Retirement and Disability Payment Act of 2000." Our bill addressed a 110 year-old injustice that requires some of the bravest men and women in our nation—retired, career veterans, to essentially forgo receipt of a portion of their regularly received disability compensation in the line of service. I am extremely disappointed that we did not take the opportunity to correct this long-standing inequity in the 106th Congress.

I rise today, to again introduce a bill along with my colleagues Senators HUTCHINSON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DASCHLE, Ms. SNOWE, and DASCHLE, that will correct this inequity for veterans who have retired from our Armed Forces with a service-connected disability.

Our bill will permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive military retired pay concurrently with veterans’ disability compensation.

This inequitable law originated in the 19th century, when Congress approved legislation to prohibit the concurrent receipt of military retired pay and VA disability compensation. It was enacted shortly after the Civil War, when the standing army of the United States was extremely limited. At that time, only a small portion of our armed forces consisted of career soldiers.

Today, nearly one and a half million Americans dedicate their lives to the defense of our nation. The United States’ military force is unmatched in terms of power, training and ability and our nation is recognized as the world’s only superpower, a status which is largely due to the sacrifices our veterans made during the last century. Rather than honoring their commitment and bravery by fulfilling our obligations, the federal government has chosen instead to perpetuate a 110 year-old injustice. Quite simply, this is disgraceful.

Military retirement pay and disability compensation were earned and awarded for entirely different purposes.
Current law ignores the distinction between these two entitlements. Members of our Armed Forces have normally dedicated 20 or more years to our country’s defense earning their retirement for service. Whereas, disability compensation is awarded to a veteran for injury incurred in the line of duty.

Career military retired veterans are the only group of federal retirees who are required to waive their retirement pay in order to receive VA disability. All other federal employees receive both the retirement pay and VA disability with no offset. Simply put, the law discriminates against career military men and women.

This inequity is absurd. How do we explain it to the men and women who sacrificed their own safety to protect this great nation? How do we explain this inequity to Edward Lynk from Virginia who answered the call of duty to defend our nation? Mr. Lynk served for over 30 years in the Marine Corps and participated in three wars, where he was severely injured during combat in two of them.

Or George Blahun from Connecticut, who entered the military in 1940 to serve his country because of the impending war served over 33 years during World War II, the Korean War and the Vietnam War. He is 100 percent disabled because of injuries incurred while performing military service.

Our nation is experiencing a prosperity in human history and yet we continue to tell these brave soldiers that we cannot afford to make good on payments they are owed. Mr. Blahun has hit the proverbial nail on the head when he labels our excuses “arbitrary bureaucratic rhetorical nonsense.” We must demonstrate to these veterans that we are thankful for their dedicated service. As such, we must fight for the amendment in the Senate version of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2001.

We are currently losing over one thousand WWII veterans each day. Every day we delay acting on this legislation means that we have denied fundamental fairness to thousands of men and women. They will never have the ability to enjoy their two well-deserved entitlements.

Mr. President, this bill represents an honest attempt to correct an injustice that has existed for far too long. Allowing disabled veterans to receive military retired pay and veterans disability compensation concurrently will restore fairness to federal retirement policy.

This legislation is supported by numerous veterans’ service organizations, including the Military Coalition, the National Vietnam War Veterans Alliance, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Paralyzed Veterans of America and the Uniformed Services Disabled Retirees.

Mr. President, passing “The Retired Pay Restoration Act of 2001” will finally eliminate a gross inequitable 19th century law and ensure fairness within the federal retirement policy. Our veterans have heard enough excuses. Now it is time for them to hear our gratitude. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to finally end this disservice to our retired military men and women.

We owe this and now is our chance to honor their service to our nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Retired Pay Restoration Act of 2001 be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 170
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the “Retired Pay Restoration Act of 2001.”

SEC. 2. PAYMENT OF RETIRED PAY AND COMPENSATION TO DISABLED MILITARY RETIREES.
(a) RESTORATION OF RETIRED PAY BENEFITS.—Chapter 71 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

§1414. Members eligible for retired pay who have service-connected disabilities; payment of retired pay and veterans’ disability compensation

“(a) PAYMENT OF BOTH RETIRED PAY AND COMPENSATION.—(1) Except as provided in subsection (b), a member or former member of the uniformed services who is entitled to retired pay (other than as specified in subsection (c) and who is also entitled to veterans’ disability compensation is entitled to be paid both without regard to sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38.

“(b) SPECIAL RULE FOR CHAPTER 61 CAREER RETIREES.—The retired pay of a member retired under chapter 61 of this title with 20 years or more of service otherwise creditable under section 1405 of this title at the time of the member’s retirement is subject to reduction under sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38, but only to the extent that the amount of the member’s retirement exceeds the amount of retired pay to which the member would have been entitled under any other provision of law based upon the member’s years of service in the uniformed services if the member had not been retired under chapter 61 of this title.

“(c) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to a member retired under chapter 61 of this title with less than 20 years of service otherwise creditable under section 1405 of this title at the time of the member’s retirement.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) the term ‘retired pay’ includes regular pay, and officers’ retirement pay, and naval pension.

“(2) the term ‘veterans’ disability compensation’ has the meaning given the term ‘compensation’ in section 101(13) of title 38.

“(3) REPEAL OF SPECIAL COMPENSATION PROGRAM.—Section 1413 of such title is repealed.

“(4) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended—

“(1) by striking the item relating to section 1413; and

“(2) by adding at the end the following new item:

“1414. Members eligible for retired pay who have service-connected disabilities; payment of retired pay and veterans’ disability compensation.”.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I rise today to join my distinguished colleagues from across the aisle, Senator Reid, in introducing the Military Retirement Equity Act of 2001. With the swift passage of this act, we hope to put an end to a grossly unfair practice, to reform a system that, as it stands today, ends up hurting those veterans who are the greatest of our nation’s heroes.

Today, our armed forces are struggling to meet even modest recruiting goals and are having even more difficulty retaining qualified men and women. Serving in the military is less likely to be seen as an attractive career. The Federal Government should do its part to help, not to hinder, the viability of the idea of a career in uniform.

Unfortunately, an outdated law passed in 1891 punishes those who have served this Nation in uniform for more than twenty years, in the process earning a longevity retirement. How? By forcing them to waive a portion of their retired pay equal to the amount of any VA disability compensation they may be eligible to receive. That is patently unfair. Military retirement pay based on longevity and VA disability compensation are awarded for two distinct, different reasons—one should not count against the other.

One is awarded for making a career of military service, the other is to redress debilitating, enduring injuries caused by the rigors of life in uniform. Military retirees are the only group of federal retirees who must waive a portion of their retirement pay in order to receive VA disability compensation. If a veteran refuses to give up his retired pay, he will lose his VA benefits.

Let’s take the fictional example of two G.I.’s named Joe and Sam. Joe and Sam joined the Army together and served in the Desert Storm. Joe left the Army after a four-year tour and joined the federal government as a civilian employee. Sam continued on and made the military his career.

Thirty years later, both men are collecting federal pay and both are eligible for VA disability compensation. Serving in the military is equal amount of his retired pay, while Joe collects the full amount of both benefits without any deduction in either.
Fairness is the issue here. We should be rewarding, not penalizing people for choosing a career in the military. Military retirees with service-connected disabilities should be allowed to receive compensation for their injuries above their retired military pay. The 10th Congressional District Act to bring equity to those who were disabled during a career of dedicated service to our nation, and the Reid-Hutchinson bill is the proper vehicle. By eliminating the offset, we can end this unfair practice that needs our help.

The Military Retirement Equity Act of 2001 has the strong support of many military and nonmilitary veterans service organizations. In addition, Congressman MICHAEL BILIRAKIS has introduced companion legislation in the House of Representatives. I encourage all of my colleagues to join us in this fight by signing on as cosponsors.

While I know it will be an uphill battle to get this legislation passed, it is one of our priorities. By ensuring the right that the Congress make this much-needed change and reward—rather than penalize—those who have selflessly served to protect our Nation.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon:

S. 172. A bill to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I stand before you and the Senate today. As I do this, our Nation is relearning a fundamental lesson that we and they have been reduced to junk bond status, from our parents and grandparents never intended to force us, as Americans, to dismantle the infrastructure that our parents and grandparents worked so hard to build.

The Bush administration is going to have to clean up a huge mess that is not of their making. The assault on domestic energy production and the lack of a national energy strategy over the last eight years are finally coming to an end. We must look at the numbers I just quoted, I believe it is the height of irresponsibility to even be discussing breaching the four lower Snake River dams. The Endangered Species Act was not implemented to force use, as Americans, to dismantle the infrastructure that our parents and grandparents worked so hard to build.

The Governors of Oregon and Washington are seeking 10 percent reductions in energy use at state facilities, and I believe this would be an appropriate goal for federal facilities as well. The federal government is also a major producer of electricity in the Western United States. Much of that generation is from hydroelectric facilities.

I have expressed concern over the last several weeks that the Columbia and Snake River hydropower facilities cannot be operated in a manner that jeopardizes salmon recovery efforts in what is shaping up to be a poor water year in the Basin.

However, there are many other federal generation facilities throughout the 12 western states that are interconnected by the high-voltage transmission system.

Therefore, I asked that the Energy Department be directed to undertake an immediate review of all of these facilities to ensure that they are providing as much power as possible during this crisis. It is not just California that needs additional generation, however. According to a recent study by the Northwest Power Planning Council, the Pacific Northwest faces a 25 percent chance of power shortages during this and coming winters.

To reduce this probability to a more acceptable level of five percent, the Northwest needs at least 3,000 megawatts of new generating resources, conservation, or short-term demand management.

This report, however, assumed that all the other generation remained equal. Yet in recent years there have been calls to close the nuclear plant WNP2, with a capacity of 1,250 megawatts.

Breaching the four lower Snake River dams, which I oppose, would reduce the available capacity by another 1,200 megawatts, enough power for Seattle.

In addition, almost 12,000 megawatts of non-federal hydroelectric power in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and California, is up for relicensing between now and 2010. More stringent operating criteria could reduce the total amount of power available.

New licenses will probably also reduce the operational flexibility of these facilities that makes hydropower so useful in meeting daily peaks in energy demand.

In the face of the numbers I just quoted, I believe it is the height of irresponsibility to even be discussing breaching the four lower Snake River dams. The Endangered Species Act was not implemented to force use, as Americans, to dismantle the infrastructure that our parents and grandparents worked so hard to build.

The Bush administration is going to have to clean up a huge mess that is not of their making. The assault on domestic energy production and the lack of a national energy strategy over the last eight years are finally coming to an end.
home to roost. This nation is more dependent on foreign oil than at any time in its history, and crude oil prices are rising as foreign nations are reducing production. Natural gas prices have doubled in recent months. Electricity prices on the West Coast have skyrocketed and they remain high in the Northeast.

The previous administration started out wanting to tax energy production through a BTU tax, as a way to force Americans to conserve. When that was enacted, the past administration went about a systematic assault on energy production. They went after coal-fired plants, nuclear plants, and hydroelectric plants.

They opposed the siting of new natural gas pipelines and the expansion of oil refining capacity. They put millions of acres of land off-limits to oil, gas, and coal exploration. The economy, particularly on the west coast, is just beginning to feel the cumulative effects of these actions.

The U.S. economy needs energy. It does not come from Safeway. Gasoline is not made by the Federal Reserve. It should be apparent to all Americans everywhere who care about this issue that we must reassert the reality that exists between the lives we live and the natural resources we demand.

At the end of the day, power is not created by hitting a light switch. Food does not come from SafeWay. Gasoline does not come from a filling station. These are all things we need, and we must be good stewards of the environment but also remember that using the land does not have to equal abusing the land. Those who advocate that all must be shut down are simply the ones who would visit this trauma that we are now seeing in California on the rest of us as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 172

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ‘‘Electric Reliability Act’’.

SEC. 2. ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION.

(a) In General.—Part II of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘SEC. 213. ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION.

‘‘(a) Definitions.—In this section:

‘‘(1) AFFILIATED REGIONAL RELIABILITY ENTITY.—A ‘‘Affiliated regional reliability entity’’ means an entity delegated authority under subsection (h).

‘‘(2) BULK-POWER SYSTEM.—

‘‘(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘bulk-power system’ means all facilities and control systems necessary for operating an interconnected electric power transmission grid or any portion of an interconnected electric power transmission grid.

‘‘(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘bulk-power system’ includes—

‘‘(i) high voltage transmission lines, substations, control centers, communications, data, and operations planning facilities necessary for the reliable operation of any part of the interconnected electric power transmission grid; and

‘‘(ii) the output of generating units necessary to maintain the reliability of the interconnected electric power transmission grid.

‘‘(3) BULK-POWER SYSTEM USER.—The term ‘bulk-power system user’ means an entity that—

‘‘(A) sells, purchases, or transmits electric energy over a bulk-power system; or

‘‘(B) owns, operates, or maintains facilities or control systems that are part of a bulk-power system; or

‘‘(C) is a system operator.

‘‘(4) ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘electric reliability organization’ means the organization designated by the Commission under subsection (d).

‘‘(5) ENTITY RULE.—The term ‘entity rule’ means a rule adopted by an affiliated regional reliability entity for a specific region and designed to enforce or ensure 1 or more organization standards.

‘‘(6) INDEPENDENT DIRECTOR.—The term ‘independent director’ means a person that—

‘‘(A) is not an officer or employee of an entity that would reasonably be perceived as having a direct financial interest in the outcome of a decision by the board of directors of the electric reliability organization; and

‘‘(B) does not have a relationship that would interfere with the exercise of independent judgment in carrying out the responsibilities of a director of the electric reliability organization.

‘‘(7) INDUSTRY SECTOR.—The term ‘industry sector’ means a group of bulk-power system users with substantially similar commercial interests, as determined by the board of directors of the electric reliability organization.

‘‘(8) INTERCONNECTION.—The term ‘interconnection’ means a geographic area in which the operation of bulk-power system components is synchronized so that the failure of 1 or more of the components may adversely affect the ability of the operators of other components within the interconnection to maintain safe and reliable operation of the facilities within their control.

‘‘(9) ORGANIZATION STANDARD.—

‘‘(A) IN GENERAL.—An ‘organization standard’ means a policy or standard adopted by the electric reliability organization to provide for the reliable operation of a bulk-power system.

‘‘(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘organization standard’ includes—

‘‘(i) an entity rule approved by the electric reliability organization; and

‘‘(ii) a variance approved by the electric reliability organization.

‘‘(10) PUBLIC INTEREST GROUP.—

‘‘(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘public interest group’ means a nonprofit private or public organization that has an interest in the activities of the electric reliability organization.

‘‘(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘public interest group’ includes—

‘‘(i) a ratepayer advocate;

‘‘(ii) a power association; and

‘‘(iii) a State or local government organization that regulates participants in, and promulgates government policy with respect to, the market for electric energy.

‘‘(11) SYSTEM OPERATOR.—

‘‘(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘system operator’ means an entity that is responsible for the operation of a bulk-power system.

‘‘(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘system operator’ includes—

‘‘(i) a control area operator;

‘‘(ii) an independent system operator;

‘‘(iii) a transmission system operator; and

‘‘(iv) a regional security coordinator.

‘‘(12) VARIANCE.—The term ‘variance’ means an exception from the requirements of an organization standard on a proposal for an organization standard in a case in which there is no organization standard that is adopted by an affiliated regional reliability entity and is applicable to all or a part of the region for which the affiliated regional reliability entity is responsible.

‘‘(b) JURISDICTION.—Notwithstanding section 201(f), within the United States, the Commission shall have jurisdiction over the electric reliability organization, all affiliated regional reliability entities, all system operators, and all bulk-power system users (including entities described in section 201(f) for purposes of approving organization standards and enforcing compliance with this section.

‘‘(2) DEFINITION OF TERMS.—The Commission may by regulation define any term used in this section consistent with the definitions in subsection (a) and the purpose and intent of this Act.

‘‘(c)EXISTING RELIABILITY STANDARDS.—

‘‘(1) SUBMISSION TO THE COMMISSION.—Before designation of an electric reliability organization under subsection (d), any person, including the North American Electric Reliability Council and its Regional Reliability Councils, may submit to the Commission any reliability standard, guidance, practice, or amendment to a reliability standard, guidance, or practice that the person proposes to be made mandatory and enforceable.

‘‘(2) REVIEW BY THE COMMISSION.—The Commission, after allowing persons who may be adversely affected an opportunity to submit comments, may approve a proposed mandatory standard, guidance, practice, or amendment submitted under paragraph (1) if the Commission finds that the standard, guidance, or practice is just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest.

‘‘(3) AUTHORITY.—The Commission, after determining that a standard, guidance, or practice shall be mandatory and applicable according to its terms following approval by the Commission and shall remain in effect until it is—

‘‘(A) withdrawn, disapproved, or superseded by an organization standard that is issued or approved by the electric reliability organization and made effective by the Commission under subsection (e); or

‘‘(B) disapproved by the Commission if, on complaint or upon motion by the Commission and after notice and an opportunity for comment, the Commission finds the standard, guidance, or practice to be unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory or preferential, or not in the public interest.

‘‘(4) ENFORCEABILITY.—A standard, guidance, or practice in effect under this subsection shall be enforceable by the Commission.

‘‘(5) DESIGNATION OF ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION.—

‘‘(1) REGULATIONS.—IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Commission shall propose
regulations specifying procedures and requirements for an entity to apply for designation as the electric reliability organization.

"(B) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—The Commission shall provide notice and opportunity for comment on the proposed regulations.

"(C) FINAL REGULATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Commission shall promulgate final regulations under this subsection.

"(2) APPLICATION.—

"(A) Submission.—Following the promulgation of final regulations under paragraph (1), an entity may submit an application to the Commission to be considered as the electric reliability organization.

"(B) CONTENTS.—The applicant shall describe in the application—

(i) the governance and procedures of the applicant; and

(ii) the funding mechanism and initial funding requirements of the applicant.

"(3) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—The Commission shall—

(A) provide public notice of the application; and

(B) afford interested parties an opportunity to comment.

"(4) DESIGNATION OF ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION.—The Commission shall designate as the electric reliability organization if the Commission determines that the applicant—

(A) has the ability to develop, implement, and enforce standards that provide for an adequate level of bulk-power systems;

(B) permits voluntary membership to any bulk-power system user or public interest group;

(C) ensures fair representation of its membership on its board of directors and fair management of its affairs, taking into account the need for efficiency and effectiveness in decisionmaking and operations and the requirements for technical competency in the development of organization standards and the exercise of oversight of bulk-power system reliability;

(D) ensures that no 2 industry sectors have the ability to control, and no 1 industry sector has the ability to veto, the applicant’s discharge of its responsibilities as the electric reliability organization (including actions by committees recommending standards for approval by the board or other board actions to develop, implement and enforce standards);

(E) provides for governance by a board wholly comprised of independent directors;

(F) provides a funding mechanism and requirements that—

(i) are just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential and in the public interest; and

(ii) satisfy the requirements of subsection (1); and

(G) has established procedures for development of organization standards that—

(i) provide notice and opportunity for public comment, taking into account the need for efficiency and effectiveness in decisionmaking and operations and the requirements for technical competency in the development of organization standards;

(ii) ensure openness, a balancing of interests, and due process; and

(iii) includes alternative procedures to be followed in emergencies;

(H) has established fair and impartial procedures for implementation and enforcement of organization standards, either directly or through delegation to an affiliated regional reliability entity, including the imposition of penalties or deprivations on activities, functions, or operations, or other appropriate sanctions;

(I) has established procedures for notice and opportunity for public observation of all meetings, except that the procedures for public observation may include alternative arrangements for public observation of the discussion of information that the directors reasonably determine should take place in closed session, such as litigation, personnel investigations, or commercially sensitive information;

(J) provides for the consideration of recommendations of States and State commissions; and

(K) addresses other matters that the Commission considers appropriate to ensure that the organization standards and policies of the electric reliability organization are just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest.

"(5) EXCLUSION OF APPLICANT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall designate only 1 electric reliability organization.

(B) MULTIPLE APPLICATIONS.—If the Commission receives 2 or more timely applications that satisfy the requirements of this subsection, the Commission shall approve only the application the Commission determines will best implement this section.

"(6) ORGANIZATION STANDARDS.—

(A) PROPOSAL TO COMMISSION.—

The applicant shall submit a proposal for a new or modified organization standard.

(B) CONTENTS.—A proposal submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) a concise statement of the purpose of the proposal; and

(ii) a record of any proceedings conducted with respect to the proposal.

(C) REVIEW BY THE COMMISSION.—

(A) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—The Commission shall—

(i) provide notice of a proposal under paragraph (1); and

(ii) allow interested persons 30 days to submit comments on the proposal.

(B) ACTION BY THE COMMISSION—

(I) IN GENERAL.—After taking into consideration any submitted comments, the Commission shall approve or disapprove a proposal or modify a proposed organization standard that is disapproved in whole or in part, if the proposal or modified organization standard shall go into effect immediately with respect to the entity to which it applies.

(II) REMAND.—If the applicant does not approve or disapprove a proposal within the period specified in clause (i), the proposed organization standard shall go into effect subject to its terms, without prejudice to the authority of the Commission to modify the organization standard in accordance with the standards and requirements of this section.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—An organization standard, as approved by the Commission, shall take effect not earlier than 30 days after the date of the Commission’s order of approval.

(D) STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL.—If the agency determines that the organization standard will best implement this section, the Commission shall approve a proposed new or modified organization standard if the Commission determines will best implement this section.

"(7) VARIANCES AND ENTITY RULES.—

(A) PROPOSAL.—An affiliated regional reliability entity may propose a variance or entity rule to the electric reliability organization.

(B) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—If expedited consideration is necessary to provide for bulk-power system reliability, the affiliated regional reliability entity may—

(i) request that the electric reliability organization expedite consideration of the proposal; and

(ii) file a notice of the request with the Commission.

(C) FAILURE TO ACT.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—If the electric reliability organization fails to adopt the variance or entity rule, in whole or in part, the affiliated regional reliability entity may request that the Commission review the proposal.

(II) ACTION BY THE COMMISSION.—If the Commission determines, after a review of the request, that the action of the electric reliability organization did not conform to the applicable standards and procedures approved by the Commission, or if the Commission determines that the variance or entity rule is just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest and that the electric reliability organization failed to act on the proposal, the Commission may—

(i) remand the proposal for further consideration by the electric reliability organization; or

(ii) order the electric reliability organization or the affiliated regional reliability entity to develop a variance or entity rule consistent with that requested by the affiliated regional reliability entity.

(D) PROCEDURE.—A variance or entity rule proposed by an affiliated regional reliability entity shall be submitted to the electric reliability organization for review and submission to the Commission in accordance with the procedures specified in paragraph (2).

(E) IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVENESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, a new or modified organization standard shall take effect immediately on submission to the Commission without notice or comment if the electric reliability organization determines that the new or modified organization standard will best implement this section.

(B) CONTESTATION.—If the Commission determines that an emergency exists requiring that the new or modified organization standard take effect immediately without notice or comment, the Commission—

(i) notifies the Commission as soon as practicable after making the determination;

(ii) submits the new or modified organization standard to the Commission not later than 5 days after making the determination; and
section (d)(4).

(c) COMPLIANCE.—Each bulk power system user shall comply with an organization standard that takes effect under this section.

(f) COORDINATION WITH CANADA AND MEXICO.—

(1) RECOGNITION.—The electric reliability organization shall take all appropriate steps to facilitate recognition in Canada and Mexico.

(2) INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall use best efforts to enter into international agreements with Canada and Mexico to provide for—

(i) effective compliance with organization standards; and

(ii) effectiveness of the electric reliability organization in carrying out its mission and responsibilities.

(B) COMPLIANCE.—All actions taken by the organization under subparagraph (A) shall be consistent with any international agreement under subparagraph (A).

(g) CHANGES IN PROCEDURE, GOVERNANCE, OR FUNDING.—

(1) SUBMISSION TO THE COMMISSION.—The electric reliability organization shall submit to the Commission—

(A) any proposed change in a procedure, governance, or funding provision; or

(B) any change in an affiliated regional reliability entity’s procedure, governance, or funding provision relating to delegated functions.

(2) CONTENTS.—A submission under paragraph (1) shall include an explanation of the basis and purpose for the change.

(h) EFFECTIVENESS.—

(1) CHANGES IN PROCEDURE.—

(A) SUBMISSION CONSTITUTING A STATEMENT OF POLICY, PRACTICE, OR INTERPRETATION.—A proposed change in procedure shall take effect 90 days after submission to the Commission if the Commission determines that the change—

(i) is just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest; and

(ii) satisfies the requirements of subsection (d)(4).

(B) CHANGES IN GOVERNANCE OR FUNDING.—A proposed change in governance or funding shall not take effect unless the Commission finds that the change—

(i) is just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest; and

(ii) satisfies the requirements of subsection (d)(4).

(2) ORDER TO AMEND.—The Commission, on complaint or on the motion of the Commission, may require the electric reliability organization to amend a procedural, governance, or funding provision if the Commission determines that the amendment is necessary to meet the requirements of this section.

(3) FILING.—The electric reliability organization shall submit the amendment in accordance with paragraph (1).

(4) DELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—(I) IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF COMPLIANCE.—At the request of an entity, the electric reliability organization shall enter into an agreement with the entity for the delegation of authority to implement and enforce compliance with organization standards in the entity’s geographic area.

(ii) the electric reliability organization finds that—

(I) the entity satisfies the requirements of subparagraph (A)(i); and

(ii) the delegation would promote the effective and efficient implementation and administration of bulk-power system reliability.

(B) OTHER AUTHORITY.—The electric reliability organization may enter into an agreement to delegate authority to any other entity, except that the electric reliability organization shall reserve the right to set and approve standards for bulk-power system reliability.

(5) APPROVAL BY THE COMMISSION.—

(A) SUBMISSION TO THE COMMISSION.—The electric reliability organization shall submit to the Commission—

(i) any agreement entered into under this subsection; and

(ii) any information the Commission requires with respect to the affiliated regional reliability entity to which authority is delegated.

(B) STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL.—The Commission shall approve the agreement, following public notice and an opportunity for comment, if the Commission finds that the agreement—

(i) meets the requirements of paragraph (1); and

(ii) is just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest.

(C) REPUTABLE PRIORITIES.—A proposed delegation of authority with an affiliated regional reliability entity organized on an interconnected-wide basis shall be rebuttably presumed by the Commission to be justified by facts that demonstrate a compelling need for implementation and administration of the reliability of the bulk-power system.

(D) INVALIDITY ABSENT APPROVAL.—No delegation of authority with an affiliated regional reliability entity organized on a regional basis shall be valid unless the delegation is approved by the Commission.

(6) PROCEDURES FOR ENTITY RULES AND VARIANCES.

(A) IN GENERAL.—A delegation agreement under this subsection shall specify the procedures by which the affiliated regional reliability entity may propose entity rules or variances for review by the electric reliability organization.

(B) INTERCONNECTION-WIDE ENTITY RULES AND VARIANCES.—In the case of a proposal for an entity rule or variance that would apply on an interconnected-wide basis, the electric reliability organization shall approve the entity rule or variance unless the electric reliability organization makes a written finding that the entity rule or variance—

(i) was not developed in a fair and open process that provided an opportunity for all interested parties to participate; and

(ii) would have a significant adverse impact on reliability or commerce in other interconnected areas.

(C) FAILURE TO REACH DELEGATION AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an affiliated regional reliability entity requests, consistent with paragraph (1), that the electric reliability organization delegate authority to it, but is unable to reach agreement within 180 days to reach agreement with the electric reliability organization with respect to the requested delegation, the entity shall seek relief from the Commission.

(B) REVIEW BY THE COMMISSION.—The Commission shall order the electric reliability organization to enter into a delegation agreement under this subsection if the Commission determines that—

(i) a delegation to the affiliated regional reliability entity would—

(I) meet the requirements of paragraph (1); and

(II) would be just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest; and

(ii) the electric reliability organization unreasonably withheld the delegation.

(D) ORDERS TO MODIFY DELEGATION AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—On complaint, or on motion of the Commission, after notice to the affiliated regional reliability entity, the Commission may order the electric reliability organization to modify a delegation agreement to a delegation agreement (A) with an affiliated regional reliability entity organized on an interconnected-wide basis if the Commission determines that—

(i) an affiliate of the regional reliability entity—

(I) no longer has the capacity to carry out effectively or efficiently the implementation...
or enforcement responsibilities under the delegation agreement; 

(II) has failed to meet its obligations under the delegation agreement; or 

(i) the rules, practices, or procedures of the affiliated regional reliability entity no longer provide for fair and impartial discharge of the implementation or enforcement responsibilities under the delegation agreement; 

(ii) the geographic boundary of a transmission entity approved by the Commission is not wholly within the boundary of an affiliated regional reliability entity, and the difference in boundaries is inconsistent with the effective and efficient implementation and administration of bulk-power system reliability; or 

(iii) the agreement is inconsistent with a delegation ordered by the Commission under paragraph (4). 

(B) SUSPENSION.— 

(i) IN GENERAL.—Following an order to modify a delegation agreement under paragraph (A), the Commission may suspend the delegation agreement if the electric reliability organization or the affected affiliated regional reliability entity does not propose an appropriate and timely modification. 

(ii) ASSUMPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES.—If a delegation agreement is suspended, the electric reliability organization shall assume the responsibilities delegated under the delegation agreement. 

(3) ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP.—Each system operator shall be a member of— 

(i) the electric reliability organization; and 

(ii) any affiliated regional reliability entity operating under an agreement effective under subsection (h) applicable to the region in which the operator operates, if the operator is responsible for the operation of, a transmission facility. 

(i) ENFORCEMENT.— 

(A) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with procedures approved by the Commission under subsection (f), the electric reliability organization may impose a penalty, limitation on activities, functions, or operations, or other disciplinary action that the electric reliability organization finds appropriate against a bulk-power system user if the electric reliability organization, after notice and opportunity for hearing, has determined that the bulk-power system user has violated an organization standard. 

(B) NOTIFICATION.—The electric reliability organization shall immediately notify the Commission of any disciplinary action imposed with respect to an act or failure to act of a bulk-power system user that affected or threatened to affect bulk-power system facilities located in the United States. 

(C) RIGHT TO PETITION.—A bulk-power system user that is the subject of a disciplinary action may request a hearing before an independent judicial court for the district in which the affected facilities are located. 

(E) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(i) Unless the Commission, on motion of the Commission or on application by the bulk-power system user that is the subject of the disciplinary action, suspends the disciplinary action, the disciplinary action shall take effect on the 30th day after the date on which— 

(1) the electric reliability organization submits to the Commission— 

(aa) a written finding that the bulk-power system user violated an organization standard; 

(bb) the record of proceedings before the electric reliability organization; and 

(cc) the Commission posts the written finding and record of proceedings on an organization Web site. 

(ii) DURATION.—A disciplinary action shall remain in effect or remain suspended unless the Commission, after notice and opportunity for hearing, modifies, amends, or revokes the disciplinary action. 

(iii) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—The Commission shall conduct the hearing under procedures established to ensure expedited consideration of the action taken. 

(ii) OTHER ACTION.—The Commission may take such other action as is necessary against the electric reliability organization or an affiliated regional reliability entity to ensure compliance with an organization standard, or any Commission order affecting electric reliability organization or affiliated regional reliability entity. 

(iv) ASSESSMENT AND RECOVERY OF CERTAIN COSTS.—The electric reliability organization shall— 

(A) conduct periodic assessments of the reliability and adequacy of the interconnected bulk-power system in North America; and 

(B) report annually to the Secretary of Energy and the Commission its findings and recommendations for monitoring or improving system reliability and adequacy. 

(1) ASSESSMENT AND RECOVERY OF CERTAIN COSTS.— 

(i) IN GENERAL.—The reasonable costs of the electric reliability organization, and the reasonable costs of each affiliated regional reliability entity that are related to implementing or enforcing any organization standard or other requirements contained in a delegation agreement approved under subsection (h), shall be assessed by the electric reliability organization and each affiliated regional reliability entity, respectively, taking into account the relationship of costs to each region and based on an allocation of all costs among all electric energy consumers. 

(ii) RULES.—The Commission shall provide by rule for the review of costs and allocations of resources in paragraph (1) in accordance with the standards in this subsection and subsection (d)(4)(F). 

(iii) APPLICATION OF ANTITRUST LAWS.— 

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the following activities are rebuttably presumed to be in compliance with the antitrust laws of the United States: 

(1) Activities undertaken by the electric reliability organization under this section or affiliated regional reliability entity operating under a delegation agreement under subsection (h). 

(2) Activities of a member of the electric reliability organization or an affiliated regional reliability entity operating under a delegation agreement under subsection (h). 

(B) ACTIVITIES OF A MEMBERS.—In a civil action brought by any person or entity against the electric reliability organization or an affiliated regional reliability entity alleging a violation of an antitrust law based on an activity under this Act, the defenses of primary jurisdiction and immunity from suit and other affirmative defenses shall be available to the extent applicable. 

(3) REGIONAL ADVISORY ROLE.— 

(A) ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL ADVISORY BODY.—The Commission shall establish a regional advisory body on the petition of the Governors of at least two-thirds of the States within a region that have more than one-half of their electrical loads served within the region. 

(B) MEMBERSHIP.—A regional advisory body— 

(i) shall be composed of 1 member from each State in the region, appointed by the Governor of the State; and 

(ii) may include representatives of agencies, departments, and commissions of the United States, on execution of an appropriate international agreement described in subsection (i) and the public interest. 

(C) CHARGES.—Each regional advisory body may provide advice to the electric reliability organization, an affiliated regional reliability entity, or the Commission regarding— 

(1) the governance of an affiliated regional reliability entity existing or proposed within a region; 

(2) whether a standard proposed to apply within the region is just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest; and 

(3) whether fees proposed to be assessed within the region are— 

(A) just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest; and 

(B) consistent with the requirements of subsection (l). 

(5) DETERMINATION.—In a case in which a regional advisory body encompasses an entire interconnection, the Commission may give deference to advice provided by the regional advisory body under paragraph (1). 

(6) APPLICABILITY OF SECTION.—This section does not apply outside the 48 contiguous States. 

(l) ASSESSMENT AND RECOVERY OF CERTAIN COSTS.— 

(A) EXTENT OF AUTHORITY OF THE ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION.—The electric reliability organization shall have authority to develop, implement, and enforce compliance with standards for the reliable operation of only the bulk-power system. 

(B) NO AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO ADEQUACY OR SAFETY.—This section does not provide the electric reliability organization or the Commission with the authority to establish or enforce compliance with standards for adequacy or safety of electric facilities or services. 

(2) NO PREEMPTION.— 

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section preempts the authority of any State to take action to ensure the safety, adequacy, and reliability of electric service within the State, so long as the action is not inconsistent with any organization standard. 

(B) CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION.—Not later than 90 days after the electric reliability organization or any other affected party submits to the Commission for a determination that a State action is inconsistent with an organization standard,
the Commission shall issue a final order determining whether a State action is inconsistent with an organization standard, after notice and opportunity for comment, taking into consideration any recommendations of the electric reliability organization.

"(C) STAY.—The Commission, after consultation with the electric reliability organization, and after consultation with the State, may stay the effectiveness of any determination made under subsection (a) upon the filing of a petition by the State, pending the Commission’s issuance of a final order."

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) GENERAL PENALTIES.—Section 316(c) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 825o(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking “subsection” and inserting “section”;

and by striking “or 214” and inserting “214, or 215”.

(2) CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Section 316A of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 825o–1) is amended by striking “or 214” each place it appears and inserting “214, or 215”.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 173. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a windfall profits adjustment on the production of domestic electricity and to use the revenues from the tax to fund rebates for individual and business electricity consumers; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, earlier this week I introduced a bill to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to establish a Western Regional Rate Cap for the sale of electricity. This is a key component to bringing stability to the electricity market and an important step in solving electricity problems.

Today, I am introducing the second in a series of bills to deal with this matter. The Consumer Utilities Turnaround, CUT, Trust Fund Act would impose a windfall profits tax on electricity generators, with the revenues from the tax going into a Trust Fund to provide rebates to consumers.

Between the second quarter of 1999 and the second quarter of 2000, the overall net income for electricity producers based outside of California who sell to California increased 333 percent. Let me also mention a couple of specific companies. These figures compare the net income of the first three quarters of 1999 with the net income of the first three quarters of 2000. For NRG Energy Inc., it was a 386 percent increase. For the AES Corporation, it was a 262 percent increase. And for Dynegy Inc., the increase was 269 percent.

While profits for producers are reaching record levels, consumers are being hit with higher prices. Recent action by the state’s Public Utility Commission has resulted in increases in consumer electricity bills from 7 to 15 percent. While this action was done to help the state’s utility companies in meeting the wholesale electricity costs, it means that consumers and businesses are shouldering the burden of the windfall profits being made by the generating companies.

As I mentioned, the CUT Act would impose a windfall profits tax on electricity generators. Each year, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, would calculate the average level of “reasonable profit” determined by state Public Utility Commissions in states in which such a determination is made. Any profit above this average level would be windfall profit and FERC would be required to provide rebates to 100 percent of the windfall profits tax.

The monies raised from the tax would be placed in the CUT Trust Fund in order to provide rebates to consumers. Governors could request that FERC fund rebates for consumers and businesses because of high electricity costs. FERC would then be charged with distributing the rebates and would be required to provide rebates to consumers each year in an amount equal to the revenues of the windfall profits tax.

Mr. President, this legislation highlights the dramatic difference between the burden California consumers are facing and the bountiful harvest being reaped by electricity generating companies. In dealing with the electricity situation in California, we must always keep this in mind.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BOND, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. CLELAND, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. FUSSELL):

S. 174. A bill to amend the Small Business Administration’s Microloan Program, a program which makes a very big difference through very small loans of up to $35,000. We are very pleased that Senators BOND, CLELAND, LANDRIEU, HARKIN, LEVIN, LIEBERMAN, BINGAMAN, ENZI, and KOHL are joining us and cosponsoring this bill.

Senator SNOWE and I are introducing a bill to improve the Small Business Administration’s Microloan Program, a program which makes a very big difference through very small loans of up to $35,000. We are very pleased that Senators BOND, CLELAND, LANDRIEU, HARKIN, LEVIN, LIEBERMAN, BINGAMAN, ENZI, and KOHL are joining us and cosponsoring this bill.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today Senator SNOWE and I are introducing a bill to improve the Small Business Administration’s Microloan Program, a program which makes a very big difference through very small loans of up to $35,000. We are very pleased that Senators BOND, CLELAND, LANDRIEU, HARKIN, LEVIN, LIEBERMAN, BINGAMAN, ENZI, and KOHL are joining us and cosponsoring this bill.

Senator SNOWE and I have worked together many times on this program, pushing to make sure our country’s smallest businesses have access to capital and business assistance. The changes we are introducing today are not controversial, and they are not new. In fact, they should sound familiar to our colleagues. First, they were part of the microloan provisions in the Senate version of last year’s SBA Reauthorization bill. Second, our Committee and the full Senate voted unanimously to pass them. Further, they were drafted in cooperation with the Administration and with the folks who make the loans and provide the business training. The National Association of SBA Microloan Intermediaries (NASMI) and its members were full partners in shaping this legislation in the Senate.

These provisions were not included in the conference agreement on SBA’s Reauthorization bill because the House Committee on Small Business wanted to postpone consideration of these changes until they could hold a hearing and their members could have a chance to weigh in on the program. I thank former House Small Business Committee Chairman Talent, and returning Minority Member, for working with us on the microloan changes.

These changes we are re-introducing today will make the SBA Microloan Program more flexible to meet credit needs and make accessible to microentrepreneurs across the nation, and more streamlined for lenders to make loans and provide management assistance. They complement the program and technical changes we made last year.

The Microloan Program Improvement Act of 2001 does the following:

It allows microintermediaries to offer revolving lines of credit. Currently, microloans are short-term loans. Eliminating revolving lines of credit will allow intermediaries greater latitude in developing microloan products that best meet their community’s needs by offering borrowers revolving lines of credit, such as for seasonal inventory needs. Congress does not intend for this flexibility to be used to make loans with long terms, such as 15 and 30 years.

It broadens the eligibility criteria for potential microintermediaries. Instead of requiring intermediaries to have one year of experience making microloans to startup, newly established, or growing small businesses and providing technical assistance to its borrowers, this legislation would deem a prospective intermediary eligible if it has equivalent experience.

It expands flexibility to intermediaries to subcontract out technical assistance. Currently, intermediaries are limited to using 25 percent of their funds to assist prospective borrowers. The Microloan Program Improvement Act of 2001 does the following:

- It expands flexibility to intermediaries to subcontract out technical assistance.
- It increases the percentage of technical assistance funds that an intermediary can use to subcontract out technical assistance. Currently, intermediaries can only subcontract 25 percent, and this legislation would raise it to 35 percent.

It establishes a peer-to-peer mentoring program to help new intermediaries provide the best possible service to microentrepreneurs. Specifically, SBA would be allowed to use up to $1 million of annual appropriations for technical assistance grants to provide peer-to-peer mentoring by subcontracting with one or more national trade associations of SBA microloan intermediaries, or subcontracting with entities knowledgeable of and experienced in microlending and related technical assistance. As Congress increases the number of lending intermediaries, one of the most difficult hurdles to reach more people, we want to make sure that new intermediaries have the benefits of lessons learned by other more
experienced lending intermediaries. Because the microlending industry is still very young, there are few sources of conventional training available to prospective and new intermediaries. According to the National Association of SBA Microlender Intermediaries, experienced SBA microlenders are called upon frequently to assist new intermediaries in addressing issues with their loan fund, from financial management and marketing to targeting loan funds effectively to a population or business sector. While these experienced intermediaries do their best to respond to the needs of their colleagues, they currently lack the resources to respond effectively and efficiently to the growing needs of the field.

Before I wrap up my statement, I would like to quickly run through the changes we made and that President Clinton signed into law on December 21.

- Increases the maximum loan amount from $25,000 to $35,000;
- Increases the average loan size for each intermediary’s portfolio from $10,000 to $15,000 and increases the average loan size for specialty lenders from $7,500 to $10,000;
- Raises the threshold for the comparable credit test from $15,000 to $20,000;
- Increases the number of non-lending technical assistance (TA) providers from 25 to 55 and raises the maximum grant amount to each TA provider from $125,000 to $200,000; and,
- Increases the number of intermediaries SBA is authorized to fund from 200 to 300.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

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

8. 174

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Microloan Program Improvement Act of 2001.”

SEC. 2. MICROLABOR PROGRAM.

(a) In General.—Section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)) is amended—(1) in paragraph (1)(B)(i), by striking “short-term.”;


(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(j) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(k) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(l) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(m) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(n) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(o) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(p) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(q) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(r) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(s) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(t) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(u) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(v) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(w) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(x) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(y) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

(z) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{c} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{d} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{e} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{f} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{g} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{h} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{i} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{j} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{k} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{l} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{m} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{n} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{o} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{p} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{q} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{r} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{s} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{t} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{u} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{v} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{w} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{x} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{y} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

{z} EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to fiscal years after 2001.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:
S. 175. A bill to establish a national uniform poll closing time and uniform treatment of absentee ballots in Presidential general elections; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 176. A bill to reform the financing of Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce legislation that will make much needed changes to our Presidential election system—and for other purposes: to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

If there was one message to come from the thirty-six day ordeal over counting the votes in this Presidential election—it was that reforms are needed in the manner of national elections. My bill would first establish a uniform poll closing time for the nation. I believe that 9 p.m. central standard time is the most appropriate time we can choose. The polls in California would close at seven. The polls in the east would close at ten. A uniform poll closing time is preferable to any kind of news blackout over election results. We live in a free society—we cannot withhold election results.

But, in this time of instant communication, let news reports begin to affect our voting patterns. We all recall the 1980 election, when President Carter's early concession demoralized West Coast voters who thought their vote no longer counted. In this last election, the state of Florida got called, when a significant part of the state had not even closed its polls. A uniform poll closing time, in my view, is the only way to avoid a repeat of this problem.

A second difficulty that surfaced during this election cycle is the counting of absentee ballots and mail-in ballots. Some states have moved to vote by mail. But I don't believe that in a national election, we can wait on the outcome of an election through such means. A major industrial nation, in the twenty-first century, shouldn't have to wait days or weeks to determine who won an election. Literally, the fate of the Presidency and the Senate depended on the counting of absentee and mail-in ballots days after the election was held. My legislation would require that, for Presidential elections, all ballots would have to be processed and recorded by election day. States can reserve the right to have mail-in voting be done in a manner that is respectful of the nation's right to know who the next President will be.

Finally, and most importantly, I want to improve the treatment that overseas military absentee ballots are granted. We ask a lot of our men and women serving overseas. They put their lives on the line to protect our democratic values. And I was stunned to see their ballots cast aside like rubbish, purely for political opportunism, and give him the power to develop, in consultation with the states, a standard, uniform method of treating ballots in Federal elections that come from our military serving overseas. This way, no soldier or sailor or airman serving overseas will have his or her vote disenfranchised because of a patchwork of fifty state laws with respect to absentee ballots. They protect our democracy. We must protect their right to participate in it.

Election reform will be an important issue for this Congress. There will be many proposals. I know that Senator McCaskill and the Rules Committee, will have a proposal to modernize voting procedures and machinery across our nation. I am certain that some of the reforms I am offering today will become part of the debate.

Today, I am also introducing the Campaign Finance and Disclosure Act of 2001. The legislation that I believe addresses the most significant problems in our present system of Federal campaign finance. The bill will help level the playing field between challengers and incumbents and will target those areas of the law that have been subject to abuse and excess, without imposing a new, untested system of taxpayer funded campaign subsidies and regulations.

I am today proposing a set of relatively simple and workable reforms that will curb the abuses undermining public confidence in the present system. In professional races more competitive, and that will help return control of federal campaigns and elections to their rightful owners—the individual voters in our respective states.

First, the bill requires that at least 60 percent of a Senate or House candidate's campaign funds come from individual residents of his or her state or congressional district. This will put the emphasis back home where it belongs, and will assist challengers, who rely more heavily on individual contributors.

In addition, the bill will end the powerful incumbent advantage of the mass mailing privilege for Senators during the year in which they are seeking re-election.

Next, the bill increases the individual contribution limit from $1000 to $3000, per candidate, per election, while addressing the precipitous rise in the role of PACs in our existing system. PAC contributions to congressional candidates grew from $125.5 million in 1974 to almost $300 million in 1996, a constant dollar increase of over 400 percent. Moreover, almost 70 percent of that $300 million went to incumbents, further serving to tilt the system against challengers. While PACs can and should be used as an effective vehicular for groups of like minded individuals to lever their support of particular candidates, this should not be allowed to undermine the candidate/voter relationship. The bill will help encourage this growing PAC influence by also limiting PAC contributions to $3000, the same limit as individuals under my bill.

To help encourage candidates of average means to run for office against other candidate support activities, the bill limits to $250,000 the amount a Senate campaign may reimburse a candidate, including immediate family, for loans the candidate makes to the campaign.

The Campaign Finance and Disclosure Act of 2001 will also prohibit, once and for all, several abuses of the law that now plague our system: campaign contributions by non-citizens will be banned; the use of campaign funds for personal purposes that are not fairly a part of running for office will be prohibited; the bill will ensure that a Superintendent of Elections, charged with enforcing this law, will have the authority to develop, in consultation with the states, a standard, uniform method of treating absentee ballots in Federal elections that come from our military serving overseas. This way, no soldier or sailor or airman serving overseas will have his or her vote disenfranchised because of a patchwork of fifty state laws with respect to absentee ballots. They protect our democracy. We must protect their right to participate in it.

Election reform will be an important issue for this Congress. There will be many proposals. I know that Senator McCaskill and the Rules Committee, will have a proposal to modernize voting procedures and machinery across our nation. I am certain that some of the reforms I am offering today will become part of the debate.
DURBIN. I introduce a piece of legislation today that deals with the repeal of certain travel provisions or restrictions and certain trade sanctions with respect to Cuba.

Last year, in the Senate Appropriations Committee, I offered legislation dealing with removing the embargo that exists on the shipment of agriculture commodities around the world. The fact is, we have some people around the world who don’t like. We say: We are going to punish you.

We don’t like Saddam Hussein. We say: The way to punish you is, we are going to slap an embargo on your country, and in that embargo we are going to include food and medicine. We say the same to the leaders of Libya, Sudan and North Korea.

It has been my strong feeling that we ought never have an embargo on the shipment of food and medicine to anywhere in the world. With those embargoes, we shoot ourselves in the foot. When we don’t sell food to those countries, other countries will sell food to them. Why on earth would we ever want to sell food as a weapon? I thought we put that behind us 20 years ago. Yet we continue to do it with respect to certain undesirable countries.

I offered legislation in the appropriations bill last year. It came to the floor of the Senate, and we moved through the Senate into conference. We had a lot of discussion about it. The fact is, we made some progress, essentially lifting sanctions and embargoes on the shipment of food and medicine to Iran, Libya and North Korea. But there is more yet to do. In conference, we got stiffed by some interests who decided at the wanted to even take a step backward with respect to the ban on travel to Cuba. They took the legislation we enacted and added to it a further step, essentially modifying all the restrictions that now exist on travel to Cuba and preventing a President from loosening the travel restrictions. They have written these restrictions into law, which makes them tighter. That made it necessary also to add provisions that ban all American financing, even private financing, for agricultural sales to Cuba. That is a step backward, not forward.

Let me read what two Members of the House who represent south Florida said when this was passed:

The prohibition will make it as difficult as possible to make agricultural sales to Cuba.

Closing off Clinton’s tourism option for Castro is our most important achievement in years. We are extremely pleased.

I understand why they are pleased. I am not. What was done by this Congress and by a few people was wrong. We ought not make it difficult to sell food or move food or medicine to Cuba or anywhere else in the world for that matter. It is not in our interest, and it is not in the interest of others anywhere in the world for us to behave in that manner.

Does anyone think, as I have asked repeatedly, that Fidel Castro or Saddam Hussein or others miss a meal because we have decided that we will not ship agricultural products or food to Iraq, Cuba? Does anybody think they have missed a meal? All these policies do is punish poor people and hungry people and sick people. This country is not going to start acting like it. This Congress ought to provide policies that say when 40 years of embargo to Cuba do not work, it is time to change the policy.

I happen to be responsible for the embargo completely. But now we are just talking about the first piece: allowing the shipment of food and medicine to Cuba.

Then there is the issue of travel to Cuba. How on Earth can one make the claim that travel and exchange and movement between the United States and Cuba somehow undermines our interests? It does not. In my judgment, the more contact, the more travel, the more movement there is between the United States and Cuba, the more we will undermine the interest of the Communist Government of Cuba. That, after all, ought to be our objective.

Our objective ought to be to find ways to see if we can’t create a new spirit of compromise that made the Cuban Government to be open, democratic, and give the people of Cuba an opportunity for the freedoms they deserve. We have had an embargo for Cuba for 40 years. It has not worked.

There is no reason to assume that anything that hasn’t worked for 40 years ought to be changed. This is a baby step in making the change that is needed. Even at that, we faced significant problems last year.

There are a number of people in the Senate who have worked on these issues for a long while. Senator ROBERTS, Senator DODD, former Senator Ashcroft, myself, and others have worked on these issues dealing with agriculture and travel and other issues for a long while. Senator ROBERTS is on the floor. I know he visited Cuba some months ago. I also have visited Cuba. I found it unthinkably, standing in a hospital in an intensive care room one day with a little boy who was in a coma, he had been in an accident, hit his head, was in a coma. He was in an intensive care room. There were no machines. I have been in intensive care rooms and have heard the rhythm of machinery pumping life into patients. Not in that room because they don’t have the equipment. This little boy had his mother by his bedside holding his hand. They told me at that hospital they were out of 240 different kinds of medicines—240 different medicines they didn’t have. They were out of it.

I am sitting there thinking, how could it serve any interest, any public policy purpose, to believe that our withholding the shipment of prescription drugs to Cuba is somehow advancing our interest? It is simply unthinkable. The same holds true with food. Our farmers toil in the fields of this country and they produce a product that is needed around the world. We are told that half of the world goes to bed with an ache in their belly because it hurts to be hungry. A quarter of the world is on a diet. Then we have farmers here in America struggling to find gas to put in a tractor to plow the field and be told the crop has no value because there is an oversupply of crops.

The farmer hears the debate over the embargoes and sanctions we have against countries that don’t like their leaders. We won’t ship food and the farmer gets hurt. You talk about a policy that is grounded in foolishness—this is it. More than foolishness, it is cruel. It is not what represents the best of this country. This country is a world leader. This country produces food in prodigious quantity. It is something the rest of the world desperately needs. To withhold it anywhere in the world is unbecoming of this country.

On a moral basis, this country has a responsibility to always, always decide that the shipment of food and medicine is going to be available anywhere in the world and that we are not going to have embargoes that include the withholding of medicines in the world. Dictators will always get something to eat and medicines to treat their diseases. Our policy punishes the sick, hungry, and poor people. It ought to stop.

My own bill I introduce today for myself, Senators ROBERTS, BAUCUS, and DURBIN simply rescinds those provisions of the FY 2001 Agriculture Appropriations Act that tightened sanctions on Cuba.

I know I have been on the floor a lot talking about these issues, but I feel strongly about them. We have the opportunity in this Congress to undo what we did last year—undo the bad parts. We did make some progress last year. Yes, we made some progress, but we did not undo what we did. I want to be unequivocal and plain, that nowhere in this world, anywhere, in our relationships in the world, will we use food or prescription drugs, or medicine, as a weapon. That would represent the best of this country’s instincts.

In my judgment, it will be accomplished when we have the opportunity to vote on it. The fact is, there are 70 or 80 votes in the Senate by people who believe in that position. We have just a few hard core folks that are still living in the fifties. They drive up here in new cars, wear new suits, but they are living in the fifties, serving in the Congress in 2001, still pushing policies that don’t work. A few people, a small cabal of people in this Congress, have probably considered raising a crop and be told that crop has no value. This is it. We should do, eliminate these kinds of sanctions and embargoes anywhere in the world.

Mr. President, I am happy to have introduced this today. I hope colleagues will carefully consider it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.
When Americans travel, they transmit our nation’s ideas and values. That is one reason why travel was permitted to the Soviet Union and is permitted to the People’s Republic of China. A tourist travel ban is simply counterproductive. Trade with Cuba is a very sensitive issue with reasonable, well-intentioned people on both sides. But it is an issue which must be addressed as globalization and the aggressive posture of America’s trade competitors increases. We cannot allow Cuba to use the embargo as the scapegoat on the altar of the cold war paradigm.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of Senator Dorgan’s bill that repeals the restrictions on food and medicine exports to Cuba and removes the legal stranglehold that has been put on liberalizing travel to Cuba.

In July of last year, I led a Senate delegation to Havana. It was a brief visit, but we had the opportunity to meet with a wide range of people and to assess the situation first-hand. We met with Fidel Castro. We spent three hours with a group of heroic dissidents who spent years in prison, yet have vowed to continue to rend Castro’s dissent. We also met with foreign ambassadors, cabinet ministers, and the leader of Cuba’s largest independent NGO.

I left Cuba more convinced than ever that we must end our outdated Cuba policy. Last year, I introduced legislation to end the embargo and begin the process of normalization of our relations with Cuba. I will reintroduce similar legislation this year.

The trade embargo of Cuba is a unilateral sanctions policy. Not even our closest allies support it. I have long opposed unilateral economic sanctions, unless our national security is at stake, and the Defense Department has concluded that Cuba represents no security threat to our nation.

Unilateral sanctions don’t work. They don’t change the behavior of the targeted country. But they do hurt our farmers and business people by preventing them from exporting, and then allowing our Japanese, European, and Canadian competitors happily to rush in to fill the gap.

Ironically, the U.S. embargo actually helps Castro. His economy is in shambles, yet the people’s rights are repressed. These are the direct results of Castro’s totally misguided economic, political, and social policies. Yet Fidel Castro is able to use the embargo as the scapegoat for Cuba’s misery. Absurd, but true.

We should lift the embargo. We should engage Cuba economically. The bill we are introducing today is a good first step. We tried to remove restrictions on food and medicine exports last year, but a small minority in the Congress prevented the will of the majority. And they compounded the damage by codifying restrictions on travel, that is, removing Presidential discretion to allow increased travel and promote people-to-people contact between Americans and Cuban citizens.

Removing the food and medicine restrictions won’t lead to a huge surge of American products into Cuba. But, today, Cuba’s imports come primarily from Europe and Asia. With free liberalization, U.S. products will replace some of those sales. Our agriculture producers will have the advantage of lower transportation costs and easier logistics. It will be a start.

Allowing for the expansion of travel will increase the exposure of the Cuban people to the United States. It will result in more travel by tourists, business people, students, artists, and scholars. It will bring us into closer contact with those who will be part of the leadership in post-Castro Cuba. It will spur more business, helping, even if only a little, the development of the private sector. Moreover, we need to restore the inherent right of Americans to travel anywhere.

The world has changed since the United States initiated this embargo forty years ago. I am not suggesting that we embrace Fidel Castro. But if we wait until he is completely gone from the scene before we start to develop normal relations with leaders and people in Cuba, the transition will be much harder on the Cuban people. Events in Cuba could easily escalate out of control and become a real danger to the United States.

I need to stress that a majority of members of Congress, in both the Senate and the House, supported these initial steps to end the embargo. By overwhelming votes in both Houses last year, we approved an end to unilateral sanctions on food and medicine exports to Cuba. But the will of the majority was stopped by a few members of Congress. This legislation will correct that.

I hope to see the day when American policy toward Cuba is no longer controlled by a small coterie of leaders in the Congress along with a few private groups, and, instead, our policy will serve the national interest. Today’s bill is a good first step.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 7
At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 7, a bill to improve public education for all children and support lifelong learning.

S. 9
At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 9, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief, and for other purposes.

S. 11
At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) was added as a cosponsor.
of S. 11, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the marriage penalty by providing that the income tax rate bracket amounts, and the amount of the standard deduction, for joint returns shall be twice the amount applicable to unmarried individuals, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 23, a bill to promote a new urban agenda, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 27, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 28, a bill to guarantee the right of all active duty military personnel, merchant mariners, and their dependents to vote in Federal, State, and local elections.

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 88, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an incentive to ensure that all Americans gain timely and equitable access to the Internet over current and future generations of broadband capability.

At the request of Ms. SNOKE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 104, a bill to require equitable coverage of prescription contraceptive drugs and devices, and contraceptive services under health plans.

At the request of Mr. CLELAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 126, a bill to authorize the President to present a gold medal on behalf of Congress to former President Jimmy Carter and his wife Rosalynn Carter in recognition of their service to the Nation.

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBADES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 132, a bill to amend the International Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that housing assistance provided under the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 be treated for purposes of the low-income housing credit in the same manner as comparable assistance.

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 135, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve payments for direct graduate medical education under the medicare program.

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was a cosponsor of S. J. Res. 1, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to voluntary school prayer.

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 13, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the need for Congress to enact a new farm bill during the last session of the 107th Congress.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT A COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP SHOULD BE ISSUED IN HONOR OF THE U.S.S. "WISCONSIN" AND ALL THOSE WHO SERVED ABOARD HER

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. KORT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCAIN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORKOWSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. WARBURGER) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 3

Whereas the U.S.S. Wisconsin served as a flagship during the World War II era and the Korean War; and
Whereas the U.S.S. Wisconsin was built in Philadelphia and commissioned on 7 December 1943, exactly two years after the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor. From the time President Roosevelt chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest, School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River. Some chose to name the vessel the Wisconsin, citizens from our immediate interest. School children volunteered to christen the battleship. Some Wisconsinites even recommended christening the Wisconsin with water taken straight from the Wisconsin River.
the trials she was at last ready for duty. On 7 July, the Wisconsin departed Norfolk, Virginia, on her way to war with the legendary Admiral William F. "Bull" Halsey and his 3rd Fleet. She came to the aid of U.S. Marines and infantry as they began their island-hopping campaign across the Western Pacific. Sherendezo with the Japanese resistance on Iwo Jima and Okinawa, then joining in the battle of Leyte Gulf. After that, the U.S.S. Wisconsin became part of Fast Carrier Task Force 38, joining in the attacks on the Philippines Islands, Saigon, Camranh Bay, Hong Kong, Canton, Hainan, and finally the Japanese home islands.

Following Japan's surrender, the Wisconsin headed home with five battle stars. Additionally, after nearly two years of service in the Pacific theater during World War II, the Wisconsin didn't lose one crewman or get hit. This is truly an amazing fact. After her service in World War II, she spent nearly two years in the Pacific as a training ship. She entered Norfolk on 1 July 1948, was taken out of commission, in reserve, and assigned to the Norfolk Group of the Atlantic Reserve Fleet. However, her rest was short as the Korean War reawakened the Wisconsin and her sister battleships. She departed Norfolk on 25 October 1951, bound for the Pacific where she became the flagship of the 7th Fleet. When the Korean War broke out, future Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, Jr., served as the Wisconsin's navigator and extolled her "versatility, maneuverability, strength, and power." During the conflict, she covered troop landings; fired upon enemy troops, trains, and bridges all along the Korean coastline; and attacked important North Korean ports in Hungnam, Wonsan, and Songjin. In April 1952, she headed to Long Beach, CA, with yet another battle star.

After departing Long Beach and arriving in Norfolk, the Wisconsin received her second overhaul at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard where she underwent an extensive overhaul. On 1 July 1948, she received her second overhaul at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard. Following a number of peacetime and diplomatic voyages showing the flag, she returned to Norfolk on 11 March 1954 for a brief overhaul before taking on her role as a training ship.

Surprisingly, it was during her service as a training ship that the Wisconsin received the greatest damage. On 6 May 1956, as she was cruising off the Virginia Capes in heavy fog, she collided with the destroyer U.S.S. Eaton. The Wisconsin returned to Norfolk with extensive damage to the bow, and a week later found herself back in the Norfolk Naval Shipyard. Shipyard workers fitted a 120-ton, 68-foot bow section from the unfinished Iowa-class battleship Kentucky. Working round-the-clock, Wisconsin's ship force and shipyard personnel completed the operation in just 16 days.

On 28 June 1956, the ship was once again ready for service. Over the next two years she steamed from Norfolk five more times before heading for Philadelphia and deactivation. For the next nearly two years of service in the Pacific theater during World War II, the Wisconsin remained on inactive status until 1986, when she was towed to Ingalls Shipbuilding in Pascagoula, Mississippi. In 1988, the U.S.S. Wisconsin was re-commissioned for a third time. In 1991, she led the Navy's surface attack on Iraq during the Gulf War and on 17 January fired her first tomahawk missile in the Persian Gulf War. Following her service, she was honored by leading the "Parade of Ships" for the Fleet Week celebration in New York Harbor.

On 7 December 2000, 57 years to the day after she was commissioned, the U.S.S. Wisconsin arrived at Nauticus, the National Maritime Center in Norfolk, Virginia, arriving at a daylong salute featuring a flyover with F-14s and a 21-gun salute. At Nauticus, she serves as a floating monument and, in April of this year, will once again serve the public when she opens her deck as an educational museum. I wish she had found her final port in the great state of Wisconsin, but getting her there simply isn't possible—she's just too big.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will help me and the senior Senator from Wisconsin honor this great ship with a commemorative stamp.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURkowski. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Wednesday, January 31, 2001 at 9:30 a.m. in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The title of this oversight hearing is "California's Electricity Crisis and Implications for the West."

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, SRC-2 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510-6150.

For further information, please call Trici Heninger at (202) 224-7875.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Wednesday, January 24, 2001, at 9:30 a.m. on the Nomination of Norman Mineta to be Secretary of Transportation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 24, 2001, for purposes of conducting a Full Committee business meeting which is scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this business meeting is to consider the nomination of Gale Norton to be Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet for a hearing on the nomination of Elaine Chao to be Secretary of Labor during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 24, 2001, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a markup on Wednesday, January 24, 2001, at 10 a.m. The markup will take place in Dirksen Room 226.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 105 (adopted April 13, 1899), as amended by S. Res. 149 (adopted October 5, 1993), as amended by Public Law 105-273, further amended by S. Res. 75 (adopted March 25, 1998), and S. Res. 383 (adopted October 27, 2000), the appointment of the following Senators to serve as members of the Senate National Security Working Group for the 107th Congress:

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BING (Democratic Administrative Co-Chairman)),

The Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN (Democratic Co-Chairman)),

The Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN (Democratic Co-Chairman)),

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY),

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBAVES),

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY),

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN),

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), and
The Senator from Florida (Mr. Nelson).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 90–97, appoints the following Senators to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:

The Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Dodd)
The Senator from Florida (Mr. Graham)
The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Feingold), and
The Senator from New York (Mrs. Clinton).

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veteran’s Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 145 and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 11:30 a.m. on Thursday, January 25. I further ask unanimous consent that on Thursday immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the majority leader be immediately recognized to offer for the RECORD the majority party’s committee assignments for the 107th Congress; following that action, a brief statement by Senator Biden and Senator Allen for not to exceed 10 minutes each, with the Senate to then automaticallystand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday, January 29, 2001.

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

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I further ask unanimous consent that on Monday immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and there be a period for the transaction of morning business until 2 p.m. with the first hour under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee and the hour from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. under the control of the Republican leader or his designee.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. On Monday, at 2 p.m., the Senate will begin debate on the nomination of Gale Norton to be Secretary of the Interior. Tuesday morning, the Senate will conduct debate on the nomination of Elaine Chao to be Secretary of Labor and Governor Whitman to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

As a reminder to all Senators, the next rollcall votes will occur on Tuesday, January 30, beginning at 2:45 p.m. in a back-to-back sequence. Following those back-to-back votes, the Senate will then begin debate on the nomination of Senator Ashcroft to be Attorney General of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:41 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 25, 2001, at 11:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24, 2001:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Norman Y. Mineta, of California, to be Secretary of Transportation.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 24, 2001:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Tommy G. Thompson, of Wisconsin, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Norman Y. Mineta, of California, to be Secretary of Transportation.
SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 25, 2001 may be found in the Daily Digest of today’s RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 30

9 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold an organizational business meeting to consider committee budget resolution, rules of procedure for the 107th Congress, and subcommittee assignments; to be followed by hearings to review the final report of the 21st Century Commission on Production Agriculture.

SH–216

10 a.m.
Budget
To hold hearings to examine the current state of the United States economy.

SD–608
HIGHLIGHTS

Senate confirmed the nominations of Tommy G. Thompson, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, and Norman Y. Mineta, to be Secretary of Transportation.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S507–S555

Measures Introduced: Sixteen bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 161–176, and S. Con. Res. 3.

Page S527

Nominations Considered: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for consideration of the nominations of Gale Ann Norton, of Colorado, to be Secretary of the Interior, on Monday, January 29, 2001 at 2 p.m., and Tuesday, January 30, 2001 at 10:30 a.m.; Christine Todd Whitman, of New Jersey, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, on Tuesday, January 30, 2001 at 10 a.m.; and Elaine Chao, to be Secretary of Labor, on Tuesday, January 30, 2001 at 2:15 p.m.; to be followed by votes on confirmation of the aforementioned nominations beginning at 2:45 p.m.

Pages S552–53

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By unanimous vote of 100 yeas (Vote No. EX. 4), Tommy G. Thompson, of Wisconsin, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services.

By unanimous vote of 100 yeas (Vote No. EX. 5), Norman Y. Mineta, of California, to be Secretary of Transportation.

Pages S515–19, S555

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nomination:

Norman Y. Mineta, of California, to be Secretary of Transportation.

Page S555

Communications:

Pages S525–27

Executive Reports of Committees:

Page S527

Statements on Introduced Bills:

Pages S527–52

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S552–53

Authority for Committees:

Page S554

Additional Statements:

Page S525

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—5)

Page S519

Adjournment: Senate met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:41 p.m., until 11:30 a.m., on Thursday, January 25, 2001. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S555.)
Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Norman Y. Mineta, of California, to be Secretary of Transportation.

Prior to this action, Committee concluded hearings on the nomination of Norman Y. Mineta, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators Boxer and Inouye and Representative Dreier, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

NOMINATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Gale Ann Norton, of Colorado, to be Secretary of the Interior.

NOMINATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee began consideration of the nomination of John D. Ashcroft, of Missouri, to be Attorney General of the United States, but did not complete action thereon, and recessed subject to call.

NOMINATION

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded hearings on the nomination of Elaine L. Chao, of Kentucky, to be Secretary of Labor, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators Leahy, McConnell and Bunning, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
11:30 a.m., Thursday, January 25

 Senate Chamber
Program for Thursday: Majority Leader will be recognized to offer for the Record the majority party committee assignments for the 107th Congress.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
2 p.m., Tuesday, January 30

 House Chamber
Program for Tuesday: To be announced.