

Whereas Brian Fahey of Rescue Company 4, a 14-year veteran of the department and resident of East Rockaway, and a husband and father of 3, lost his life in the fire; and

Whereas Harry Ford of Rescue Company 4, a 27-year veteran of the department from Long Beach, and a husband and father of 3, lost his life in the fire: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors John J. Downing, Brian Fahey, and Harry Ford, who lost their lives in the course of duty as firefighters, and recognizes them for their bravery and sacrifice;

(2) extends its deepest sympathies to the families of these 3 brave heroes; and

(3) pledges its support and to continue to work on behalf of all of the Nation's firefighters who risk their lives every day to ensure the safety of all Americans.

A CALL FOR ACTION

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, a new poll conducted by the Opinion Research Corporation International and released by the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence confirms once again that the American people support sensible gun safety legislation. Eighty-three percent of those polled said they support criminal background checks on all gun purchases at gun shows. Nearly four out of five respondents voiced support for preventing gun dealers from selling guns to anyone who has not passed a background check, even if it takes more than 3 days to complete the check. And more than 8 out of every 10 people polled believe that all guns should be sold with childproof safety locks.

The message here is clear. People are fed up with the reports of gun violence that dominate the front page and the evening news. America wants action.

The Brady Campaign's poll and countless other studies demonstrate our mandate. The incidents of gun violence that plague our neighborhoods and endanger our children confirm our moral obligation.

We should ignore neither. We cannot let another Congress go by without action. Let's close the loopholes in our gun laws and remember the 107th Congress as a time when we made America a safer place for our children and our grandchildren.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE REPORT ON DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISES PRO- GRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, when the 105th Congress passed the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, TEA-21, there was a vigorous and close debate about whether to convert the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program into a race neutral program helping all small disadvantaged businesses. It troubled many members of both Houses that we lacked basic information about the characteristics of DBEs and non-DBEs and about alleged discrimination in the transportation industry. Consequently, I introduced, with widespread bi-partisan support, an amendment to TEA-21, requiring the

GAO to gather the information Congress was missing that is essential to understanding the DBE program. As Congressman SHUSTER, Chair of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the floor manager for the transportation bill, emphasized during the House debate, the Act "also requires a GAO study that would examine whether there is continued evidence of discrimination against small business owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals. I believe such a study will lay the groundwork for future reform."

Three years later, the GAO has produced a comprehensive report on the questions Congress asked it to investigate. This objective, impartial report entitled, "Disadvantaged Business Enterprises: Critical Information is needed to Understand Program Impact," GAO Report GAO-01-586, June 2001, is highly significant to the continuing legislative and judicial debate over the DBE program. Professor George R. La Noue, one of the distinguished scholars in this field, has analyzed the GAO's report. He notes that the "DBE program has been continuously subject to litigation during its almost two decades of existence." Professor La Noue concludes that "the picture of the DBE program that emerges from the GAO report is one of essential information that is missing, or if available, does not support any finding of a national pattern of discrimination against DBEs." I am pleased to provide Professor La Noue's analysis of the GAO report, and I request that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

AN ANALYSIS OF "DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISES: CRITICAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED TO UNDERSTAND PROGRAM IMPACT"

GAO Report [GAO-01-586 June 2001]

(By George R. La Noue, Professor of Political Science)

DIRECTOR, PROJECT ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND PUBLIC CONTRACTS, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE COUNTY

During the 1998 consideration of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), there was extensive debate in both Houses about whether to make the DBE program race-neutral. In the end, a compromise was reached to retain a race conscious DBE program, while requiring the General Accounting Office to make a three year study of the characteristics of the DBEs and non-DBEs participating in federal transportation programs and to gather existing evidence of discrimination against DBEs. Such information was intended to provide a solid basis of facts for courts, legislators, and others grappling with the complex issues of the constitutionality of the DBE program.

The GAO study now has been released and its conclusions are highly significant. GAO performed its three year study by obtaining data from 52 state DOT recipients (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) and 31 of the largest (accounting for two-thirds of transit grant funds obligated in 1999) transportation districts in the country. In addition GAO staff interviewed representatives of interest groups on both sides of the

DBE question and analyzed the results of 14 transportation related disparity studies.

Following are GAO's major conclusions.

1. DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS

GAO conducted a survey of discrimination complaints received by USDOT and recipients. GAO found that, while USDOT sometimes receives written complaints of discrimination, the agency does not compile or analyze the information in those complaints. GAO could not supply information on the number of complaints filed, investigations launched, or their outcomes. (p. 33) GAO also asked state and local transit recipients about complaints they received and they had better data. During 1999 and 2000, 81 percent of the recipients had no complaints, while a total of 31 complaints were received by the other recipients. Of these, 29 were investigated and findings of discrimination were made only 4 times across the nation.

The report concluded: Other factors may also limit the ability of DBEs to compete for USDOT-state assisted contracts. The majority of states and transit districts we surveyed had not conducted any kind of analysis to identify these factors. Using anecdotal information, we identified a number of factors, or barriers, such as a lack of working capital and limited access to bonding, that may limit DBEs' ability to compete for contracts. However, there was little agreement among the officials we contacted on whether these factors were attributable to discrimination. (p.7)

In fact GAO reported there were few if any studies by government agencies or industry groups regarding barriers to DBE contracting. "USDOT officials, however, stated that they believe contract bundling is one of the largest barriers for DBEs in competing for transportation contracts." (p. 35) That, of course, is not a problem caused by discrimination.

2. DISPARITY STUDIES

GAO also reviewed 14 transportation-specific disparity studies completed between 1996 and 2000. GAO examined these studies because they might be a source of evidence about discrimination against DBEs and because USDOT permits recipients to use disparity studies to set annual goals and to determine the level of discrimination these goals purportedly are remedying. GAO found that about 30 percent of the recipients surveyed used disparity studies to set their fy 2000 goals. (p. 29).

GAO found that: the limited data used to calculate disparities, compounded by the methodological weaknesses, create uncertainties about the studies findings. . . . While not all studies suffered from every problem, each suffered enough problems to make its findings questionable. We recognize there are difficulties inherent in conducting disparity studies and that such limitations are common to social science research; however, the studies we reviewed did not sufficiently address such problems or disclose their limitations. (p.29)

GAO then detailed disparity study problems, particularly in calculating DBE availability. These problems are important not only because they undermine the validity of the disparity studies involved, but because these same problems exist in the regulations USDOT issued regarding annual goal setting. USDOT as a practical matter permits recipients to use a wide variety of sources to measure availability on which goals are then based.

GAO made other specific criticisms of the studies. For example, the studies did not have information on firm qualifications or capacities; they failed to analyze both the dollars and contracts awarded and sometimes did not have subcontracting data. This