

(Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 466, a bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to fully fund 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure for programs under part B of such Act.

S. 556

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 556, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to reduce emissions from electric powerplants, and for other purposes.

S. 561

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 561, a bill to provide that the same health insurance premium conversion arrangements afforded to Federal employees be made available to Federal annuitants and members and retired members of the uniformed services.

S. 570

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 570, a bill to establish a permanent Violence Against Women Office at the Department of Justice.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) were added as cosponsors of S. 582, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option to cover certain legal immigrants under the medicaid and State children's health insurance program.

S. 677

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 677, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the required use of certain principal repayments on mortgage subsidy bond financing to redeem bonds, to modify the purchase price limitation under mortgage subsidy bond rules based on median family income, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 677, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 677, *supra*.

S. 718

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 718, a bill to direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology to establish a program to support research and training in methods of detecting the use of performance-enhancing drugs by athletes, and for other purposes.

S. 830

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S.

830, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to make grants for the development and operation of research centers regarding environmental factors that may be related to the etiology of breast cancer.

S. 839

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of payment for inpatient hospital services under the medicare program and to freeze the reduction in payments to hospitals for indirect costs of medical education.

S. 847

At the request of Mr. DAYTON, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 847, a bill to impose tariff-rate quotas on certain casein and milk protein concentrates.

S. 860

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 860, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain expenses of rural letter carriers.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 866, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a national media campaign to reduce and prevent underage drinking in the United States.

S. 906

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 906, a bill to provide for protection of gun owner privacy and ownership rights, and for other purposes.

S. 920

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 920, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against income tax to individuals who rehabilitate historic homes or who are the first purchasers of rehabilitated historic homes for use as a principal residence.

S. 926

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 926, a bill to prohibit the importation of any article that is produced, manufactured, or grown in Burma.

S. RES. 117

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Delaware

(Mr. BIDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 117, a resolution honoring John J. Downing, Brian Fahey, and Harry Ford, who lost their lives in the course of duty as firefighters.

S. CON. RES. 9

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 9, a concurrent resolution condemning the violence in East Timor and urging the establishment of an international war crimes tribunal for prosecuting crimes against humanity that occurred during that conflict.

S. CON. RES. 34

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 34, a concurrent resolution congratulating the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the tenth anniversary of the reestablishment of their full independence.

S. CON. RES. 53

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 53, concurrent resolution encouraging the development of strategies to reduce hunger and poverty, and to promote free market economies and democratic institutions, in sub-Saharan Africa.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DODD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER and Mrs. BOXER).

S. 1107. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prevent discrimination based on participation in labor disputes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I, along with 15 of my colleagues are introducing a bill today that addresses an issue we haven't talked enough about in the Senate in recent years—but it's a critically important issue that we cannot continue to ignore.

I'm talking about workers' rights—specifically the erosion of a worker's fundamental right to strike, to protect that right.

Today, we are introducing the Workplace Fairness Act. This may sound familiar to many of my colleagues here in the Senate. It was a bill my good friend and former colleague Senator Howard Metzenbaum from Ohio introduced in the 102nd and 103rd congress.

The Workplace Fairness Act would amend the National Labor Relations

Act and the Railway Labor Act by prohibiting employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike. It would also make it an unfair labor practice for an employer to refuse to allow a striking worker who has made an unconditional offer to return to go back to work.

Why do we need this legislation?

Because right now, a right to strike is a right to be permanently replaced—to lose your job. Every cut-rate, cut-throat employer knows they can break a union if they are willing to play hardball and ruin the lives of the people who have made their company what it is. In my own state of Iowa—Titan Tire Company out of Des Moines, is trying to drive out the union workers with permanent replacements—the union has been on strike for three years now.

Over the past two decades, workers' right to strike has too often been undermined by the destructive practice of hiring permanent replacement workers. Since the 1980s, permanent replacements have been used again and again to break unions and to shift the balance between workers and management.

Titan Tire just outside is just one of many examples.

On May 1, 1998, the 650 members of the United Steelworkers of America, Local 164, who work in Des Moines Titan Tire plant, were forced into an Unfair Labor Practice Strike.

During the contract negotiations preceding this strike, Titan International Inc. President and CEO, Morry Taylor, attempted to eliminate pension and medical benefits and illegally move jobs and equipment out of the plant. He also forced employees to work excessive mandatory overtime, sometimes working people as many as 26 days in a row without a day off.

Well, the membership decided that Titan's final offer was impossible to accept, and they voted to strike. Two months later, in July, 1998, Titan began hiring permanent replacement workers.

During the past three years, approximately 500 permanent replacement workers have been hired at the Des Moines plant. And little or no progress has been made toward reaching a fair settlement. In fact on April 30, 2000, the day before the second anniversary of the Titan strike, Morrie Taylor predicted that the strike would never be settled.

Workers deserve better than this. Workers aren't disposable assets that can be thrown away when labor disputes arise.

When we considered this legislation in 1994, the Senate labor and Human Resources Committee heard poignant testimony about the emotional and financial hardships caused by hiring permanent replacement workers. We heard about workers losing their homes; going without health insurance because of the high costs of COBRA coverage; feeling useless when they were

permanently replaced after years of loyal service.

The right to strike—which we all know is a last resort since no worker takes the financial risk of a strike lightly—is fundamental to preserving workers' rights to bargain for better wages and better working conditions. Without the right to strike, workers forgo their fair share of bargaining power.

Permanent striker replacement not only affects the workers who were replaced. It affects other workers in competing companies. When one employer in an industry breaks a union, hires permanent replacements, and cuts salaries and benefits, it affects all the other companies in the industry. Now they either have to find a way to compete with the low-wages and shoddy benefits of a cut-rate, cut-throat business—or they have to follow suit.

Also, workers faced with being replaced are forced to make a choice. They can either stay with the union and fight for their jobs, or they can cross the picket line to avoid losing the jobs they've held for ten or twenty or thirty years.

Is this a free choice, as some of our colleagues would suggest? Or is this blackmail that takes away the rights and the dignity of the workers of this country? What does it mean to tell workers, "you have the right to strike"—when we allow them to be summarily fired for exercising that right?

In reality, there is no legal right to strike today. And because there is no legal right to strike, there is no legal right to bargain collectively. And since there is no legal right to bargain collectively, there is no level playing field between workers and management.

In other words, Management gets to say that you must bargain on their terms—or find some other place to work. If you're permanently replaced, that means you're out of work; you lose all your pension rights; you lose your seniority; you lose your job forever.

How did this happen? We've got to go back to the 1930's for the answer.

In response to widespread worker abuses—and union busting—Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act—the Wagner Act—in 1935 and it was signed into law by President Roosevelt. The Wagner Act guarantees workers the right to organize and bargain collectively and strike if necessary. It makes it illegal for companies to interfere with these rights. In fact, it specifies the right to strike and states: 'Nothing in this act—except as specifically provided herein—shall be construed so as to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike.'

In 1938, the Supreme Court dealt the Wagner Act a mortal blow in the case National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) versus Mackay Radio and Telegraph Co. In that case, the Court said that Mackay Radio could hire perma-

nent replacement workers for those engaged in an economic strike.

There are two types of strikes: economic and unfair labor practices. Employers must rehire employees in unfair labor practice strikes. The NLRB determines if the strike is economic or based on unfair labor practices. Unions cannot know in advance whether NLRB will rule that their employer has engaged in unfair labor practices. So any employee participating in a strike runs a risk of permanently losing his or her job.

What's interesting is that following the Court's ruling, companies did not take advantage of this loophole until the 1980s. Before then, they recognized that doing that would upset this level playing field. For almost 40 years, management rarely hired permanent replacements.

That began to change in the 1980s. Since then, hiring permanent replacements has become a routine practice to break unions and shift the balance between workers and management.

Again, the Workplace Fairness Act would restore the fundamental principle of fair labor-management relations—the right of workers to strike without having to fear losing their jobs.

Permanent striker replacement keeps us from moving forward as a nation into an era of high-wage, high-skilled, highly productive jobs in the global marketplace. Without the right to strike, workers' rights will continue to erode. The result will be fewer incentives and less motivation to produce good work, and companies will also suffer with less quality in their products.

Obviously, this legislation won't be adopted this year. But we are introducing it today to signal my intent on raising it and other fundamental labor law reforms in the next session of Congress. It's time for us to level the playing field for hard-working Americans.

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. 1107

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

SECTION 1. PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION DURING AND AT THE CONCLUSION OF LABOR DISPUTES.

Section 8(a) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting " ; or"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6)(i) to offer, or to grant, the status of a permanent replacement employee to an individual for performing bargaining unit work for the employer during a labor dispute; or

"(ii) to otherwise offer, or grant, an individual any employment preference based on the fact that such individual was employed, or indicated a willingness to be employed, during a labor dispute over an individual who—

“(A) was an employee of the employer at the commencement of the dispute;

“(B) has exercised the right to join, to assist, or to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection through the labor organization involved in the dispute; and

“(C) is working for, or has unconditionally offered to return to work for, the employer.”

SEC. 2. PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION DURING AND AT THE CONCLUSION OF RAILWAY LABOR DISPUTES.

Paragraph Fourth of section 2 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 152) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a)” after “Fourth.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) No carrier, or officer or agent of the carrier, shall—

“(1) offer, or grant, the status of a permanent replacement employee to an individual for performing work in a craft or class for the carrier during a dispute involving the craft or class; or

“(2) otherwise offer, or grant, an individual any employment preference based on the fact that such individual was employed, or indicated a willingness to be employed, during a dispute over an individual who—

“(A) was an employee of the carrier at the commencement of the dispute;

“(B) has exercised the right to join, to organize, to assist in organizing, or to bargain collectively through the labor organization involved in the dispute; and

“(C) is working for, or has unconditionally offered to return to work for, the carrier.”

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my good friend Senator HARKIN as an original cosponsor of the Workplace Fairness Act of 2001. This measure, along with the “Right to Organize Act of 2001,” which I introduced yesterday, are two of the most important pieces of legislation that will come before the Senate this year.

Together, these measures strengthen workers’ rights to organize, to join a union, and to advocate for fair collective bargaining and fair agreements. Together, these measures produce the basic platform for healthy economies, healthy communities, and healthy families.

Specifically, the Striker Replacement Act is designed to combat an unfair labor practice which strikes at the very heart of the collective bargaining process in this country: the permanent replacement of striking workers. The goal of this Act is to restore the labor-management balance in today’s workplace by preventing the fundamental right to strike from being transformed into a right to be fired.

The record shows that permanent replacement of striking workers has been used increasingly over the years. Private sector employers, emboldened by the Reagan Administration’s permanent replacement of striking Federal employees in the early 1980’s, began to use the permanent replacement of striking workers as a means of abrogating collective bargaining agreements and bringing in new hires often screened for their anti-union biases.

The process is fairly simple: require major and unreasonable concessions of a union; force them to strike; permanently replace them with workers un-

sympathetic to the union; and move to decertify the union. This should be called what it is: outright union busting. And it should not be tolerated.

The purpose of the Railway Labor Act and the National Labor Relations Act was to respond to the persistent—and sometimes violent—denial by certain employers of the right to organize and bargain collectively. The resulting strikes and other forms of industrial unrest in the 1930’s were held by the courts to have severely burdened free and open commerce across the country. As a result, the Railway Labor Act and the National Labor Relations Act were passed, guided by two fundamental principles: 1. Employees have a right to pursue their interests collectively without fear of employer reprisals, and 2. Questions about representation must be separated from substantive issues in dispute. Government-supervised procedure should be established to ensure fair representation; while collective bargaining should be the forum for settling the remaining substantive disputes.

This system and these principles are sound. Workers have a right to organize without being retaliated against for exercising that right. And they have a right to negotiate wages, benefits, and other items through collective bargaining.

But these principles only work if the right to strike, in the words of the National Labor Relations Act, is not “interfered with or impeded or diminished in any way.” In 1938, the Supreme Court in the Mackay Radio case cut a huge swath through these guiding principles by creating the striker replacement doctrine. Under this doctrine, affirmed in subsequent decisions, such as *Belknap v. Hale* (1983) and *TWA v. IFFA* (1989), even though it is unlawful to fire a striking worker, it is not unlawful to permanently replace him or her.

The distinction between firing and permanent replacement, is ludicrous—and it is untenable. The central practical reality—as any man or woman who has exercised his or her right to strike and has paid the consequences can tell you—in either case, whether it is called a firing or a permanent replacement—the employee loses their job because he or she has exercised the right to strike. That’s the reality. That’s the harsh reality.

The measure we are introducing today is a simple one. It does two things: 1. It amends the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prohibit employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike, or giving employment preference to cross over employees, and 2. It makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer to refuse to allow a striking worker to return to work if that worker has unconditionally offered to return to work.

It’s that simple. These are fundamental protections. These are protections that are part of the basic com-

pact with the American worker created by the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act. It is long past time that workers seeking to better their lives, their families, and their communities are given access to a collective bargaining process that is fair and even-handed. It is long past time that workers be allowed to advocate for reasonable terms and conditions of their employment without fear of devastating retribution.

Finally, this measure not only meets the needs of workers, their families, and their communities, it also serves the interest of our nation in a global economy. As others have pointed out, if we are to remain strong and competitive as a nation, we must develop a highly motivated and skilled workforce and we must create stable worker-employer relationships that are based on mutual respect and a mutual commitment to a joint economic enterprise. This will only happen if we level the playing field and support a just, sound, and effective collective bargaining process.

This measure, the Workplace Fairness Act, is one key to achieving these goals. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1108. A bill to authorize the transfer and conveyance of real property at the Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President. I rise today with my colleague from Maine to introduce legislation facilitating the land conveyance at Winter Harbor, ME.

First, may I note that this bill is the product of countless hours of hard work and deliberation by the communities it affects—Winter Harbor and Gouldsboro—the State of Maine, and the Maine Delegation. I would like to thank those involved: Chairmen Stan Torrey and Tom Mayor and members of the Gouldsboro and Winter Harbor Base Reuse Committees; Jean Marshall, the Defense Conversion Coordinator for Eastern Maine Development; Linda Pagels and Roger Barto, Town Managers for Gouldsboro and Winter Harbor; and Commander Edwin Williamson, Commanding Officer of Naval Security Group Activity Winter Harbor, for their efforts in crafting legislation that all concerned can support.

The Navy has been a strong and supportive presence in the Winter Harbor region since the establishment of their facility over 80 years ago. What started as one man’s patriotic efforts in World War I to establish a radio station for transatlantic communications developed into a complex network of sophisticated equipment that became Winter Harbor Naval Security Group Activity. Throughout the two World Wars and subsequent Cold War, the men and women stationed at Winter Harbor provided invaluable services in our Nation’s defense.

Maine and the Navy have always had a special relationship, and that relationship extended to Winter Harbor. The base and community embraced one another and developed a good neighbor relationship seldom seen between a military installation and the surrounding community. For both sides, it was truly a win-win situation. The sailors and their families enjoyed the hospitality of Maine while the towns of Winter harbor and Gouldsboro economically benefited from the Navy's presence.

Unfortunately, the advent of new technology has made the equipment and mission of Winter Harbor obsolete. With the announcement that the Winter Harbor Naval Activity would close in June 2002, the communities began the laborious process of planning for life without the good neighbors of Winter Harbor NSGA.

With this base closing, Maine will lose an economic base it has depended on for over 80 years. At its high point, Winter Harbor had approximately 250 sailors, 140 civilian employees, and their family members in residence and the base became an economic focal point for the region with an estimated \$11 to \$15 million being contributed to the local economy on an annual basis.

To offset this impending loss, the towns applied for and received a small Economic Development Administration Defense Conversion Planning Grant in the amount of \$200,000. While these funds proved crucial to the start of the reuse process, many needs still remain unmet. This legislation is intended to address some of those needs and to minimize the financial consequences of the base closure.

The towns of Winter Harbor and Gouldsboro are not looking for charity. As you will see, this legislation's intent is to reimburse the towns for infrastructure improvements made at the Navy's behest and to provide the means for the region to restore its economic viability.

As I mentioned earlier, the Maine Delegation has been working with the local communities, the State, Navy, and National Park Service to develop a comprehensive plan for reuse of the property and facilities. The primary facilities at Winter Harbor are located on a beautiful and breathtaking portion of the Maine coastline known as Schoodic Point. Once the base closes, this legislation dictates that the Schoodic Point property will shift to the Department of the Interior's jurisdiction for inclusion in Acadia National Park.

In preparation for this property transfer, the National Park Service has initiated a plan to establish a Research and Education Center at the site. This center will host educational programs and private and public research facilities, becoming a source for meaningful employment and economic generation for the communities. However, the National Park Service effort will not be achieved overnight and, like all programs, requires adequate funding.

As such, this legislation was drafted to include financial provisions to ease and expedite this transition as well as to reimburse the community for local services and infrastructure improvements.

In closing, I would like to thank all of those in the local communities, the State of Maine, the Navy, and the National Park Service and, of course, my colleagues from the Maine Delegation for their assistance in crafting this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this initiative and allow the good people of Winter Harbor and Gouldsboro to make the most of this unique base reuse opportunity.

I ask unanimous consent 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. 1108

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

SECTION 1. LAND TRANSFER AND CONVEYANCE, NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY, WINTER HARBOR, MAINE.

(a) TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OF SCHOODIC POINT PROPERTY AUTHORIZED.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may transfer, without consideration, to the Secretary of the Interior administrative jurisdiction of a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon and appurtenances thereto, consisting of approximately 26 acres as generally depicted as Tract 15-116 on the map entitled "Acadia National Park Schoodic Point Area", numbered 123/80,418 and dated May 2001. The map shall be on file and available for inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(2) The transfer authorized by this subsection shall occur, if at all, concurrently with the reversion of administrative jurisdiction of a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 71 acres, as depicted as Tract 15-115 on the map referred to in paragraph (1), from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior as authorized by Public Law 80-260 (61 Stat. 519) and to be executed on or about June 30, 2002.

(b) CONVEYANCE OF COREA AND WINTER HARBOR PROPERTIES AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Navy may convey, without consideration, to the State of Maine, any political subdivision of the State of Maine, or any tax-supported agency in the State of Maine, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any of the parcels of real property, including any improvements thereon and appurtenances thereto, consisting of approximately 485 acres and comprising the former facilities of the Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, located in Hancock County, Maine, except for the real property described in subsection (a)(1).

(c) TRANSFER OF PERSONAL PROPERTY.—The Secretary of the Navy shall transfer, without consideration, to the Secretary of the Interior in the case of the real property transferred under subsection (a), or to any recipient of such real property in the case of real property conveyed under subsection (b), any or all personal property associated with such real property so transferred or conveyed, including—

(1) the ambulances and any fire trucks or other firefighting equipment; and

(2) any personal property required to continue the maintenance of the infrastructure of such real property, including the generators and an uninterrupted power supply in building 154 at the Corea site.

(d) MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTY PENDING CONVEYANCE.—The Secretary of the Navy shall maintain any real property, including any improvements thereon, appurtenances thereto, and supporting infrastructure, to be conveyed under subsection (b) in accordance with the protection and maintenance standards specified in section 101-47.4913 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations, until the earlier of—

(1) the date of the conveyance of such real property under subsection (b); or

(2) September 30, 2003.

(e) INTERIM LEASE.—(1) Until such time as any parcel of real property to be conveyed under subsection (b) is conveyed by deed under that subsection, the Secretary of the Navy may lease such parcel to any person or entity determined by the Secretary to be an appropriate lessee of such parcel.

(2) The amount of rent for a lease under paragraph (1) shall be the amount determined by the Secretary to be appropriate, and may be an amount less than the fair market value of the lease.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall credit any amount received for a lease of real property under paragraph (1) to the appropriation or account providing funds for the operation and maintenance of such property or for the procurement of utility services for such property. Amounts so credited shall be merged with funds in the appropriation or account to which credited, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as the funds with which merged.

(f) REIMBURSEMENT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER ASSESSMENTS.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may require each recipient of real property conveyed under subsection (b) to reimburse the Secretary for the costs incurred by the Secretary for any environmental assessment, study, or analysis carried out by the Secretary with respect to such property before completing the conveyance under that subsection.

(2) The amount of any reimbursement required under paragraph (1) shall be determined by the Secretary, but may not exceed the cost of the assessment, study, or analysis for which reimbursement is required.

(3) Section 2695(c) of title 10, United States Code, shall apply to any amount received by the Secretary under this subsection.

(g) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property transferred under subsection (a), and each parcel of real property conveyed under subsection (b), shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy. The cost of any survey under the preceding sentence for real property conveyed under subsection (b) shall be borne by the recipient of the real property.

(h) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Navy may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with any conveyance under subsection (b), and any lease under subsection (e), as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

The Secretary of Defense shall transfer to the Secretary of the Interior amounts as follows:

(1) \$5,000,000 for purposes of capital investments for the development of a research and education center at Acadia National Park, Maine.

(2) \$1,400,000 for purposes of operation and maintenance activities at Acadia National Park Maine.

SEC. 3. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR TOWN OF WINTER HARBOR.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy

shall, by grant, provide financial assistance to the Town of Winter Harbor, Maine (in this subsection referred to as the "Town"), in each of fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2004, for the purpose of reimbursing the Town for costs incurred in making improvements to the water and sewer systems of the Town for the benefit of the Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, located in Hancock County, Maine.

(2) The amount of the grant under paragraph (1) in fiscal year 2002 shall be \$68,000.

(3) The amount of the grant under paragraph (1) in each of fiscal years 2003 and 2004 shall be the amount, not to exceed \$68,000, jointly determined by the Secretary and the Town to be appropriate to reimburse the Town as described in that paragraph in the applicable fiscal year.

(b) GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICT.—(1) The Secretary shall, by grant, provide financial assistance to the School Administrative District (SAD) operating Sumner High School, Sullivan, Maine.

(2) The purpose of the grant is to offset the loss of impact aid under title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 that the local educational agency experienced for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 as a result of the closure of the Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine.

(3) The amount of the grant under paragraph (1) shall be \$86,000.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) TRANSFERS OF FUNDS TO DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2002, \$6,400,000 for purposes of the transfers of funds required by section 2.

(b) GRANTS.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of the Navy for purposes of the grants required by section 3, amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 2002, \$154,000.

(2) For each of fiscal years 2003 and 2004, such amounts as may be necessary.

(c) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated by this section for the Department of Defense, or for the Department of the Navy, for a fiscal year are in addition to any other amounts authorized to be appropriated for such Department for such fiscal year under any other provision of law.

(d) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated by this section for a fiscal year shall remain available until expended, without fiscal year limitation.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joining my distinguished colleague, Senator SNOWE, today in introducing this legislation, the Naval Security Group Activity at Winter Harbor Conveyance Act. This conveyance legislation will authorize the transfer of land, which has been under the control of the Naval Security Group for some seventy plus years back to the Department of the Interior, and to the State, ultimately to be put to good use by our local communities.

Over the past seven decades, the Navy has performed a key national security mission called Classic Wizard at Winter Harbor. The Navy has played a significant role in the economic development of the local communities as Maine residents and Navy personnel have supported this mission. As the requirement for the Classic Wizard mission at Winter Harbor is coming to an end, and as technology advances, this naval activity will be ending its ties to the base in the summer of 2002.

While the Navy will be missed, it has worked hand-in-hand with me and the other members of the Maine delegation, the Department of Interior, National Park Service, and our local communities in creating a viable economic development and reuse plan for the naval base and its associated property.

As part of its reuse plan for the site, the National Park Service has proposed developing a research and education center at the Schoodic Point. The center would accommodate and promote a variety of research activities including wildlife genetics and serve as a base for permanent and visiting scientists to conduct interdisciplinary research.

I worked with the National Park Service in the development of its proposal, and I have offered to help make the concept a reality. Maine Governor Angus King shares my support for the proposed research and learning center and has expressed the State's willingness to work as a partner in the effort to establish a wildlife genetics laboratory at the center. We believe that such a laboratory would generate good jobs and promote the region's economy. The work done at Schoodic Point also would compliment the world class research underway at other area facilities in the area such as The Jackson Laboratory, the Mount Desert Island Biological Laboratory, and the University of Maine's Cooperative Aquaculture Research Center.

The National Park Service's proposed reuse of the peninsula also includes an educational component that would promote the public's understanding of the important natural and cultural resources that are a part of our national park system. Moreover, those who have visited Schoodic would agree that the remarkably beautiful 100 acres are worthy of being a part of Acadia National Park, one of our Nation's greatest natural treasures.

It is important for the Federal Government to lend a hand to communities that are struggling to cope with the adverse effects of a base closure. Our legislation, which was developed in consultation with the local communities, the State, the Department of the Interior and the Navy, provides the options and opportunities that the region needs to move beyond the loss of the Naval Security Group Activity at Winter Harbor. I will work to secure approval of this bill by the Senate Armed Services committee and the full Senate.

By Mr. ENZI:

S. 1110. A bill to require that the area of a zip code number shall be located entirely within a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to announce the introduction of a bill that would help preserve the identity of American communities that have struggled with the United States Postal Service to acquire their own, individual zip codes. The bill would do this by prohibiting the Postal Service from

extending zip codes across State boundaries.

This bill was introduced in response to concerns raised by the community of Alta, WY. Alta is a small, rural town situated next to the Wyoming-Idaho border at the western base of the Grand Teton Mountains. Because of treacherous travel conditions to the east of Alta, the Postal Service made the decision to serve Alta residents out of the post office in neighboring Driggs, ID. Alta is isolated from other parts of Wyoming and it simply would be too dangerous to require the Postal Service to cross the Teton mountain range in the winter to deliver mail to Alta. In providing this service, however, the post office has not provided Alta residents their own zip code at the Driggs post office, but has required them to use the Driggs zip code even though Alta residents live in an entirely different State.

While this may not seem like a big deal on its face, there are a number of technical complications that arise in the lives of Alta residents because the Postal Service has not been willing to extend the courtesy of an Alta zip code.

By requiring Alta residents to use the Driggs zip code, the Postal Service has created a lot of confusion for Alta residents who attempt to conduct business with mail order companies. What sales tax do they pay? Idaho or Wyoming? Although the Postal Service maintains that zip codes are not used to identify specific locations, other companies use zip codes as an important location code that is necessary to adequately conduct their business. Sales tax is often programmed by zip code, so are car insurance rates, life insurance, homeowner's insurance, even our Federal and State income taxes use zip codes as an indicator of when and where to pay taxes.

The requirements of this bill will not be onerous for the Postal Service to implement. It will not require the service to build new facilities or even to change its method of operations. All it will do is require the Postal Service to identify those communities whose mail service crosses State boundaries and to assign them the necessary identification number that they need to provide the rest of the world a clear and concise description of where they live and who they are.

I urge my colleagues to support this most important legislation.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BURNS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HELMS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LUGAR, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. REED, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr.

SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1111. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to authorize the National Rural Development Partnership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture Nutrition and Forestry.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise today with Senator CONRAD to introduce the National Rural Development Partnership Act of 2001—a bill to codify the National Rural Development Partnership, NRDP or the Partnership, and provided a funding source for the program, I am pleased that Senators ALLARD, BAUCUS, BINGAMAN, BURNS, COLLINS, CRAPO, DASCHLE, DAYTON, DORGAN, ENZI, GRAMM, GRASSLEY, HAGEL, HELMS, HUTCHISON, JEFFORDS, JOHNSON, KENNEDY, KERRY, LEAHY, LUGAR, MIKULSKI, MURRAY, BEN NELSON, REED, ROBERTS, SARBANES, BOB SMITH, GORDON SMITH, THOMAS, and WELLSTONE are joining us as original cosponsors.

The Partnership was established under the Bush administration in 1990, by Executive Order 12720. Although the partnership has existed for ten years, it has never been formally authorized by Congress. The current basis for the existence of the partnership is found in the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act of 1972 and the Rural Development Policy Act of 1980. In addition, the conference committee report on the 1996 federal farm bill created specific responsibilities and expectations for the partnership and State rural development councils, SRDCs.

The partnership is a nonpartisan interagency working group whose mission is to “contribute to the vitality of the Nation by strengthening the ability of all rural Americans to participate in determining their futures.” The NRDP and SRDCs do something no other entities do: facilitate collaboration among federal agencies and between Federal agencies and State, local, and tribal governments and the private and non-profit sectors to increase coordination of programs and services to rural areas. When successful, these efforts result in more efficient use of limited rural development resources and actually add value to the efforts and dollars of others.

On March 8, 2000, the Subcommittee on Forestry, Conservation, and Rural Revitalization, which I chaired, held an oversight hearing on the operations and accomplishments of the NRDP and SRDCs. The subcommittee heard from a number of witnesses, including officials of the U.S. Departments of Agriculture, Transportation, and Health and Human Services, State agencies, and private sector representatives. The hearing established the need for some legislative foundation and consistent funding. The legislation we introduced last year and are reintroducing this Congress accomplishes just that.

This legislation formally recognizes the existence and operations of the partnership, the National Rural Development

Coordinating Committee, NRDC, and SRDCs. In addition, the legislation gives specific responsibilities to each component of the Partnership and authorizes it to receive congressional appropriations.

Specifically, the bill formally establishes the NRDP and indicates it is composed of the NRDC and SRDCs. NRDP is established for empowering and building the capacity of rural communities, encouraging participation in flexible and innovative methods of addressing the challenges of rural areas, and encouraging all those involved in the partnership to be fully engaged and to share equally in decisionmaking. This legislation also identifies the role of the Federal Government in the partnership as being that of partner, coach, and facilitator. Federal agencies are called upon to designate senior-level officials to participate in the NRDC and to encourage field staff to participate in SRDCs. Federal agencies are also authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with, and to provide grants and other assistance to, State rural development councils, regardless of the form of legal organization of a State rural development council.

The composition of the NRDC is specified as being one representative from each Federal agency with rural responsibilities, and governmental and non-governmental for-profit and non-profit organizations that elect to participate in the NRDC. The legislation outlines the duties of the council as being to provide support to SRDCs; facilitate coordination among Federal agencies and between the Federal, State, local and tribal governments and private organizations; enhance the effectiveness, responsiveness, and delivery of Federal Government programs; gather and provide to Federal agencies information about the impact of government programs on rural areas; review and comment on policies, regulations, and proposed legislation; provide technical assistance to SRDCs; and develop strategies for eliminating administrative and regulatory impediments. Federal agencies do have the ability to opt out of participation in the council, but only if they can show how they can more effectively serve rural areas without participating in the partnership and council.

This legislation provides that states may participate in the partnership by entering into a memorandum of understanding with USDA to establish an SRDC. SRDCs are required to operate in a nonpartisan and nondiscriminatory manner and to reflect the diversity of the States within which they are organized. The duties of the SRDCs are to facilitate collaboration among government agencies at all levels and the private and non-profit sectors; to enhance the effectiveness, responsiveness, and delivery of Federal and State Government programs; to gather information about rural areas in its State and share it with the NRDC and other entities; to monitor and report on poli-

cies and programs that address, or fail to address, the needs of rural areas; to facilitate the formulation of needs assessments for rural areas and participate in the development of the criteria for the distribution of Federal funds to rural areas; to provide comments to the NRDC and others on policies, regulations, and proposed legislation; assist the NRDC in developing strategies for reducing or eliminating impediments; to hire an executive director and support staff; and to fundraise.

As I have stated before, this legislation authorizes the partnership to receive appropriations as well as authorizing and encouraging federal agencies to make grants and provide other forms of assistance to the partnership and authorizing the partnership to accept private contributions. The SRDCs are required to provide at least a 33-percent match for funds it receives as a result of its cooperative agreement with the Federal Government.

As you know, too many parts of rural America have not shared in the boom that has brought great prosperity to urban America. We need to do more to ensure that rural citizens will have opportunities similar to those enjoyed by urban areas. To do so, we do not necessarily need new government programs. Instead, we must do a better job of coordinating the many programs available from USDA and other Federal agencies that can benefit rural communities. With the passage of this legislation, the NRDP and SRDCs will be better situated to provide that much needed coordination.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator LARRY CRAIG and 31 of our colleagues today in the introduction of the National Rural Development Partnership Act of 2001. This bill is similar to S. 3175 which Senator CRAIG and I sponsored last year during the 106th Congress. I am pleased that so many members from both sides of the aisle have recognized the importance of this measure by agreeing to join as original cosponsors.

The National Rural Development Partnership had its origin in Executive Order 12720, issued by President George H. Bush in 1990. Through the issuance of this order, the U.S. Department of Agriculture was assigned the responsibilities of creating the partnership and providing assistance to States that wish to form rural development partnerships. The intent of the legislation is the same. At least 40 States have now formed partnership councils to coordinate rural development activities of Federal, State, local, and tribal governments with private and non-profit organizations, to address community and economic development needs, and to coordinate community and job building activities in rural areas. The funding for these activities has been voluntary from various Federal agencies, including the Departments of Health and Human Services, Labor, Transportation, Veterans, and state

agencies. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has historically provided the largest single amount.

The needs of rural America are great. The demands on the Federal budget are also great. If we are to make optimum use of hard-to-find Federal, State, local, and private resources in rural areas, it is imperative that we find ways to coordinate development activities. This legislation does that. It formally authorizes National Rural Development Councils and also authorizes appropriations for this program.

The existing partnerships are doing an outstanding job in coordinating activities to enhance the quality of life and to build jobs in areas that have historically lacked high paying opportunities. While we recognize the continuing importance of the agriculture industry in many States, especially a State like North Dakota, we recognize that, unless we diversify our economy, we will continue to see out migration from the rural areas into the already crowded metropolitan areas of our country.

Again, I am pleased to join this bipartisan effort.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. INOUE):

S. 1112. A bill to provide Federal Perkins Loan cancellation for public defenders; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I rise with Senator CHAFEE to reintroduce legislation to include full-time public defense attorneys in the Federal Perkins Loan Cancellation Forgiveness Program for law enforcement officers. This bill would provide parity to public defense attorneys and uphold the goals set forth by the Supreme Court to equalize access to legal resources. Senators FEINSTEIN, BINGAMAN, AKAKA, KERRY, SARBANES, JOHNSON, and INOUE are original cosponsors of this bipartisan bill. Representative Tom Campbell of California introduced a companion bill in the House in the 106th Congress.

Under section 465(a)(2)(F) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, a borrower with a loan made under the Federal Perkins Loan Program is eligible to have the loan canceled for serving full-time as a law enforcement officer or correction officer in a local, State, or Federal law enforcement or corrections agency. While the rules governing borrower eligibility for law enforcement cancellation have been interpreted by the Department of Education to include prosecuting attorneys, public defenders have been excluded from the loan forgiveness program. This policy must be amended.

Like prosecutors, public defense attorneys play an integral role in our adversarial process. This judicial process is the most effective means of getting at truth and rendering justice. The

United States Supreme Court in a series of cases has recognized the importance of the right to counsel in implementing the Sixth Amendment's guarantee of a fair trial and the Fourteenth Amendment's due process clause requiring counsel to be appointed for all person accused of offenses in which there is a possibility of a jail term being imposed.

Absent adequate counsel for all parties, there is a danger that the outcome maybe determined not by who has the most convincing case but by who has the most resources. The Court rightly addressed this possible miscarriage of justice by requiring counsel to be appointed for the accused. Public defenders fill this Court mandated role by representing the interests of criminally accused indigent person. they give indigent defendants sufficient resources to present an adequate defense, so that the public goal of truth and justice will govern the outcome.

The Department of Education's interpretation of the statute to include public defenders from the loan forgiveness program undermines the goals set forth by the Supreme Court to equalize access to legal resources. It creates an obvious disparity of resources between public defenders and prosecutors by encouraging talented individuals to pursue public service as prosecutors but not as defenders. The criminal justice system works best when both sides are adequately represented. The public interest is served when indigent defendants have access to talented defenders. One of the ways to facilitate this goal is by granting loan cancellation benefits to defense attorneys.

Moreover, public defense attorneys meet all the eligibility requirements of the loan forgiveness program as set forth in current Federal regulations. They belong to publicly funded public defender agencies and they are sworn officers of the court whose principal responsibilities are unique to the criminal justice system and are essential in the performance of the agencies' primary mission. In addition, like prosecuting attorneys, public defenders are law enforcement officers dedicated to upholding, protecting, and enforcing our laws. Without public defense attorneys, the adversarial process of our criminal justice system could not operate.

I urge my colleague to join me, Senator CHAFEE, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator BINGAMAN, Senator AKAKA, Senator KERRY, Senator SARBANES, Senator JOHNSON, and Senator INOUE in supporting the goal of equalized access to legal resources, as set forth in the Constitution and elucidated by the Supreme Court, by providing parity to public defenders and allowing them to join prosecutors in receiving loan cancellation benefits.

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. 1112

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

SECTION 1. FEDERAL PERKINS LOAN CANCELLATION FOR PUBLIC DEFENDERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of Education has issued clarifications that prosecuting attorneys are among the class of law enforcement officers eligible for benefits under the Federal Perkins Loan cancellation program.

(2) Like prosecutors, public defenders also meet all the eligibility requirements of the Federal Perkins Loan cancellation program as set forth in Federal regulations.

(3) Public defenders are law enforcement officers who play an integral role in our Nation's adversarial legal process. Public defenders fill the Supreme Court mandated role requiring that counsel be appointed for the accused, by representing the interests of criminally accused indigent persons.

(4) In order to encourage highly qualified attorneys to serve as public defenders, public defenders should be included with prosecutors among the class of law enforcement officers eligible to receive benefits under the Federal Perkins Loan cancellation program.

(b) AMENDMENT.—Section 465(a)(2)(F) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087ee(a)(2)(F)) is amended by inserting “, or as a full-time public defender for service to a local or State government, or to the Federal Government (directly or by a contract with a private, nonprofit organization)” after “agencies”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to—

(1) loans made under part E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, whether made before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) service as a public defender that is provided on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or the amendment made by this section shall be construed to authorize the refunding of any repayment of a loan.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 1113. A bill to amend section 1562 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of Medal of Honor Roll special pension, to provide for an annual adjustment in the amount of that special pension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition at this time to comment on legislation that I have introduced today to increase the special pension that is available to Medal of Honor recipients, and to provide for automatic adjustments in that special pension to reflect annual increases in the cost of living. When the Congress enacted the Medal of Honor pension, it stated, in the 1916 Senate Report, Report No. 240, 64th Congress, accompanying enactment, that the special pension was then necessary to serve as a “recognition of superior claims on the gratitude of the country,” and to “reward . . . in a modest way startling deeds of individual daring and audacious heroism in the face of mortal danger when war is on.” The legislation that I have introduced today has the same two purposes: to recognize, and to reward, the “startling deeds of

individual daring and audacious heroism" to which every Medal of Honor recipient can lay claim.

No one can question that Medal of Honor recipients deserve the Nation's respect and gratitude. And no one could question a limited government pension is a proper sign of that respect and gratitude. I am concerned that some of the 149 surviving Medal of Honor recipients, there are only 149 such people among us, may struggle to make financial ends meet, notwithstanding the availability of the pension. The current \$600 monthly amount is simply too small, in my estimation, to afford a minimum standard of living for our Nation's heroes given their expenses.

In 1997, the Congressional Medal of Honor Society suggested that the Medal of Honor pension level be set at \$1,000 per month and that the level of the pension be adjusted thereafter on an annual basis to reflect increases in the annual cost of living. At that time, the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which I then had the privilege of chairing, succeeded in securing an increase in the pension from \$400 to \$600 per month, but we were not successful in persuading the House to approve an "indexation" feature. I believe a compelling argument could be made then, and still can be made now, to grant the entire increase suggested by the Congressional Medal of Honor Society and to approve the indexing of the benefit. I am pleased to offer legislation to that effect today.

Many Medal of Honor recipients, out of a sense of duty and patriotism, make frequent trips to provide accounts of their act of valor and, more importantly, to speak of the lessons learned in battle and the vigilance that freedom requires to this day. Countless young Americans have benefitted by the example of these most distinguished role models. Often, the expenses associated with these excursions are borne by the medal of Honor recipients themselves, men who, we must remember, emerged from, and, in most cases, returned to, the ordinary citizenry from whom America has always drawn her warriors. Testimony offered by AMVETS at a Veterans' Affairs Committee hearing on July 25, 1997, confirmed that the majority of Medal of Honor recipients live only on their social security benefits, supplemented by the Medal of Honor pension, giving them an average monthly income of only \$1,600. It is unconscionable to think that we, as a country, can allow them to live so close to the poverty line.

I ask my colleagues to join with me, once again, to show our gratitude to the recipients of our Nation's highest honor. Let us show them—in this minor way—how grateful America truly is for their wonderful example.

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. 1113

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

SECTION 1. INCREASE AND ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT OF MEDAL OF HONOR ROLL SPECIAL PENSION.

(a) INCREASE IN AMOUNT.—Subsection (a) of section 1562 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking "\$600" and inserting "\$1,000, as adjusted from time to time under subsection (e)".

(b) ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT.—That section is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) Effective as of December 1 each year, the Secretary shall increase the amount of monthly special pension payable under subsection (a) as of November 30 of such year by the same percentage that benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1 of such year as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i))."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to months that begin on or after that date.

(2) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall not make any adjustment under subsection (e) of section 1562 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (b) of this section, in 2001.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 1114. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of educational benefits for veterans under the Montgomery GI Bill; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition at this time to comment briefly on legislation that I am introducing today to increase educational benefits paid to veterans under the Montgomery GI bill, MGIB. This bill is the same as a bill, H.R. 1291, that was passed by the House, under the leadership of the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Representative CHRIS SMITH, on June 19, 2001, by a vote of 416-0. I introduce the same legislation here in the Senate, and I urge my colleagues to join with me to complete the task of increasing veterans' Montgomery GI bill benefits.

This legislation, once it is fully phased in over a three year period, would increase the basic monthly benefit paid to veterans with at least three years of service who have returned to school from \$650 to \$1,100. With this 85 percent increase in MGIB benefits, the largest percentage increase in the history of the Montgomery GI bill, a veteran with three years of service would be able to afford the average cost of tuition, fees, books, and room and board at a four-year public college or university, and still have money left over for transportation expenses or other personal expenses. The legislation would provide greater educational freedom for veterans who are constrained by the current benefit

amount; it would open up the possibility of attendance at more expensive universities. And it would promote the national security interests of the United States by providing a substantial inducement for young men and women to serve in the military.

When I became chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs at the start of the 105th Congress in 1997, I committed to increasing MGIB benefits which, due to budget constraints, had been woefully inadequate. I am pleased to report that that picture has changed; the basic MGIB benefit has increased by 52 percent from \$427 to 650 per month, and in addition, service members now have the opportunity to "buy-up" an additional \$150 in monthly benefits, bringing the total level of available benefits to \$800 per month, an increase of 87 percent since 1997. Despite this significant progress, however, I remain concerned that the benefit usage rate among young veterans is too low, and that it may not yet be a sufficient inducement to assist the Department of Defense in recruiting high quality young men and women to serve in the military.

Of the young veterans eligible for MGIB benefits, only 57 percent choose to avail themselves of this extraordinary opportunity. According to a recent report by the Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, a significant reason for this relatively low usage rate is the inadequacy of the benefit amount. MGIB benefits have simply not kept pace with rising education costs. As a consequence, veterans who use the benefit must compromise on the educational programs they select; a low percentage of MGIB users, only 12 percent, attend private institutions, and a relatively high percentage of MGIB users, 27 percent, enroll in two-year college programs. Now I do not undervalue the role, contributions, or quality of our two-year colleges. The fact is, however, that many veterans who would choose to attend four-year institutions, even public institutions, cannot afford to do so with the current level of benefits. My legislation would move us closer to the day when the only limitation on veterans' educational choice would be their own interests and aspirations.

One of the primary purposes of the MGIB is to assist the Department of Defense, DOD with service member recruitment. When DOD asked new recruits in 1997 to list the reasons they joined the military, money for college ranked second only to "a chance to better myself in life" among the answers given. Even so, tight labor market and the availability of other Federal education aid have resulted in DOD difficulty in meeting recruiting goals. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Management Policy reports that a benefit level "of approximately \$1,000 per month . . . would increase high-quality accessions without having a negative impact on reenlistments. . . ." Thus, my proposed legislation, which would, in phases, increase

the monthly benefit to \$1,100, is consistent with DOD's position that increased MGIB benefits are necessary for it to attract high-quality recruits.

Attracting high-quality young men and women into the military is not only in the interest of the Department of Defense, it is in the national interest of all of our citizens. The United States Commission on National Security/21st Century, chaired by our former colleagues, Senators Gary Hart and Warren Rudman, recently called on Congress to enhance national security by "significantly enhanc[ing] the Montgomery GI Bill" by providing a benefit that would pay for the average education costs of four-year U.S. colleges. The Commission emphasized that the "GI bill is both a strong recruitment tool and, more importantly, a valuable institutional reward for service to the nation in uniform." I thank the Commission for recognizing the important role the GI bill has played, and will continue to play, in ensuring the security of our country.

I commend the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Representative CHRIS SMITH, who has taken the lead on this issue in the House during this first year of his chairmanship. Under Mr. SMITH's leadership, the House did its part on June 19, 2001, by passing H.R. 1291 by a resounding vote of 416-0. I urge my Senate colleagues to join with me to complete the task here in the Senate.

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. 1114

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

SECTION 1. INCREASE IN RATES OF BASIC EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE UNDER MONTGOMERY GI BILL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Section 3015(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) for an approved program of education pursued on a full-time basis, at the monthly rate of—

"(A) for months occurring during fiscal year 2002, \$800,

"(B) for months occurring during fiscal year 2003, \$950,

"(C) for months occurring during fiscal year 2004, \$1,100, and

"(D) for months occurring during a subsequent fiscal year, the amount for months occurring during the previous fiscal year increased under subsection (h); or".

(2) Section 3015(b)(1) of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(1) for an approved program of education pursued on a full-time basis, at the monthly rate of—

"(A) for months occurring during fiscal year 2002, \$650,

"(B) for months occurring during fiscal year 2003, \$772,

"(C) for months occurring during fiscal year 2004, \$894, and

"(D) for months occurring during a subsequent fiscal year, the amount for months occurring during the previous fiscal year increased under subsection (h); or".

(b) CPI ADJUSTMENT.—No adjustment in rates of educational assistance shall be made under section 3015(h) of title 38, United States Code, for fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2004.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HUTCHISON, and Mr. CORZINE):

S. 1115. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to making progress toward the goal of eliminating tuberculosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join my colleagues Senator STEVENS, Senator INOUE, Senator HUTCHISON, and Senator CORZINE in introducing the Comprehensive Tuberculosis Elimination Act. This bipartisan legislation will provide enhanced authority and greater resources to State, local and Federal health officials to do all they can to combat this deadly infectious disease in our country.

Tuberculosis is the world's leading infectious killer. Its growth has been propelled by the global HIV epidemic, and multi-drug resistant strains have become increasingly prevalent around the world. The World Health Organization estimates that more than one-third of the world's population is infected with tuberculosis. Every year, there are 8 million new cases of active tuberculosis and 2 million deaths from tuberculosis. This disease causes more deaths among women worldwide than all other causes of maternal death combined.

These harrowing statistics illustrate the truth behind the saying that diseases know no borders. Senators INOUE, STEVENS, and HUTCHISON and I have already introduced the Stop TB Now Act, which focuses on international tuberculosis control. The bill we are introducing today will deal with tuberculosis in our own country. Only through enactment of both of these measures can we be sure of defeating this readily treatable and preventable disease.

Today's bill is intended to fulfill the recommendations of the landmark report issued by the Institute of Medicine last year, entitled "Ending Neglect: The Elimination of Tuberculosis in the United States." Our measure will create a national plan for the eradication of tuberculosis. It will enhance tuberculosis-related research, education and training through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. It will also expand support for vaccine research and for international tuberculosis research through the National Institutes of Health.

In the United States, tuberculosis has been going through what the Institute of Medicine calls "recurrent cycles of neglect" by public health authorities, "followed by resurgence" of the disease. In the late nineteenth century, tuberculosis was one of the leading causes of death in America. As cities swelled with waves of European im-

migration, millions of individuals and families were forced into overcrowded tenements and unhealthy workplaces. Many fell victim to outbreaks of deadly infectious diseases. In 1886, the leading cause of death among infants was tuberculosis, followed by infant diarrhea.

Although medical science and public health were in their infancy in those days, the need to combat tuberculosis was clear even then. In 1882, Robert Koch first isolated the organism that causes this disease, providing physicians and scientists with a microbial foundation for science-based public health action. In the early twentieth century, health advocates and physicians formed an association dedicated to fighting tuberculosis, which today is the American Lung Association. Their work helped to bring about more sanitary living conditions and workplaces for the poor, stronger public health laws, and the use of sanatoriums to treat people with tuberculosis.

In this century, the possibility of actually eradicating tuberculosis arose following the development of effective antibiotics in the 1950s. But the country failed to capitalize on scientific opportunities or undertake the kind of broad public health campaign that we undertook so successfully against polio. As a result, scientific interest and public health funding for tuberculosis control waned in the following decades. After years of decline, specific Federal funding for tuberculosis control was actually eliminated in 1972.

Our country paid the price for this complacency in the 1980s. A resurgence of cases and an alarming growth in the prevalence of drug-resistant tuberculosis strains challenged public health and shook the confidence of experts. Through great effort and difficulty, we renewed our national commitment to fighting tuberculosis. But the effort took longer than necessary, and the Nation suffered needless deaths and illness as we worked to bring the number of new tuberculosis cases to its current, all-time low.

Today, we have a historic opportunity to eradicate tuberculosis in the United States. We have a generation of public health officials who have lived through and successfully combated the recent resurgence of the disease. And we have expert recommendations from both the Federal Advisory Council for the Elimination of Tuberculosis and the Institute of Medicine to guide our efforts.

This legislation is supported by leading public health organizations, including the American Lung Association, the American Thoracic Society, the National Coalition to Eliminate Tuberculosis and RESULTS International. Its enactment can be an essential in achieving to fulfilling this important and long overdue public health goal, and I urge the Senate to approve it.

By Mr. INOUE (for himself, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HUTCHISON, and Mr. CORZINE):

S. 1116. A bill amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide increased foreign assistance for tuberculosis prevention, treatment, and control; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues, Senator STEVENS, Senator KENNEDY, Senator HUTCHISON, and Senator CORZINE, to introduce the Stop Tuberculosis Now Act of 2001, a bill that responds to the dire need of the United States and the rest of the world to stop the terrible infection that is threatening citizens in every country of the world.

Tuberculosis is the biggest killer of young women and people with AIDS in the world today, and two million people will die of tuberculosis this year alone. Although tuberculosis is preventable and treatable, last year there were more than 17,000 new cases of tuberculosis in the U.S. Among these cases were new strains of tuberculosis that are resistant to many traditional antibiotics that were very successful in the past. Due to its infectious and resistant nature, tuberculosis cannot be stopped at national borders, and virtually every international airport in the U.S. therefore is a port of entry for carriers of tuberculosis. Thus, it will be impossible to control tuberculosis in the U.S. until we control it worldwide.

Because of this dire situation, we are introducing the "Stop Tuberculosis Now Act," which calls for a U.S. investment in international tuberculosis control of \$200 million in 2002, with a focus on expanding the proven, low cost direct observation therapy system, DOTS, tuberculosis treatment for countries with high rates of tuberculosis infection. DOTS tuberculosis treatment involves a health worker observing and ensuring tuberculosis patients take their prescribed medication that is needed to stop a tuberculosis infection successfully. The current projection for implementing an international tuberculosis treatment program is \$1 billion. The U.S. share of this program would be \$200 million. This is a small price to pay in order to stop this terrible infectious disease which brings such misery and death, to the U.S. and the rest of the world.

This bill would amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and declare that a major objective of the U.S. foreign assistance program is to control tuberculosis. Congress would designate the World Health Organization and other health organizations to develop and implement a comprehensive tuberculosis control program, including expanding the use of the strategy of DOTS tuberculosis treatment method and strategies to address multi-drug resistant tuberculosis. The particular focus of this program would be in countries with the highest rates of tuberculosis infection. The program would set as goals the cure of at least 95 percent of tuberculosis cases detected and the reduction of tuberculosis related deaths by 50 percent, by December 31, 2010.

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. 1116

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 "Stop Tuberculosis (TB) Now Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1)(A) Tuberculosis is one of the greatest infectious causes of death of adults worldwide, killing 2,000,000 people per year—one person every 15 seconds.

(B) Globally, tuberculosis is the leading cause of death of young women and the leading cause of death of people with HIV/AIDS.

(2) An estimated 8,000,000 individuals develop active tuberculosis each year.

(3) Tuberculosis is spreading as a result of inadequate treatment and it is a disease that knows no national borders.

(4) With over 40 percent of tuberculosis cases in the United States attributable to foreign-born individuals and with the increase in international travel, commerce, and migration, elimination of tuberculosis in the United States depends on efforts to control the disease in developing countries.

(5) The threat that tuberculosis poses for Americans derives from the global spread of tuberculosis and the emergence and spread of strains of multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB).

(6) Up to 50,000,000 individuals may be infected with multi-drug resistant tuberculosis.

(7) In the United States, tuberculosis treatment, normally about \$2,000 per patient, skyrockets to as much as \$250,000 per patient to treat multi-drug resistant tuberculosis, and treatment may not even be successful.

(8) Multi-drug resistant tuberculosis kills more than one-half of those individuals infected in the United States and other industrialized nations and without access to treatment it is a virtual death sentence in the developing world.

(9) There is a highly effective and inexpensive treatment for tuberculosis. Recommended by the World Health Organization as the best curative method for tuberculosis, this strategy, known as directly observed treatment, short course (DOTS), includes low-cost effective diagnosis, treatment, monitoring, and recordkeeping, as well as a reliable drug supply. A centerpiece of DOTS is observing patients to ensure that they take their medication and complete treatment.

SEC. 3. ASSISTANCE FOR TUBERCULOSIS PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND CONTROL.

(a) ADDITIONAL PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND CONTROL.—Section 104(c)(7)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b(c)(7)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by adding at the end before the semicolon the following: " , by expanding the use of the strategy known as directly observed treatment, short course (DOTS) and strategies to address multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) where appropriate at the local level, particularly in countries with the highest rate of tuberculosis"; and

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) by inserting after "the cure of at least 95 percent of the cases detected" the following: "by focusing efforts on the use of the directly observed treatment, short course (DOTS) strategy or other internationally accepted primary tuberculosis control strategies"; and

(B) by striking "and the cure" and inserting "the cure".

(b) FUNDING REQUIREMENT.—Section 104(c)(7) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b(c)(7)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

"(B) In carrying out this paragraph, not less than 75 percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subparagraph (D) shall be used for the diagnosis and treatment of tuberculosis for at-risk and affected populations utilizing directly observed treatment, short course (DOTS) strategy or other internationally accepted primary tuberculosis control strategies developed in consultation with the World Health Organization (WHO), including funding for the Global Tuberculosis Drug Facility of WHO's Stop TB Partnership."

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 104(c)(7) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b(c)(7)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (C) (as redesignated by this Act) as subparagraph (D); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

"(C) In conjunction with the transmission of the annual request for enactment of authorizations and appropriations for foreign assistance programs for each fiscal year, the President shall transmit to Congress a report that contains a summary of all programs, projects, and activities carried out under this paragraph for the preceding fiscal year, including a description of the extent to which such programs, projects, and activities have made progress to achieve the goals described in subparagraph (A)(ii)."

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Subparagraph (D) of section 104(c)(7) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b(c)(7)), as redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking "\$60,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2001 and 2002" and inserting "\$60,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 2002".

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 1117. A bill to establish the policy of the United States for reducing the number of nuclear warheads in the United States and Russian arsenals, for reducing the number of nuclear weapons of those two nations that are on high alert, and for expanding and accelerating programs to prevent diversion and proliferation of Russian nuclear weapons, fissile materials, and nuclear expertise; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, when Winston Churchill addressed the student body at Westminster College in 1946, he declared to the United States that "with primacy of power is also joined an awe-inspiring accountability to the future . . . you must not only feel the sense of duty done, but also the anxiety lest you fall below that level of achievement." Over the course of the cold war, we did not fail in our duty, nor should we in the new century.

In the same speech he laid before the whole world the rhetoric that would define the cold war. In describing the Sphere of Soviet dominance in Eastern Europe, Mr. Churchill described an Iron Curtain which the ancient capitals of Warsaw, Prague, and Budapest were

held. With the fall of communism in the early part of the last decade, the United States has had to re-shape its review of Eastern Europe. No longer do we view the countries of Poland, the Czech Republic, or Hungary as isolated adversaries, but as partners in the very alliance that carried us through the cold war. In the same way that we have looked to reforming our relationship with the countries of the old Warsaw Pact we must find new ways to view Russia. It is difficult to fathom that in the 21st century we view Russia as a declared ally on the world stage while maintaining a nuclear posture at home which treats her as an enemy. It is time that we transform our nuclear doctrine from one that reflects the thinking of the cold war to one that fits in the context of the 21st century and addresses what is perhaps the greatest threat to our security.

When President Bush met with Mr. Putin a few weeks ago, he expressed that the United States and Russia can find a "common position" on a "new strategic framework". President Bush declared that the two countries are friends and that it is time for the U.S. and Russia to act that way. In context of this historic meeting, it is time that we "work together to address the world as it is, not as it used to be, it is important that we not only talk differently, we must also act differently."

I rise today to introduce legislation that would direct the President to seek in his own words: "... a broad strategy of active non-proliferation ... to deny weapons of terror from those seeking to acquire them ... and to work with allies and friends who wish to join us to defend against the harm they, WMD can inflict"

The Nuclear threat Reduction Act of 2001, NTRA, would make it the policy of the United States to reduce the number of nuclear warheads and delivery systems held by the U.S. and Russia through bilateral agreements. These reductions should fall to the lowest possible number consistent with national security. It would enable the President to reduce our nuclear stockpile while negotiating such reductions with the Russians that are transparent, predictable and verifiable. To do such a thing would be a mark of principled leadership. It would acknowledge that it is no longer necessary to maintain large stockpiles of nuclear arms by the United States and Russia and that to continue to do so would be unacceptable.

On May 23, 2000 President Bush stated "The premises of cold war targeting should no longer dictate the size of our arsenal." I could not agree with the President more. The current level of nuclear weapons maintained by the United States comes at a great cost to ourselves financially and poses a significant threat to our security. The level of nuclear protection that we maintain forces the Russians to keep a similarly robust force which they cannot afford. The crumbling infrastruc-

ture of the Russian Military continually raises the risk of accidental launch or greater proliferation. Indeed, the legislation being considered today would ensure that once parts of the Russian arsenal are dismantled, they will be kept safe, they will be accounted for, and they will eventually be destroyed.

The savings from reducing our nuclear arsenal are substantial. A recent CBO report estimated that \$1.67 billion could be saved by retiring 50 MX Peacekeeper missiles by 2003. We could use this money to address shortfalls in our conventional capabilities. Additionally, we can devote more funds to meeting the asymmetrical threats that will face us in the future. To invest in deterrents to cyberwarfare and to augment spending on homeland defense would be the best way to transform our thinking and spending from the Cold War to the twenty-first century.

In addition to this, the Nuclear Threat Reduction Act would encourage the U.S. and Russia to take their systems off of high-alert status. In the context of the cold war, such a strategy was necessary to ensure our security, but it no longer applies to present conditions.

The Nuclear Threat Reduction Act would also embolden existing Department of State, Energy, and Defense programs that seek to contain existing nuclear weapons material and expertise in Russia. The economic situation in Russia makes it more and more likely that a rouge state will acquire the means to manufacture nuclear weapons. This could come through the distribution of nuclear material or the exodus of Russian scientists. Our former colleague Sen Nunn put it best when he said "We dare not risk a world where a Russian scientist can take care of his children by endangering ours." The cost to the United States is minuscule compared to the threat of nuclear proliferation. Work on this serious issue has already been addressed by the Nunn-Lugar bill, but it is time that we further our efforts.

In January of this year, a task force headed by Howard Baker and Lloyd Cutler issued a report calling the proliferation of the Russian nuclear stockpile "The most serious threat to national security we face today". The Baker-Cutler Task Force strongly endorsed existing non-proliferation programs and suggested that their goals could be achieved in 8-10 years if they are fully funded. Increased support for these programs will certainly bring them more in line with the immediacy and scope of the dangers that they address.

The NTRA requires the President to formulate and submit to Congress a strategic plan to secure and neutralize Russia's nuclear weapons and weapons-usable materials over the next eight years. The plan would have to include the administrative and organizational reforms necessary to provide effective coordination of these programs and to

reflect the priority that the President attaches to them. The President himself has advocated such a strategy and I call on him to implement it.

Finally, the NTRA requires the President to submit a report to Congress on the feasibility of establishing a "debt for security" program with Russia. Under this concept, a portion of Russia's debts to various major powers would be forgiven in exchange for a Russian commitment to devoting those funds to non-proliferation activities. If successful, such a program could significantly help Russia's secure, account for, and neutralize its weapons materials.

In closing, The Nuclear Reduction Act of 2001 would help us fulfill the duty that comes with being the world's last remaining super power. By preventing the spread of nuclear materials and technology, reducing the nuclear stockpiles of the United States and Russia, and by taking our missiles off of high-alert status, we can fulfill that duty. I ask the other Members of the Senate to join me in support of this measure.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 819. Mr. THOMPSON proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1052, to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage.

SA 820. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. EDWARDS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1052, *supra*.

SA 821. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1052, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 822. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1052, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 823. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1052, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 824. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1052, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 825. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1052, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 826. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. NELSON, of Nebraska, Mr. ENZI, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. ROBERTS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1052, *supra*.

SA 827. Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1052, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 828. Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1052, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 829. Mr. DEWINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1052, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 830. Mr. BREAU (for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. EDWARDS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1052, *supra*.