The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OTTER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, March 18, 2002,

I hereby appoint the Honorable C.L. “Butch” Otter to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. Dennis Hastert,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God of Redemption, humanly we are always in search for freedom. Sometimes oppression comes from outside ourselves; sometimes our limitations are from within. Your spirit alone sets us internally free to realize peace.

The Mosaic Passover and Exodus and the Paschal Mystery of Jesus’ death and resurrection help us interpret how You always lead Your people through suffering and death to the everlasting freedom You promise.

Enable Members of Congress to enter by faith into the approaching feasts and experience the mysterious promise You present to us today. Guide them with an integrity of life and good judgment to lead Your people to greater and lasting freedom.

Some people need to be freed of sickness and hunger; some need to be freed of injustice and terrorism. Some are caught in their own patterns of prejudice and revenge; some are desperate because of their anger and greed. In subtle yet profound ways, Lord, Your spirit can free people from self-interest, loneliness and compulsions. In your own way, bring all beyond their imagining to the fulfillment of Your promise within them.

Renew America these days in a new moral consciousness that will have the world respect us once again as the land of the free and the home of the brave, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concur-

rence of the House is requested:

S. 1372. An act to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States.


S. 2019. An act to extend the authority of the Export-Import Bank until April 30, 2002, was referred to the Committee on Financial Services.

COMMUNICATION FROM FORMER STAFF ASSISTANT TO THE HONORABLE JIM MCCREERY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Jennifer Lawrence, former staff assistant to the Honorable Jim McCrery, Member of Congress:

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for trial testimony issued by the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana in a criminal case pending there.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that it is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House to comply with the subpoena.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Lawrence,
Former Staff Assistant to Congressman Jim McCrery of Louisiana.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m. tomorrow for morning hour debates.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, March 19, 2002, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

5914. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Cranberries Grown
Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 3925. A bill to establish an exchange program between the Federal Government and the private sector in order to promote the development of expertise in information technology management, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. GRUCCI.

H.R. 3986: A bill to amend the Patriot Act to permit an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence whose spouse died as a result of a terrorist activity on September 11, 2001, to apply for naturalization under the provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of those committees pursuant to clause 1(k) and (s), rule X. (Rept. 107-379, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H. Con. Res. 1390 Mr. Crowley and Mr. Hill.
H. Con. Res. 1529: Mr. Norwood, Mr. Cunningham, Ms. Rivers, and Ms. McKinney.
H. Con. Res. 1577: Mr. Flake, Mr. Weldon of Florida, Mr. Hayes, Mr. Boehlert, and Mr. Goodlatte.
H. Con. Res. 1598: Mr. Ballenger, Ms. McCollum, Mr. Boehlert, Mr. Wicker, and Mr. Sanders.
H. Con. Res. 1904: Mr. Capuano, Mr. Baca, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Jackson of Illinois, and Mr. Hinchey.
H. Con. Res. 2063: Mr. Wu.
H. Con. Res. 2219: Mr. Tiahrt.
H. Con. Res. 2251: Mr. Ross.
H. Con. Res. 2324: Mr. Smith of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 2383: Mr. Blagojevich, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Hefley, Mr. Cantor, and Mr. Mascara.
H. Con. Res. 2831: Mr. Bishop.
H. Con. Res. 3135: Mr. Wynn.
H. Con. Res. 3338: Mr. Platts.
H. Con. Res. 3328: Mr. Stupak.
H. Con. Res. 3346: Mr. Platts.
H. Con. Res. 3443: Mr. Lipinski and Ms. Carson of Indiana.
H. Con. Res. 3524: Mr. Grucci.
H. Con. Res. 3569: Mr. Bowwell.
H. Con. Res. 3669: Mr. Horn.
H. Con. Res. 3694: Mr. Houghton, Mrs. Morella, Mr. Hulshov, Ms. Price of Ohio, Mr. Hayworth, and Mr. Pomeroy.
H. Con. Res. 3698: Mr. Tiahrt.
H. Con. Res. 3693: Mr. Sessions, Mr. Baldacci, and Mr. Frost.
H. Con. Res. 3831: Mr. Hall of Ohio, Mr. Calvert, and Mr. Frost.
H. Con. Res. 3836: Ms. Harman, Mr. Snyder, and Mr. McGovern.
H. Con. Res. 3835: Mr. Jeff Miller of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 3897: Mr. Filner, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Isakson, Mrs. Roukema, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Kolbe, Mr. Paycheck, Mr. Turner, Ms. Rivers, and Mr. Kуетz.
H. Con. Res. 3906: Mr. Honda, Mr. Frost, Mr. Frank, Mr. Schrock, and Mr. Pence.
H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. Rohrabacher and Mr. Tancredo.
H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. Blagojevich, Ms. Brown of Florida, Mr. Meeks of New York, Mr. Matsui, Mr. Evans, and Mr. Bono.
H. Con. Res. 199: Mr. Moran of Kansas and Mr. Cleek.
H. Con. Res. 365: Mr. Chambliss, Mr. Brea- hutter, Mr. Towns, Ms. Harman, Mr. Davis of Illinois, and Mr. Jackson of Texas.
The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

PRAYER

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

Dear God, a thousand years in Your sight are like yesterday when it is past. Lord of Time, You divide our lives into years, months, weeks, and hours. As we live our lives, You make us very conscious of the passage of time, the shortness of time to accomplish what we want, and our impatience with other people’s priorities in the use of time. We have learned that work expands to fill the time available, but also that deadlines are a part of life.

Here we are at the beginning of a crucial week before the Spring recess begins on Friday. Grant the Senators and their staffs an expeditious use of the hours of this week to accomplish what really needs to be done. Help the parties work together to finish what is crucial for America. Grant us all an acute sense of the value of time and our accountability to You for using it wisely. We believe there is enough time in this week to do what You want done. We press on without pressure but with promptness to Your timing. You are all-powerful, and I ask that You grant us the wisdom to live in this moment and the patience with other people’s priorities.

We have learned that patience with other people’s priorities is crucial for America. Grant us all an opportunity to work together to finish what is really needs to be done. Help the parties work together to finish what is crucial for America. Grant us all an acute sense of the value of time and our accountability to You for using it wisely. We believe there is enough time in this week to do what You want done. We press on without pressure but with promptness to Your timing. You are all-powerful, and I ask that You grant us the wisdom to live in this moment and the patience with other people’s priorities.

We press on without pressure but with promptness to Your timing. You are all-powerful, and I ask that You grant us the wisdom to live in this moment and the patience with other people’s priorities.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. As if in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 705 occur at 5:50 p.m. today, with the remaining provisions of the previous order in effect.

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object, let me clarify if I may. We are moving the vote under this unanimous consent agreement from 6 p.m. to 5:50, and I assume, because we are moving that vote to begin earlier—some Senators might have thought it would begin at 6—if necessary we might delay the conclusion somewhat.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, it would be the first time we ever delayed a vote, but we will do that.

Mr. LOTT. There is a first time for everything.

I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent we now proceed to a period of morning business until 4:30 today.

I see the Republican leader. I ask he be allowed to speak first, of course, and then Senator GRASSLEY wishes to speak for up to 8 minutes, and then Senator BYRD would speak for up to 40 minutes.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we are extending the morning business for an hour and a half; I presume that time would be equally divided.

Mr. REID. We will do our best to equally divide it. The only two speakers we know of are Senators GRASSLEY and BYRD. But if someone comes in, we will make sure the minority has equal billing until 6 p.m. It could be hard to get Members over here. We hope others are coming. We will make sure we are as fair as we can in allocating the time. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the first request with respect to setting the vote at 5:50 p.m.?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the second request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on a subject that I hope will be on the Senate’s agenda after we come back from Easter recess, which I think starts at the end of this week. That issue is Trade Promotion Authority for the President.

It is time for the Senate to pass Trade Promotion Authority, not only for President Bush, because he has asked for it, but because every President ought to have this authority. The President needs this authority to help in the reduction of non-tariff trade barriers as well as tariffs and to negotiate international trade agreements.

It has been over a decade since our Nation has had Trade Promotion Authority for the President. Since that time, we have fallen further behind. This map shows how far behind we are. It shows that the rest of the world is no longer going to stand around and wait for the United States to show leadership on trade.

Here you can see all these countries in red. That sea of red represents 111 countries that are a party to more than 130 free trade agreements that do not include the United States of America. The United States was not at the negotiating table for these 130 free trade agreements. How many free trade agreements do we have with other countries? Three!

Until just last year, with the passage of the Jordan Free Trade Agreement, it has been over 6 years since the United States enacted a free trade agreement with another country. Our failure to act, in fact, does make a difference.
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While we stand on the sidelines, the rest of the world moves ahead, concluding an average of twenty new free trade agreements every year. The European Union alone has signed preferential agreements with 27 countries and is right now working on 15 more. That means other countries are writing the rules of trade, and the United States is not at the table. The rules these other countries write are not designed to benefit U.S. companies and U.S. workers. When other countries write the rules, we lose.

In the absence of Trade Promotion Authority, we have allowed our foreign competitors to make deals that have placed U.S. interests at a disadvantage. If we do not pass Trade Promotion Authority soon, then we are going to continue to fall further and further behind. We will sit on the sidelines and our competitors will continue to make deals that exclude us—it’s a game plan for failure.

Without Trade Promotion Authority, American negotiating power to bring down trade barriers is severely limited. Foreign competitors will continue to weave a web of preferential trade and investment opportunities for themselves and we will fall further behind. American companies, workers, and farmers are paying a high price for our inaction. Compared to their foreign counterparts, U.S. exporters often face higher tariffs, higher costs, and greater administrative delays, and even less favorable investment opportunities and protection.

While other countries negotiate free trade agreements, ensuring that their products sail across borders tax free, American workers face high tariffs that erode their competitive edge. I will just give one example: Caterpillar, a corporation headquartered in the State of Illinois. Caterpillar’s motor graders, made in the United States and exported to Chile, face nearly $15,000 in tariffs whereas Caterpillar’s counterparts, making those same motor graders in Brazil for export to Chile, only face a tariff of $3,700. That ought to get anybody’s attention about the importance of negotiating down these barriers.

Further, when Caterpillar’s competitors produce the same product in Canada, it can be exported to Chile free of tariffs because of the Canada-Chile free trade agreement.

We cannot continue to put U.S. workers at a disadvantage in the international marketplace. Isolationism is a failed policy that damages U.S. interests on many levels. This year the Senate has the ability to reject this failed policy by bringing up and passing Trade Promotion Authority. This is not the time for us to take a pass on policies that could enhance our global competitiveness and increase our economic stature worldwide.

Presidential leadership is very obvious in this war on terrorism. We have a strong diplomatic component to that. We have a strong military component to that. But we also need a strong economic component to the President’s leadership, and that can come in part through this President having Trade Promotion Authority.

The Senate Finance Committee reported Trade Promotion Authority out of our committee last year in its usual way of doing business, by a strong bipartisan vote of 18 to 3. I am confident when this bill comes to the floor it will receive bipartisan support from the entire Senate.

It is time to get this bill, Trade Promotion Authority, on the Senate floor and get it passed. Renewing Trade Promotion Authority will help level the global playing field and create countless opportunities for our workers, our farmers, and our businesses.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, may I inquire how long it is remaining on Senator Grassley’s request?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The remaining time?

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent he be allowed an additional 10 minutes so I may address some questions to him.

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

Mr. LOTT. I thank my colleagues for allowing that.

Mr. President, I say to Senator Grassley from Iowa that I appreciate his remarks today, and I appreciate the work he has done in this area. I know he feels very strongly about the need for free trade and having open markets, but also that it be fair trade.

I know it is very important to a State such as Iowa, which not only is very much involved in the manufacturing area but particularly in agriculture because we could export a lot more of our agricultural products. So I thank him for the position he takes as a Senator from the great State of Iowa and also as a leader on the Finance Committee, both as former chairman and now as ranking member.

I emphasize, once again, the point he made that this Trade Promotion Authority was reported out of the Finance Committee by a vote of 18 to 3, which was a very wide, bipartisan vote. I should note both the majority leader and minority leader voted for that package.

Yet this bill has been languishing. The House passed this legislation on December 6 of last year. I think if it had been acted on last year. It did not. I think it is imperative that we act within the near future.

I inquire of Senator Grassley, has he been given any indication as to when he expects to see this bill for full Senate action? Does he know what commitments have been made?

Mr. GRASSLEY. We were told some time this spring. Spring is fleeting. That is why I hope we can get a date definite that we will be brought up and it can be passed.

It will be particularly fruitful and beneficial to the President to have Trade Promotion Authority now as he goes to the international conference at Monterrey this week. It would be nice if he had it as he is going to visit Peru; as he is going to visit El Salvador. Wherever the President is going to go, this issue always comes up.

As I talked to Bob Zoellick, the U.S. Trade Representative who does our negotiations, the fact that the President does not have this authority weakens our position at the international conferences we attend, particularly now as we are beginning negotiations in Geneva, on what is called the Doha Round—it was agreed to last November, a brand new round of negotiations that hopefully will be finalized for about 3 years—for the President to be credible and his people to be credible at the negotiating table, we must have Trade Promotion Authority.

Mr. LOTT. My impression is that after we complete the energy legislation and the campaign finance reform issues—I guess it could be even after the Easter recess—the next order of business would be the budget resolution. Then Senator Daschle indicated we would go to trade at that point. I am not sure exactly what that means. I presume sometime in late April or May.

But I do agree we need to act on this legislation. It is very unfortunate we did not move the Andean Trade Promotion Authority, which has also been reported out by the Finance Committee.

Mr. GRASSLEY. We negotiated three trade agreements. Of these countries, the Andean countries, had requested this legislation be passed, and indicated to me it had gone beyond being an issue of trade; it had gotten to be a very serious political problem in those countries. I am wondering about what exactly is the U.S. commitment to these negotiations, and prosperity in those regions.

Of the countries which Senator Grassley has listed, more and more countries are trading with these countries in Central and South America. We are really not in there the way we should be.

Recently, I had occasion to be in Spain, and I was surprised to find how much involvement Spain has in Central and South America, including, I believe, Spain owning the second largest bank in Central America.

That is just one example of what has happened there. These countries have an ever-growing number of free trade agreements. Yet the United States has only three trade agreements.

Is that correct?

Mr. GRASSLEY. We negotiated three trade agreements. Of these countries, 111 have negotiated 130 trade agreements.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am also very much worried. It appears that the way this will be brought to the floor, once again, is setting it up in such a
way that the Senate may not be able to act. On bill after bill, we have seen that recently. That happened with the stimulus bill. It happened with agriculture. We are not sure what the outcome is going to be on the energy bill. When a bill to the floor, and the substance of that bill is such that we have to write it on the floor of the Senate, that is a problem. But in the case of trade, I also see that we are being told it has to be coupled with trade adjustment assistance.

What there is a bipartisan feeling that there needs to be some assistance available in dealing with dislocated workers, at least on the interim basis, it includes, for instance, health care provisions that are going to be extremely controversial.

To say that bill has to come to the floor providing COBRA health insurance provisions for trade adjustment assistance in order to get trade promotion authority is to set ourselves up in such a way that it will be very hard—and maybe even impossible—to get this very important legislation through.

Does Senator Grassley care to comment on that issue.

Mr. GRASSLEY. It is a very divisive issue. As Senator Lott brought up about tax benefits for COBRA insurance, there was divisiveness during the debate on economic stimulus, and it kept economic stimulus from passing.

It seems to me that a bill that was voted out of committee by 18 to 3 should not be handled in any other spirit than the spirit of that vote within the Finance Committee, which is typical of the way the Senate ought to work, and also a follow-on of how our committee has always worked to produce good bills which have come out of the committee most of the time with bipartisan support.

In so many other areas other than just faith, I would compliment my Democrat counterpart, Senator Baucus, and his staff for trying to work through some of the disagreements that might come up on the floor of the Senate.

I think there is a terrible pressure for more to be done, and that it is going to be divisive. I hope we can get past that. For instance, in the case of health insurance and incentives for the unemployed to have health insurance, that is a very worthy issue. But that ought to come up in the context of discussion with the issue, as the President has presented it, of tax credits for all of the uninsured so that they will be able to buy health insurance. We should not take that issue up with the very narrow part of the unemployment because of the relationship to trade. That should come up as an issue of all the uninsured, and we should deal with that as a separate issue.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank Senator Grassley for his comments. I take this occasion to emphasize that particular point, and serve notice that this could be an area of major concern and a serious problem in producing a result on trade promotion authority. It would be a tragic example if we do not succeed in this area. Once again, that would mean the Senate has failed to do its work, especially after such good bipartisan work has been done in committee.

I encourage Senator Grassley and Senator Baucus to continue in the spirit in which they reported this bill from committee to the full Senate. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

OPPOSITION TO THE SECTION 245(i) PROVISION AND AMNESTY FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, last week, CNN broke the news that, six months after the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the Immigration and Naturalization Service finally provided a confirmation notice to a Florida flight school that two of the suicide hijackers who died on September 11 had been approved for student visas.

The American people must have been shaking their heads in dismay. Certainly many politicians viewed the incident with incredulity and anger. Our President said he was “plenty hot.” The Attorney General promised an investigation.

Legislators and pundits have called for the restructuring—and even for the abolishment—of the INS.

I find it hard to understand the apparent shock. That this incident occurred should come as no surprise to anyone who has read anything in recent months about the inept manner in which our immigration system is apparently operating. In the aftermath of the September 11 attacks, the American people heard repeatedly about the lapses in our immigration laws that allowed these terrorists to enter our country. Three of the terrorists were in the country on expired visas and apparently operating. In the aftermath of the September 11 attacks, the American people were told that this government is doing all that it can to strengthen our borders and make Americans safe.

But then this CNN report is unveiled, reinforcing the negative impression that most Americans have of our Nation’s border security.

If the American people went to bed last Tuesday night in dismay over this latest INS debacle, they must have been absolutely astounded when they awoke Wednesday morning to learn that the House of Representatives had passed, at the request of the President, what amounts to an amnesty for hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens, many of whom have not undergone any—any—background or security check.

Supporters of the House-passed extension of the so-called Section 245(i) provision were quick to claim that it is not a amnesty. They argue, is where you fill out your paperwork—here or abroad. That is nonsense. Section 245(i)—amnesty is amnesty—pure and simple.

The section 245(i) provision, which expired last April, allows undocumented immigrants to seek permanent residency without leaving the United States, if—if they pay a $1,000 fee and have a close relative or employer sponsor them. Without the provision, these immigrants would be forced to leave the country, and under tougher illegal immigration reforms passed in 1996, be barred from reentering for up to 10 years.

If waiving tougher penalties for illegal aliens is not a form of amnesty, then I don’t know what is.

Those who support reviving the 245(i) provision impress upon us that there are many, many individuals who came to this country legally, but became lost in the huge backlog of paperwork at the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Thus their visas expired while they were awaiting the processing of paperwork and they continued to live in the United States illegally and undetected.

I don’t doubt that many of these individuals are well-meaning and have attempted to follow the law. I recognize that many of these individuals, if not for some type of legal exemption, will have to leave the country and be separated from their families. But we must not forget that three of the September 11 terrorists were living in the United States on expired visas. An additional two terrorists—Mohammed Atta and Marwan al-Shehhi tried to change their visa status while they were in the United States, and, thus, were able to begin their flight training at a Florida school. And as we learned in these last few days, not only did the Immigration and Naturalization Service never catch them, but months after September 11, the Immigration and Naturalization Service was still issuing paperwork clearing the way for these two terrorists to enter the stream of American society.

American people were told that this government is doing all that it can to strengthen our borders and make Americans safe.

But then this CNN report is unveiled, reinforcing the negative impression that most Americans have of our Nation’s border security.

If the American people went to bed last Tuesday night in dismay over this latest INS debacle, they must have been absolutely astounded when they awoke Wednesday morning to learn that the House of Representatives had passed, at the request of the President, what amounts to an amnesty for hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens, many of whom have not undergone any—any—background or security check.

Supporters of the House-passed extension of the so-called Section 245(i) provision were quick to claim that it is not a amnesty. They argue, is where you fill out your paperwork—here or abroad. That is nonsense. Section 245(i)—amnesty is amnesty—pure and simple.

The section 245(i) provision, which expired last April, allows undocumented immigrants to seek permanent residency without leaving the United States, if—if they pay a $1,000 fee and have a close relative or employer sponsor them. Without the provision, these immigrants would be forced to leave the country, and under tougher illegal immigration reforms passed in 1996, be barred from reentering for up to 10 years.

If waiving tougher penalties for illegal aliens is not a form of amnesty, then I don’t know what is.

Those who support reviving the 245(i) provision impress upon us that there are many, many individuals who came to this country legally, but became lost in the huge backlog of paperwork at the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Thus their visas expired while they were awaiting the processing of paperwork and they continued to live in the United States illegally and undetected.

I don’t doubt that many of these individuals are well-meaning and have attempted to follow the law. I recognize that many of these individuals, if not for some type of legal exemption, will have to leave the country and be separated from their families. But we must not forget that three of the September 11 terrorists were living in the United States on expired visas. An additional two terrorists—Mohammed Atta and Marwan al-Shehhi tried to change their visa status while they were in the United States, and, thus, were able to begin their flight training at a Florida school. And as we learned in these last few days, not only did the Immigration and Naturalization Service never catch them, but months after September 11, the Immigration and Naturalization Service was still issuing paperwork clearing the way for these two terrorists to enter the stream of American society.
These terrorists weren’t hiding from the system, they were exploiting the flaws in the system. Reviving the 245(i) provision reopens another crack in the system through which a potential terrorist can crawl. What the CNN story says is that we should be even more lenient with visa applicants, but that we should be much tougher, with visa applicants.

The section 245(i) provision poses a dangerous risk to our border security by allowing the all-important State Department background checks being conducted on potential immigrants in their home countries. By allowing hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens to apply for permanent residency in our country, section 245(i) allows them to sidestep face-to-face interviews at U.S. consulates in their own countries. U.S. consular officers abroad offer unmatched expertise in their host country’s social conditions. They have knowledge of police records. They are knowledgeable of fraudulent document operations. They are knowledgeable of political extremism groups. Under section 245(i), U.S. consulate officers would not fully exercise their expertise in screening immigrants for permanent residency.

Supporters of the 245(i) provision will tell us that we can rely on a thorough INS background check. Ha-ha. Don’t forget that if the visa applicants fail the INS security check, they are already inside the country. If they fail that check, they are already inside this country. And because of the ineptitude of the INS, they may have been living in this country for months and, who knows, perhaps years. We cannot afford to have a weaker visa screening standard for illegal aliens who are given the additional opportunity to permanently reside in our country.

Moreover, an extension of the 245(i) provision would contribute significantly to the INS dangerously overloaded processing backlog. The Immigration and Naturalization Service currently faces a backlog of roughly 4 million cases, and we can expect an additional half a million visa application filings if section 245(i) is revived. The fact that the INS is notifying a Florida flight school of Mohammed Atta’s student visa approval 6 months after the September 11 attacks clearly suggests that the Immigration and Naturalization Service is unable to handle further increases in its workload. What’s more, it does not make a whiff of sense to place these new obligations on an agency that both the administration and Members of Congress are suggesting will undergo dramatic reforms in the coming months.

All of that is to say nothing about the message that we send abroad to potential immigrants who are waiting patiently to legally enter this country. Section 245(i) acts as an incentive, a lure, for illegal immigration suggesting that it is quicker and more convenient to enter the country illegally than to wait outside the United States to complete the visa application process.

These are serious concerns that the Senate will need to address before it acts on this issue. The American people and the Congress should know the answers to these questions. In fact, there are questions that ought to be raised as we consider changes to our immigration system, but I am becoming increasingly doubtful that the administration really wants to provide the answers.

The administration has been very quiet about its reasons for asking the Congress to renew the 245(i) provision. The White House issued only a three-paragraph statement last week in supporting the House-passed extension of 245(i), which states in the first paragraph:

The Administration strongly supports House passage of H.R. 1885...This legislation reflects the Administration’s philosophy that government should recognize the importance of families and help to strengthen them.

Mr. President, I support recognizing the importance of families. I am sure that every Senator here is all for families. In fact, we are yet to meet an anti-family politician.

But this Government’s first obligation, especially in light of what happened on September 11, ought to be that of protection of American families, and the 245(i) provision does not meet that test in the wake of September 11.

Last week, the Homeland Security Director unveiled a color-coded system to alert Americans of varying levels of terrorism threats. Governor Ridge warned that the United States remains on an elevated threat level and that the corresponding yellow light signifies that there is still a “significant threat” of a terrorist attack. Certainly, the administration would want to explain why, on the same day that the Homeland Security Director would issue an elevated state of alert, the White House would push through the House an amnesty for illegal aliens that would weaken our visa screening processes. Doesn’t make much sense, does it? The right hand seems not to know what the left hand is doing.

It is lunacy—sheer lunacy—that the President would request, and the House would pass, such an amnesty at this time when the right hand seems not to know what the left hand is doing.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, it is quite obvious to everybody that the United States is at war and that every effort must be made to support our men and women in uniform, particularly those who are putting their lives on the line. And who knows, that might be anybody who is in the military at a time of war. You don’t go to war if you don’t go to war to win.

It is with some frustration that I address the Senate on a problem within the Department of Defense where it seems as if everybody is not pulling together as a team. I want to share my views on the latest results of an ongoing oversight investigation of the Department of Defense credit card use. This is a joint effort supported by the General Accounting Office. I have had the privilege
Mr. President, I rise today to focus on an area of our government that often goes unnoticed but is of the utmost importance: military finances. The Department of Defense is the largest consumer of credit cards in the United States, with over $6 billion spent annually. This vast sum of money is not just a matter of numbers; it is a reflection of accountability and responsibility. The Pentagon, as the的心脏和灵魂 of our Armed Forces, is responsible for ensuring that every dollar spent is done so with the utmost care and attention to detail. Unfortunately, it seems that this is not always the case.

Credit cards are a valuable tool for the military, allowing them to purchase necessary supplies and services. However, when they are misused, the taxpayers suffer. This mismanagement is not a new issue. The General Accounting Office has been examining the use of credit cards for over a decade and has found widespread fraud and abuse. The consequences of this abuse are serious, with lost money and decreased accountability.

The Department of Defense has implemented a system called EAGLS (Electronic Accountability, Guidance, and Line-of-Sight) to track travel and purchase card transactions. This system is supposed to improve accountability, but my colleagues and I have seen firsthand that it falls short. The system does not always detect unauthorized transactions, leading to lost funds and lost opportunities for the military.

Credit card abuses are not limited to travel and purchase cards. There are also credit card transactions for personal expenses, which can lead to significant losses. The military has a revolving fund for these transactions, but when the fund is depleted, the taxpayer is left to foot the bill. This is unacceptable, and it is our responsibility to ensure that every dollar is accounted for and spent appropriately.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the Department of Defense must take better care of our hard-earned dollars. The taxpayers deserve better, especially when we consider the sacrifices of the men and women who serve our country. It is time for greater accountability and transparency in the use of credit cards. We must ensure that every dollar spent by the Department of Defense is spent wisely and with the utmost concern for our nation's financial well-being.
a warning shot across the bow. The bank is turning up the pressure. It declared its intent to cancel the U.S. Army account, 413,029 of these cards at midnight, this month, this year. That got somebody’s attention in a hurry, and now there are underway between the Bank of America and the Department of Defense.

Mr. President, you might say there is a glimmer of hope on the horizon, and the reason for hope comes from a branch of Department of Defense policy called salary offsets. One might call it garnishment of salary.

Before I explain this new policy, it is important to understand why the Department of Defense credit card program is teetering on the brink of disaster.

As of November last year, 46,572 Department of Defense personnel had defaulted on more than $62 million in official travel expenses and personal credit card balances that was growing at the rate of $1 million per month, making the Department of Defense default rate six times the industry average.

Here is a government, which is supposed to be setting a good example, having a default rate six times what the bank would normally expect from anybody else using credit cards.

For a business that is interested in profit, this is a profit that anyone can have by doing the right thing. A small bank has to float a loan in order to get $1 million back, but the Defense Department has $1 million in offsets, and the interest on that loan is for the benefit of the Defense Department.

Salary offsets provide some measure of accountability, but there are limitations. For one, the money was taken from the bank in big chunks, but it is repaid in little dribbles here and there over a long period of time. There are loopholes in the Defense Department offsets program. These offset programs are widely recognized as having major loopholes. Just this year, we have had to deal with more than 200 of these accounts that are in default.

Salary offsets are having little or no effect on the high delinquency rates. Delinquencies have actually risen since the salary offset policy has been put in place. That is because offsets do not kick in for 120-plus days, 4 months past billing. Payments are due within 30 days of billing.

Today the Department of Defense has outstanding balances of $760 million. About 30 percent of the dollars owed for official travel expenses are more than 30 days past due, and 15 percent are 60 days past due. One in five Department of Defense accounts is over 90 days past due for payment. That is four to five times the industry average.

The 3-month gap between the payment due date and offsets means the bank has to float a loan— it is a free loan to the Defense Department and its abusers—that costs the bank $1 million to $5 million a year.

Wouldn’t you like to get an interest-free loan this way by using a Government credit card?

A prime driver behind delinquencies is the use of the card to cover personal expenses. Mr. President, you may remember I mentioned several cases in a speech last year about egregious abuse of the Department of Defense credit cards. There is the case of Marine Sgt. A. Lopez who ran up a $19,581 bill for personal expenses and then left the service and the unpaid bill when his enlistment was up.

We have a Marine option by the name of P. Falcon, Army, with an unpaid bill of $9,847, including $3,100 spent at a nightclub. We have a dead sailor named T. Hayes who spent $3,521; Q. Rivera, Arm Reserve, whose wife spent $13,011 on a shopping spree in Puerto Rico. And we have R. Walker, Air National Guard, with an unpaid balance of $7,428, including his wife’s gambling debts.

Now, in the past 8 months, since this salary offset program was born, there are now 31,579 accounts enrolled in the offset program; in other words, a garnishment of wages. So far, the offset payments total $5.2 million.

Salary offsets provide some measure of accountability, but there are limitations. For one, the money was taken from the bank in big chunks, but it is repaid in little dribbles here and there over a long period of time. There are loopholes in the Defense Department offsets program. These offset programs are widely recognized as having major loopholes. Just this year, we have had to deal with more than 200 of these accounts that are in default.

Some real leadership at the top would also help. One of the most powerful elements of leadership is a setting of examples of excellence. Setting a good example should include paying credit card bills on time.

Officers in our military branches should always set the example. Unfortunately, there are 773 commissioned officers who have defaulted on $1.1 million in charges. All of these accounts are in charge-off status or unpaid for 7 months or more. The rank of these officers ranges from junior lieutenants up to senior colonels. Some of these accounts were with the Navy Public Works Department, the Navy Construction Battalions, and the Navy’s top level financial management office in the Pentagon, and I am told she is in charge of cash integration.

When one of these cases is put under a microscope, it seems as if the whole problem comes into sharper focus.

Her case is not unique. There is another one. I am going to call him Nick. His last name is Fungcharoen. I am not going to repeat that, obviously. He is an officer in the Army, and he was given a purchase card on a Christmas shopping spree, and in a few short days ran up a bill of $11,551 at Macy’s, Nordstrom, and Circuit City. She bought gift certificates worth $7,500, a Compaq computer, a Nintendo game, a BlackBerry, all at taxpayer expense.

She presented the bill to her Navy supervisor who signed and certified for payment, and it was paid in full. She also used her travel card to buy airline tickets for her son that cost another $722. When Ms. Mays left the Public Works Department, she was allowed to keep her purchase card. I guess they figured she might need it again, and they were right. She did, this time for a personal car rental, and Public Works gladly paid the bill.

I find this Mays case very troublesome. She has allegedly made a number of fraudulent purchases. Yet there was no investigation. More aggressive offsets and investigations are needed. Something had to give.

Today the Department of Defense has outstanding balances of $760 million. About 30 percent of the dollars owed for official travel expenses are more than 30 days past due, and 15 percent are 60 days past due. One in five Department of Defense accounts is over 90 days past due for payment. That is four to five times the industry average.

Credit card abuse in the military will never stop until officers clean up their act. I have provided a list of these 773 commissioned officers who defaulted on their accounts, along with the unpaid balance for each officer. I have written a letter to the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, John J. Obi, M.D., performed the operation, and Nick used his Department of Defense credit card to pay the bill.

Mr. President, you might say there is a glimmer of hope on the horizon, and the reason for hope comes from a branch of Department of Defense policy called salary offsets. One might call it garnishment of salary.

Before I explain this new policy, it is important to understand why the Department of Defense credit card program is teetering on the brink of disaster.

As of November last year, 46,572 Department of Defense personnel had defaulted on more than $62 million in official travel expenses and personal credit card balances that was growing at the rate of $1 million per month, making the Department of Defense default rate six times the industry average.

Here is a government, which is supposed to be setting a good example, having a default rate six times what the bank would normally expect from anybody else using credit cards.

For a business that is interested in profit, this is a profit that anyone can have by doing the right thing. A small bank has to float a loan in order to get $1 million back, but the Defense Department has $1 million in offsets, and the interest on that loan is for the benefit of the Defense Department.

Salary offsets provide some measure of accountability, but there are limitations. For one, the money was taken from the bank in big chunks, but it is repaid in little dribbles here and there over a long period of time. There are loopholes in the Defense Department offsets program. These offset programs are widely recognized as having major loopholes. Just this year, we have had to deal with more than 200 of these accounts that are in default.

Some real leadership at the top would also help. One of the most powerful elements of leadership is a setting of examples of excellence. Setting a good example should include paying credit card bills on time.

Officers in our military branches should always set the example. Unfortunately, there are 773 commissioned officers who have defaulted on $1.1 million in charges. All of these accounts are in charge-off status or unpaid for 7 months or more. The rank of these officers ranges from junior lieutenants up to senior colonels. Some of these accounts were with the Navy Public Works Department, the Navy Construction Battalions, and a Navy captain. Individual unpaid balances top out at $8,500. Some of the charges on these accounts look suspicious and need investigation.

Commissioned officers who run up $1.1 million in bad debts set a terrible example for the rank and file. Somebody over in the Pentagon needs to come down hard on officer scofflaws.
When the relationship soured, the case ended up in small claims court. Nick had retired on disability and wanted his money back. The judge became alarmed that Nick testified proudly he had used his government-issued credit card to pay the doctor. Nick whipped out the card in the courtroom and showed it to the judge. The judge examined the card and read the inscription that says, “for official government travel only.”

The judge stated in total disbelief, “You paid for this breast enlargement with a government credit card?”

After the revelation, the judge simply said, “Let’s not go there.”

That case is unique. It is unique because the cardholder paid his bill, though not always on time. So I have two problems with all of that.

The point is, we have to get this stopped. We have to make sure all of the resources of the Defense Department are not used for playing games with government credit cards but are used to make sure we win the war on terrorism.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUGAR). The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 25 minutes.

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

The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. LUGAR. I thank the Chair.

The remarks of Mr. LUGAR pertaining to Joint Resolutions are located in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced bills and Joint Resolutions.”

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2356) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today with the opening of this debate, we take the first step toward passing the McCain-Feingold-Shays-Meehan bill in the Senate and take one of the final steps toward passing this bill last month, and, most of all, the work done by my colleagues here in the Senate, under the leadership of Senator McCaIN of Arizona.

A year ago, we had an excellent debate as representatives of the people here on this floor. In fact, it began almost exactly a year ago, on March 19. We had an outstanding exchange of ideas, we held numerous votes, and we worked hard on both sides of the issue. I believe that the debate enriched this body, and that it enriched the McCain-Feingold bill.

In the end, the will of the Senate was done, and we passed the bill in a strong bipartisan vote of 59-41. A year later, we are here again on the floor working to pass reform. But this time it is different. This time, we already know where the Senate stands. And we know that all that stands between this bill and the President’s desk is the Senate’s final consideration of the bill this week.

With the strong vote for McCain-Feingold last year, the Senate recognized the importance of our responsibility to the people and as stewards of democracy. As long as we allow soft money to exist, we risk damaging our credibility when we make the decisions about the issues that the people elected us to make.

The people sent us here to wrestle with some very tough issues. They have vested us with the power to make decisions that have a profound impact on their lives. That is a responsibility that we take very seriously. But today, when we weigh the pros and cons of legislation, many people think we also weigh the size of the contributions we got from interests on both sides of the issue. And when those contributions can be a million dollars, or even more, it seems obvious to most people that we would reward, or at least listen especially carefully to, our biggest donors.

So, year ago we voted to change the system. And now, both bodies have fully and fairly debated the issues and discussed the merits of this bill. We have given this important issue the time and consideration it deserves. Now, very simply, it is time to get the job done. It is time to get this bill to the President.

I believe the Senate is ready to repair a broken system. And make no mistake about it, the way the soft money and issue ad loopholes are being abused today has devastated the campaign finance system. More than that, these loopholes have weakened the effectiveness of this body and cast doubt on the work we do. They have weakened the public trust in our democratic process. In a very real sense, they have weakened our democracy.

I know many of us here are tired of seeing headlines that imply that legislators accept bribes and outcomes have bought with our own will or good judgment, but a result of our desire to please wealthy donors. We are tired of those headlines, and so are the American people. The people know that the system can function better when soft money doesn’t render our hard money limits meaningless, and when phony issue ads don’t make a joke of our election laws. And they also know that this is our best chance in years to do something to effect real change.

This week we can show them, just as we did a year ago in this Senate, that we are ready for change, and that we are going to make that change happen. As we embark on this discussion about campaign finance reform on the floor today, it is remarkable how much has changed since the Senator from Arizona and I introduced this bill in September of 1995, and even since we stood here a year ago. Both sides of Capitol Hill have finally acknowledged the damage that soft money has done to the American people. We can ban soft money contributions, after years of soft money scandals and embarrassments that have chipped away at the integrity of this body.

As many commentators have noted, the collapse of Enron gave the campaign finance reform issue momentum prior to the House vote in February. But I would note that our effort has been given momentum by many other campaign finance scandals that have occurred just in the last few years. I think they are actually more than we care to remember.

Soft money has had an increasingly prominent role in party fundraising over the last 12 years. In 1988 the parties began raising $100,000 contributions for the Bush and Dukakis campaigns—an amount unheard of before the 1988 race. By the 1992 election, the year I was elected to this body, soft money fundraising by the major parties doubled, to $121 million. In successive election cycles the amount of soft money raised by the parties has simply skyrocketed. In 2000 soft money totals were more than five times what they were in 1992. It was already a lot in 1992. In 2000, it was five times what it had been 8 years earlier.

And along with the money, came the scandals—soft money and scandals have gone hand in hand for more than a decade now. First, the mere fact that public money was being raised in such enormous amounts was a scandal in the early 1990s. But then we had the Lincoln Bedroom, and the White House
Coffees, and Charlie Trie and John Huang and Johnny Chung. And then, of course, the Presidential pardons coming under suspicion at the conclusion of the Clinton administration. We faced questions in this body as we considered bills regulating tobacco and telecommunications and the President’s Bill of Rights, while at the same time we raised soft money from the industries and interest groups that had a huge stake in those bills. The public watched with increased skepticism as we attempted to sell tobacco-reform legislation based on the demands of wealthy soft money donors. With the enormous influx of soft money being raised by both parties, with every vote we cast the public wondered, and had reason to wonder, was it the money?

Of course of late we have seen yet another scandal take shape—the Enron debacle. As the Enron story unfolded, I think many of us were reminded why the Supreme Court, in Its famous 1976 Buckley versus Valeo decision, said that the appearance of corruption, not just corruption itself, justifies congressional action to place some limits on our campaign finance system.

In the Buckley case, the Supreme Court understood that public mistrust of government is destructive to democracy. From a constitutional point of view, it hardly matters whether that mistrust is based on actual misconduct or simply its appearance.

In the case of Enron’s collapse, the need to address public mistrust has been paramount for Congress and the administration as they have investigated the company’s alleged wrongdoing. When a corporation such as Enron leaves devastated employees and fleeced shareholders in its wake, the public depends on us—on Congress and the administration—to determine what went wrong and defend the public interest.

But the potential for a conflict of interest in such a case is clear: Many of the elected officials who were asked to sit in judgment of Enron, including Members of Congress, the Attorney General, and the President of the United States, have been accepting, and even asking for, campaign contributions from all sorts of corporations, unions, and wealthy individuals that has exploited the soft money loophole to buy influence with Congress and the executive branch at the very highest levels. So banning soft money will help to untangle the web of money and influence that has made Congress and the White House so vulnerable to the appearance of corruption for far too long.

In the coming days we will face the final test of this long legislative battle and take our final steps toward enacting these hard-fought reforms into law. Passing campaign finance reform is within our grasp, and, so, finally, is a renewed integrity for our democratic process.

Of course, while the soft money ban is central to the bill, and is the most important feature of the bill, this bill contains reforms on a variety of other issues.

I say to the Presiding Officer, of course, you were one of the principal authors of very important provisions relating to so-called phony issue ads that make the bill even stronger.

A number of amendments were added on the Senate floor last year that improved and strengthened the bill. Almost all of them are in the bill now before us that we hope, by the end of the week, will be sent to the President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed in the Record immediately following my statement.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, the debate is finally here. Our bipartisan coalition is strong and resolute. And the moment for reform has arrived.

After 6½ years of work on this bill, and more than a decade of scandals that have threatened the integrity of our legislative process, I do believe this body is ready to get the job done for the American people. I believe the American people have waited long enough.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.
the vote activities carried out by 501(c) organizations. The provision also clarifies that candidates may solicit unlimited funds for 501(c) organizations where the solicitation does not specify the purpose of the money contributed or the organization’s principal purpose is not voter registration or get out the vote activities.

Sec. 223(f). State Candidates. Prohibits candidates for state or local office from spending soft money on public communications that promote or attack a clearly identified federal candidate or federal office. Excludes communications which refer to a federal candidate who is also a candidate for state or local office.

Taken together, these soft money provisions are designed to shut down the soft money loophole as comprehensively as possible. By including entities established, maintained, controlled, or acting on behalf of federal and state officeholders and candidates, they also prohibit so-called “leadership PACs” or “candidate PACs” from raising or spending soft money in connection with Federal elections and are designed to prevent the evasion of the law by federal or state officeholders using 501(c)(4) or 527 organizations.

Sec. 101(b). Definitions. Provides definitions for certain terms used in the soft money provisions. Federal election activity means voting activities within 120 days before a federal election, get out the vote activity in connection with an election in which federal candidates are on the ballot (even if state candidates are also on the ballot), and public communications that promote or attack a clearly identified federal candidate or federal office. These are the activities that state parties must pay for with hard money (except as specifically provided under the bill).

Generic campaign activity means campaign activities like general party advertising that promote a political party but not a candidate.

Public communication means a communication to the general public by means of broadcast, cable, satellite, newspaper, magazine, or any other medium or mass medium of communications, including telephone bank, or any other general public political advertising.

Mass mailing is a mailing of more than 500 identical pieces or similarly similar pieces within any 30 day period.

Telephone bank means more than 500 identifying similar pieces or pieces similar in nature within a 30 day period.

Sec. 102. Increased contribution limits for state committees of political parties. Increases the amount that individuals can give to state parties from $5,000 to $10,000. See Section 307 for additional increases in contribution limits.

Sec. 301. Reporting requirements. Requires national political party committees, including congressional campaign committees to report all receipts and disbursements and state party committees to report all receipts and disbursements and state party committees to report all receipts and disbursements for Federal election activities and receipts and disbursements for activities permitted by the Levin amendment (i.e., spending of capped soft money donations on certain forms of voter registration and get-out-the-vote activities).

Sec. 302. Use of Contributed Amounts for Corporate and Labor Disbursements for Electioneering Communications. Bars the use of corporate and union treasury money for electioneering communications coordinated with candidates or parties. The provision essentially prohibits electioneering communications that are coordinated with candidates or parties and outside groups, advertising that promotes or attacks a clearly identified federal candidate. The provision applies to all contributions to candidates or parties and outside groups, advertising that promotes or attacks a clearly identified federal candidate.

Sec. 201. Disclosure of Electioneering Communications. Requires candidates who spend over $10,000 in a calendar year on electioneering communications to file a disclosure statement within 24 hours after reaching that amount or within 24 hours of each additional $10,000 of spending. Electioneering communications are defined as broadcast, cable or satellite communications that mention or show the likeness of a clearly identified candidate for Federal office within 60 days of a general election or 30 days of a primary election, convention, or caucus, and which is targeted to the candidate’s state/district. Electioneering communications do not include news broadcasts, communications that constitute independent expenditures because they contain express advocacy, or candidate debates and advertisements for candidate debates. The FEC may promulgate additional exceptions for advocacy that are not for or against, promote, or support a clearly identified Federal candidate.

Sec. 202. Contributions to Electioneering Communications. Makes clear that electioneering communications that are coordinated with candidates or parties are independent expenditures, and the principal place of business of that person if it is not an individual, the amount of each disbursement over $200 and the identity of the recipient, the purpose of the disbursement, and the election to which the communication pertains and the candidate or candidates who are identified. If the disbursement is made from a segregated account only individuals can contribute, the disclosure statement must also reveal the names and addresses of the contributors of $1,000 or more to that account. If the disbursement is not made from such a segregated account then all donors of $1,000 to the organization making the expenditure must be disclosed. Money in the segregated account can be used for purposes other than electioneering communications, and the spending on other activities need not be disclosed, but all contributions to the organization must be informed that their money might be used for electioneering communications.

Sec. 203. Use of Soft Money for Electioneering Communications. Bars the use of corporate and union treasury money for electioneering communications coordinated with candidates or parties and outside groups, advertising that promotes or attacks a clearly identified federal candidate.

Sec. 204. Rules Relating to Certain Targeted Electioneering Communications. Unions and corporations are considered to be one entity so a national party cannot make an independent expenditure if a state party has made a coordinated expenditure with respect to a particular candidate.

Sec. 205. Independent Versus Coordinated Expenditures by Parties. Requires political parties to choose in each election between making the limited expenditures permitted to be coordinated with a candidate under 2 U.S.C. §441(a)(d) and making unlimited independent expenditures. Parties would make the decision with respect to a particular election after their nominee has been chosen. If a party makes an independent expenditure, it may not also coordinate with respect to that election. If it makes a coordinated expenditure, it may not make an independent expenditure of $5,000 or more. In the case of individuals, or prohibited in the case of groups, advertising that promotes or attacks a clearly identified federal candidate.

Sec. 206. Definition of Independent Expenditure. Clarifies the statutory definition of independent expenditure to mean an expenditure that expressly advocates the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate that is not made in coordination with a candidate.

Sec. 207. Reporting Requirements for Certain Contributions. Requires anyone, including a political committee, who makes independent expenditures totaling $10,000 or more until the 20th day before the election to file a report with the FEC within 48 hours. An additional report must be filed within 48 hours of any additional independent expenditure of $1,000 or more. In the case of individuals, or prohibited in the case of groups, advertising that promotes or attacks a clearly identified federal candidate.

Sec. 301. Use of Contributed Amounts for Certain Purposes. Codifies FEC regulations.
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relating to the personal use of campaign funds by candidates. Contributions will be considered converted to personal use if they are used for an expense that would exist irrespective of the campaign or otherwise for the candidate, his or her family, or their friends, including, among other things, a mortgage or rent payment, clothing, vacation expenses, tuition payments, noncampaign-related automobile expenses or other items.

Sec. 302. Prohibition of Fundraising on Federal Property. Amends 18 U.S.C. §607 to provide for the authorization of agencies or the Federal Government to require any contribution from a person who is located in a federal room or building. It is also unlawful for any candidate to hold a campaign contribution while located in a federal room or building.

Sec. 303. Strengthening Foreign Money Ban. Prohibits foreign nationals from making any contribution to a committee of a political party or any contribution in connection with federal, state or local elections, including any electioneering communications. The SEC shall provide the SEC with the authority to impose civil penalties for violations of this section.

Sec. 304. Modification of Individual Contribution Limits in Response to Expenditures from Personal Funds. Allows Senate candidates to raise larger contributions from individual donors. The provision sets up three different “triggers” according to the level of the candidate’s state. When a wealthy candidate’s personal spending passes the first trigger amount, the individual contribution limits are tripled. At the second trigger, the opposing candidate can raise six times the limits from individual donors. And at the third trigger, party coordinated spending limits are increased. The amount of additional fundraising and spending at all trigger levels is limited to 110% of the amount of personal wealth spent. The provision also prohibits all candidates from raising contributions to repay loans they make to their own campaigns of over $250,000. Section 316 further limits the amount of additional fundraising that can be done by Senate candidates under this provision. See section 319 for a similar provision applicable to House candidates.

Sec. 305. Limitation on Availability of Low-Pay to Federal Candidates. Provides that if federal candidates purchase personal computer software vendors to develop software that requires the FEC to promulgate standards for the software. The software shall require the FEC to maintain a public database containing information about the software and the software vendor. The software shall include a number of statistical determinants of the success rate of political advertising in the candidate’s state. The FEC shall conduct a study of the clean money, clean election systems in Arizona and Maine. The study shall include a number of statistical determinants of the success rate of political advertising in the candidate’s state. The FEC shall report its findings to Congress.

Sec. 310. Study and Report on Clean Money Election Laws. Requires the GAO to conduct a study of the clean money, clean election systems in Arizona and Maine. The study shall include a number of statistical determinants of the success rate of political advertising in the candidate’s state. The FEC shall report its findings to Congress.

Sec. 311. Clarity Standards for Identification of Sponsors of Election-Related Advertising. Amends and supplements the FEC’s current requirements that the sponsors of political advertising identify themselves in their ads. Additional provisions include: (1) applies the requirements to any disbursement for public political advertising, including electioneering communications; (2) requires the address, telephone number, and Internet address of persons other than candidates who publish political advertising to appear in the ad; (3) requires radio ads to include a statement by the candidate that he or she has approved the advertising to appear in the ad; (4) requires a television ad to include the same audio statement along with a picture of the candidate or a full screen view of the candidate making the statement, and a written version of that statement that appears for at least 4 seconds; and (5) requires persons other than candidates to include a statement that that person “is responsible for the content of this advertising.”

Sec. 312. Increase in Penalties. Increases from one year to five years the maximum term of imprisonment for knowing and willful violations of the FECA involving the making, receiving, or reporting of any contribution, donation, or expenditure aggregating $25,000 or more during a calendar year. Provides that criminal fines of up to $250,000 may also be assessed for prohibited contributions or transfers of that amount, or of up to $100,000 for violations totaling less than $25,000 in a year.

Sec. 313. Statute of Limitations. Extends the statute of limitations for violations of the FECA from three to five years.

Sec. 314. Sentencing Guidelines. Directs the U.S. Sentencing Commission to: (1) within 90 days of the effective date promulgate a guideline, or amend an existing guideline, for penalties under FECA and related election laws; and (2) submit to Congress an explanation of any such guidelines and any legislative or administrative recommendations for other legislation or administrative consider-
runoff or recount) or any previous election, but only for expenses for which it would otherwise be permissible to spend soft money. No soft money may be spent on office buildings or the effective campaign.

Sec. 403. Judicial Review. Provides that any action for declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge constitutionality of any provision of the Act or any amendment made by it must be filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia where the complaint will be heard by a three-judge court. Appeal of an order or judgment in such an action shall be reviewable only by appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States. Petition for such an appeal must be taken by notice of appeal filed within 10 days of the judgment and a jurisdictional statement must be filed within 30 days of the entry of a final judgment. The District Court and the Supreme Court must expeditiously dispose of the case. Allows a Member of Congress to intervene in support of or in opposition to a party to the case. The Court may make orders that similar positions be filed jointly or be represented by a single attorney at oral arguments.

TITLE V: ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURE PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Internet Access to Records. Requires the FEC to make all designations, reports, statements, and notifications available on the Internet within 48 hours of receipt.

Sec. 502. Maintenance of Website of Election Reports. Requires the FEC to maintain an Internet site to make all publicly available election reports accessible to the public and to coordinate with other agencies that receive complaints to allow each report to be posted on the FEC's site in a timely manner.

Sec. 503. Additional Monthly and Quarterly Disclosures. Requires candidates to file quarterly reports instead of semi-annual reports in non-election years. National parties are required to file monthly reports rather than having a choice between monthly and quarterly reports.

Sec. 504. Public Access to Broadcasting Records. Requires radio and television broadcasting stations to maintain records of requests to purchase political advertising time, including requests by candidates or by advocacy-type organizations to communicate a message relating to a political matter of national importance. The records must be made available for public inspection and must include, among other things, the name and contact information of the person requesting the advertisement, the time, date and time and the rates charged for the advertisement.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, first, I want to acknowledge my good friend, colleague and ranking member on the Rules Committee, Senator MITCH MCCONNELL of Kentucky.

While he and I may be on opposite sides of another issue—the election reform legislation which is now pending before the Senate. I would much prefer to be with him on an issue rather than against him.

I think all my colleagues agree that he is a formidable advocate for his position. Even if a resolution is clear on this legislation at the end of the day, I suspect this will not be the end of Senator MCCONNELL’s advocacy with regard to campaign finance reform issues.

I turn now to the matter at hand. I rise today to express my optimism that Congress will enact real campaign finance reform this week.

We must not use this week to merely re-debate legislation already fully debated and adopted by both chambers of Congress. Only final passage is the proper tribute to the culmination of years of extraordinary bicameral and bipartisan leadership provided by my good friends and colleagues.

In the Senate, the leaders of campaign finance reform are Senator JOHN MCAIN of Arizona and Senator RUSS FEINGOLD of Wisconsin. In the House, the leaders are Congresswoman CHRISTOPHER SHAYS of Connecticut and Congresswoman MARTIN MEEHAN of Massachusetts.

On February 14, 2002, the Shays-Meehan Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Bill, H.R. 2356, was adopted by a vote of 240-189 in the House. On April 2, 2001, the McCain-Feingold Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform bill, S. 27, was adopted by a vote of 59-41 in the Senate.

Interestingly, today is only one day short of being a full year since the Senate started debate on the McCain-Feingold measure—March 19, 2001.

Last year, I was honored to serve as floor manager for the Senate debate on campaign finance reform legislation. I was equally honored to be counted as one of the 59 votes to adopt the McCain-Feingold bill.

I stand in the same shoes today. It is a high honor to serve as floor manager of the Senate debate on the Shays-Meehan measure. I will be equally as honored to be counted among the many Members who will vote in a bipartisan manner to adopt this reform bill.

I congratulate my colleagues in both chambers for the hard-fought success given the fact that the Senate debate on the Shays-Meehan legislation, which I believe to be a decisive victory, and the House debate on the Shays-Meehan measure, which I would have preferred to be a decisive victory, were both decisive victories.

It is with a sense of parochial pride in this House action that the major cosponsor of the legislation, who is a longstanding friend of mine and a Member of the Connecticut delegation, has been a principled advocate of campaign finance reform for years.

I want to express the tremendous sense of pride of all the people of Connecticut to Chris Shays for his outstanding efforts to achieve real campaign finance reform on behalf of all Americans.

Our Senate debate will only confirm that the House merely adopted virtually the same bill as the Senate approved after a robust debate on April 2, 2001.

In general, both bills would change the way political parties raise and spend money, regulate issue advertising, increase contribution limits, improve disclosure requirements, and make other changes to campaign finance law.

Specifically, both bills would ban unrestricted “soft money” contributions to political parties by corporations, unions, and individuals.

Both bills would restrict end-of-campaign advertising funded by organizations that name a Federal candidate; both bills would put an aggregate limits on contributions by individuals to candidates, PACs, and parties; and both bills would improve disclosure of campaign finance activity.

There are a few minor differences between the House and Senate passed bills. For example, there is a difference in the contribution limits for an individual. Under the House bill, an individual may contribute a total of $95,000 in 2 years to candidates, PACs, and parties. Under the Senate bill, an individual may contribute a total of $37,500 in 1 year to candidates, PACs, and parties. Under both bills, an individual is nevertheless limited to an annual maximum contribution of $37,500 to candidates.

Another difference between the two bills is that the House bill eliminates Senator TORGничел’S’s amendment requiring the lowest unit rate for the purchase of broadcast advertisements.

Finally, the House bill extends to House candidates the “millions amendment.” These are all very minor differences that serve to make the two bills substantially the same.

As a result, the Senate would not benefit from an extended debate on re-hashing the same debate of this version of the Shays-Meehan legislation. Last year’s open and full Senate debate on these same issues in McCain-Feingold remains sufficient for our purposes today, which is to pass comprehensive campaign finance reform.

It is my fervent hope that we pass this legislation with a minimum amount of debate. This is not a “mission impossible,” given the fact that the House bill is virtually a mirror image of the Senate-passed legislation, requiring the lowest unit rate for the purchase of broadcast advertisements.

The Senate already participated in weeks of full, open and unrestricted debate on campaign finance reform. And the Senate already voted on both the substance of the bill and all relevant amendments to the bill.

Now the question becomes whether yet another extended Senate debate will serve to ensure certain improvements in the bill or, to the contrary, only serve to ensure further delay of the bill?

On balance, I believe the risk of delay far outweighs the potential for legislative improvements. There is no perfect legislation. Attempting to craft perfect legislation only serves to jeopardize the Senate’s ability to send this measure to the President for signature.

Instead of becoming law, the Shays-Meehan bill would be on yet another journey. It would be a candidate for a Senate-House conference or additional Senate debate. The chances would kill any real chance to enact campaign finance reform in the 107th Congress.
I urge my colleagues to consider this road well traveled for decades. It is time to resist exploring new and substantial forks in the road.

As do many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I feel strongly about the need for comprehensive campaign reform. Time and again we have seen thoughtful, appropriate—and, I must emphasize, bipartisan—efforts to stop the spiraling money chase that afflicts our political system, only to see a mi-

nority in the Senate block further consideration of the issue.

It is almost as if the opponents of reform are heeding the humorous advice of Mark Twain, who once said, “Do not put off until tomorrow what can be put off till day-after-tomorrow just as well.”

It is now long past the day-after-tomorrow. We simply cannot afford to wait any longer to do something about the spiraling money chase that afflicts our political system, only to see a minority in the Senate block further consid-

eration of the issue.

Oscar Wilde once observed that “A cynic is a person who knows the price of everything and the value of nothing.” I fear that the exploding dominance of money in politics has created a similar atmosphere of cynicism in our political system—an environment where the value of ideas, of debate, of people in general, is overwhelmed by the price tag of free speech and political success.

The worst aspect of the current financing system is its affect on eroding public confidence in the integrity of our political process.

The real concern is that the escalating amounts of money pouring into our elections is having a corrupting influence on our political system. The public perception of the problems of corruption and the appearance of corruption is that large political contributions to candidates and political parties provide those donors with prefer-

anced access and influence over American public policy—and the average American has neither the access nor influence in Washington.

The more money that is required to run for office, the more influence that the donors—wealthy individuals, corporations, labor unions, and special interest groups—have over elected official and public policy.

The real harm to avoid is having the concerns of the average voters completely usurped by the money and influence of these powerful individuals, corporations, and interest groups.

It is this concern—the relationship of money to power—that is casting a vote of “no confidence” in the integrity of our electoral process. It is this devast-

ating corruption and the appearance of corruption that campaign finance reform seeks to avoid. To date, Congress has an unacceptable record since we have only sought to avoid the remedy for the harm.

Unfortunately, not only does historical data tend to support this pessi-

mistic view—the current data sustains this view.

Take a cursory look at raising and spending soft money in the November 2000 Presidential and congressional elections. It sends one message—our financing system is in urgent need of re-

pair.

According to the center for responsive politics, the total amount spent on the 2000 Presidential and congressional campaigns was approximately $3 billion. This price tag is up from $2.2 billion in 1996 and $1.8 billion in 1992. According to the Federal Election Commission, the Democratic and Republican parties raised $1.2 billion in 2000—a 36 percent increase over the $881 million raised by the parties in 1996.

In that same period, democrats raised over $245 million in soft money, while Republicans raised over $249 million in soft money. The parties use soft money funds for direct contributions to candidates and other activities to advocate the election or defeat of candidates for Federal office.

The Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law conducted a study on television advertising in the 2000 Federal elections. The Brennan Center found that the President-

dential election was the first election in which national political parties spent more on television ads than the candidates themselves spent—the Democratic and Republican national committees together spent over $80 million on TV ads, a lot more than the $67 million spent by Vice-President Gore and Governor Bush.

The Brennan Center found that the vast amount of money spent by the parties on TV ads was “soft money,” the unregulated and unlimited party donations to corporations, labor unions, and wealthy individuals.

The Brennan Center found that spending by groups in congressional campaigns on so-called issue ads increased from $10 million in 1998 to $32 million in 2000.

Finally, the Brennan Center also found that only a small percentage of party soft money is spent for get-out-the-vote and voter mobilization activities. A large dollar goes to GOTV and voter registration activi-

ties while 40 cents of every dollar goes to purchase ads to support or defeat candidates for Federal office.

In contrast to all this financial participation in the Federal Election Commission report on the 2000 Federal elections, just under 105.4 million Americans voted in the Presidential election. That is 51 percent of the Census Bureau’s estimated voting-age population of over 205.8 million Americans.

The voter turnout figure of 51 percent in 2000 was somewhat higher than the 49 percent turnout for the 1996 Federal elections—the first time in modern political history when less than half of the eligible electorate turned out to vote for President.

This means that the voter turnout has been approximately over 63 per-

cent of the voting age population in 1952 to slightly over 51 percent of the voting age population in 2000.

Arguably, while there are no accu-

rate national statistics, it is sufficient to point out that there is only a small percentage of individual donors with average income who actually contribute to political campaigns.

These statistics tell the story of a system in which a small percentage of individual donors are making ever larger contributions, while at the same time more and more voters have lost such confidence in our elections that they do not even feel it is worthwhile to vote.

Do any of us really believe this is ac-

ceptable? Do any of us believe that this is not a system in need of comprehen-

sive reform?

If we are to break the grip that money currently holds on our cam-

paigns, we must enact legislation that stops the flood of unregulated money in the political system and limit the flow of regulated money into Federal campaigns.

We must restore common sense by eliminating the opportunities for legal- ly exploiting loopholes that mock the spir-

it of our campaign finance laws. We must give those who enforce the law the resources they need to ensure that the campaign financing system is lawful and fair.

I look forward to participating in the process of winding-down the campaign finance debate. I also look forward to working with my colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—and to adopting this moderate legislation that restores the proper balance of money to politics and restores the American people’s confidence in our current financing sys-

tem.

I urge each of my colleagues to put aside any and all partisanship and personal ambitions to join me in de-emphasizing the importance of money in politics.

This is not a complicated task. We desperately need to ensure that the average American is heard in Washington over the din of special interest voices. We must ensure that the exercising of Americans’ free speech in the political process is not governed by the price tag of contribution amounts that can be raised and spent on Federal elec-

tions. As Supreme Court Justice Stevens wrote in the Nixon v. Shrink Mis-

souri Government PAC case, “Money is property, money is not speech.”

This is why Congress has an obliga-

tion to enact comprehensive, meaning-

ful, and real campaign finance law and pass the law now.

The action we take today will signal to all Americans that exercising their first amendment right to free speech
and association outside the beltway has now been heard inside the beltway.

Americans have waited long enough. Congress has the first opportunity in a generation to clean up a political system that most Americans believe is polluted by campaign contributions, or the appearance of such pollution. There is no room for wavering or using a philosophical, legal or factual excuse for killing this legislation. This is a real chance to curb the role of money in politics.

It has been decades since Congress took similar comprehensive action with the enactment of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971. The one thing we cannot afford to do is wait any longer—now is the time to enact the Shays-Meehan/McCain-Fingeold legislation. The American people have waited long enough!

I fully support this legislation as the best effort that Congress can make to enact real campaign finance reform. I stand ready to do what I can to make reform a reality in the 107th Congress. I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

COMMENDING THE COURAGE OF INGRID BETANCOURT, CLARA ROJAS, MARTHA DANIELS, AND THE COLOMBIAN PEOPLE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, just an hour or so ago, I made a call to Colombias urban centers, have been left in darkness, and 76 municipalities in 6 provinces have had their phone service cut out completely.

Colombian citizens are living each day in fear while enduring tremendous domestic hardship. President Pastrana has warned his people more attacks are likely, and the citizens of Colombia are frightened, to put it mildly.

Even worse, FARC rebels have undertaken a violent and public siege of terror by kidnapping Colombian citizens and demanding ransom. When the ransom is not paid, the hostages are killed, and new hostages are taken. It is a vicious cycle that repeats over and over again on the spirit of this beleaguered nation. Indeed, at this point close to 4,000 people have died in Colombia since the beginning of hostilities; kidnappings are about 3,000 a year. At the same time, rebel groups have executed several political figures, including mayors, judges, members of the legislature, and candidates. As elected officials ourselves, this is a development that we should be particularly enraged by, and note that this has drawn the attention and concern of all people in democratic countries around the globe.

On March 3, Martha Catalina Daniels, a Colombian Senator, was tortured and killed near Bogota by guerrilla fighters while attempting to negotiate the release of hostages kidnapped by leftist rebels. After her torture, she was shot at close range with two bullets to the head, and then dumped in a ravine off a country road. A staffer and a journalist were also killed in this vicious attack against decency and democracy, not to mention the value of human life.

Senator Daniels was the fourth member of the Colombian Congress to be killed since the middle of last year while working in her elected capacity as a representative of the Colombian people. Could you imagine similar events happening in our Capitol? There would be tremendous public outcry, and the Government would respond swiftly. Just because this crime happened in conflict-torn Colombia does not mean that we should allow this execution to pass by without public comment or outcry in this, the greatest Congress on the planet. We must stand with our democracy-loving colleagues around the world in condemning these attacks. This crime was a vicious and merciless murder of the representative people of one of our staunchest friends and a brave and courageous public servant and her staff. They were simply doing their jobs—jobs that we and our staffs do everyday. In recognition of this commitment, Senator Daniels sacrifice will not be forgotten by the Congress and our fellow citizens in America. Her death will not be in vain.

Yet the assault on democracy in Colombia is not only targeted at those who hold office. Rebels also have targeted national candidates for public office as Colombia prepares for an upcoming presidential election. On February 23, Colombia presidential candidate Ingrid Betancourt, and her chief of staff, Clara Rojas, were seized while driving toward the southern war zone of San Vicente del Caguan. Mrs. Betancourt’s driver and her assistants accompanying her were held and released, but Mrs. Betancourt and Ms. Rojas were kept in custody—a clear sign that this kidnapping was intended to send a signal to the political class in Colombia. The FARC believed to have perpetrated this crime, currently hold five other politicians hostage and are attempting to cripple democracy in this Nation by force. However, the Colombian Government rightly refuses to negotiate with these terrorists for fear that concessions would encourage even more kidnappings in the future, and the situation is presently at a standoff.

Mrs. Betancourt has been allowed to fax her family to assure them of her well-being, and she has expressed her concern for her family, friends, and country. Even now, as a prisoner, she stands by her democratic principles. As she suffers, she seeks to bring international attention to the problem of violence in Colombia through her plight. Mrs. Betancourt’s daughter has stated that her mother has indicated her desire that people be conscious of what is happening in Colombia and recognize that a war is going on in that country every day. She seeks to use her own situation as a rallying point for the international community against violence in Colombia.

I spoke to Mrs. Betancourt’s husband this afternoon, and expressed my sympathy to him and his family, and my admiration for his courageous wife, and expressed as well those same sentiments on behalf of all of us in this Chamber. I pray for her safe and quick return.

Attention in America is rightly focused on Afghanistan and the war against terrorism. However, we cannot allow the brave sacrifices of people like Ingrid Betancourt to go unnoticed. We have an enormous amount of our attention to expend on the staggering problems of Colombia. If we turn our backs on this corner of the world, I fear that we may see another situation arise like that
which we saw when we ignored Afghanistan after the Soviet occupation. We cannot and should not allow this to happen.

And so, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be deeply aware of the situations such as Martha Daniels, Ingrid Betancourt, and their staffs. They have paid the ultimate price for their commitment to democracy and have shown great courage by serving as politicians in such a volatile and strife-torn country. Their service is a testament of the democratic commitment of the vast majority of Colombian people, a commitment that was reconfirmed on March 11, when huge numbers of Colombians went to the polls even though they had been threatened with violence as they sought to execute their constitutionally given right to vote.

Colombia is a troubled country in desperate need of our assistance and the assistance of other democratic nations around the globe. But the spirit of democracy lives on in the dedicated public servants and citizens of our friend and neighbor to the South.

I want the Colombian Government, and more importantly the people of Colombia, to know their courage and sacrifice has been noted by the American people and by this individual in this body speaking. I am very confident, on behalf of all of us in this Chamber in urging the FARC and other organizations to cease in the abduction of political figures, to cease in the abduction of innocent civilians, in that country and to go back to the bargaining table and try to figure out a way to resolve this four-decade old conflict. The deaths and the abductions shredding this country deserve the attention of this Congress, the American people, and freedom-loving people everywhere.

I ask my colleagues to take an active interest in this problem and act as friends of Colombia. The Colombian people, people like Ingrid Betancourt and Martha Danielei, deserves no less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Randy Crane, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. When is the vote scheduled?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is scheduled for 5:50 p.m.

Mr. LEAHY. Is there time reserved to the Senator from Vermont?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has used 6 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. I understand the Senator from Vermont has 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is divided equally between 5:38 and 5:50.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, we are voting on our 42nd judicial nominee to be confirmed since last July when the Senate Judiciary Committee reorganized after the Senator majority changed. With the confirmation of Robert Randall Crane to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas—and I predict we will accomplish the Senate will have confirmed 7 judicial emergencies since we returned to session a few short weeks ago, 14 judicial emergencies since I became chairman.

As of this week, the Senate has confirmed more judges in the last 9 months than were confirmed in 4 out of 6 years under the Republican leadership. I have heard some inaccurate statements—I am sure innocently and without misrepresentation, on the other side of the aisle. As of this week, we will have confirmed, in 9 months, more judges than were confirmed in 4 of the 6 total years under the Republican leadership. In fact, the number of judicial nominations over these past 9 months exceeds the number of judicial nominees confirmed during all 12 months for the years 2000, 1999, 1997, and 1996.

During the 6½ years the Republicans controlled the Senate, the number of judicial nominations averaged 38 a year. We have done more than that in 9 months. In the past 9 months, we have had more hearings for more nominees and had more confirmations than the Republican leadership for President Bush. So far we have done 14. Looking at the first 3 months of the session, we will have confirmed 14. During the first 3 months of each session they were in charge the following occurred: In month 1, 1995, they confirmed 1; month 2, 1996, they confirmed 0; by March of 1997, they confirmed 2; by March of 1998, the high-water mark, they had 12; by March of 1999, they had 0; by March of 2000, they had 7; by March of 2001, they had 0; we have done 14.

We tried to have a pace faster than the Republicans when they chaired the Judiciary Committee, when they controlled the Senate, and so far we have done that. Some have expressed concern how this Senate, under this leadership, has handled nominations of President Bush. So far he will have won 41 out of 42 nominations. As great as the football team is in Nebraska, they would be delighted to win 41 out of 42, as would any team.

In 1999, when the Republicans controlled the Senate, in the whole year, they confirmed 26 district judges and 7 circuit judges. In the year 2000, for the whole year, they confirmed 31 district judges and 8 circuit judges. In the first 6 months of last year, when they controlled the Senate, they had 0. In the past 9 months—remember, these are comparing whole years—in the past 9 months, we have had 35 district judges, 7 courts of appeal.

Take the average number of days between nomination and confirmation, figuring we have to wait extra time for ABA: they 28; we 182 one or more; 212 days another year; 232, another; 176, another; 196, another. The Democrats average considerably less.

Reviewing today’s nominations illustrates the effect of the reform process that the Democratic leadership has spearheaded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 6 minutes.
Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see no other Member seeking recognition. I ask consent the vote still be at 5:50 and I be allowed to use the time until 5:50.

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

Mr. President, we will have a vote today on Randy Crane. There are Members who have stated, because the Democrats took over the full committee in July of last year, we would try to do the same thing to the Republicans that the Republicans did to the Democrats; that is, slow up and refuse to confirm judges. Of course, the figures show the opposite. The speedy confirmation of Randy Crane to the district court in Texas illustrates the effect of the reforms on the process that the Democratic leadership has spearheaded.

Despite the poor treatment of too many Democratic nominations through the practice of anonymous holds and other tactics employed during the past 6½ years, Randy Crane will be filling a judicial emergency vacancy seat that has been vacant since the year 2000 when the new position was created. I worked with the Senators from Texas and others Senators along the southwestern border to fill this vacancy. In fact, Randy Crane is the second Federal judge confirmed from Texas in just the past few months.

Not too long ago when the Senate was under Republican control, it took 943 days to confirm Judge Tagle to the Southern District of Texas. She was nominated in August of 1995 and made to wait until March of 1998, stalled for 3 years, then passed unanimously—a lot different than the nomination of Michael Schattman to a vacancy on the Northern District of Texas. He never got a hearing. I recall 2 years ago, Ricardo Morado, who served as mayor of San Benito, TX, was nominated for a vacancy and never got a hearing. They could have given those votes. We could have moved forward to fill those vacancies. This Senate and this Judiciary Committee is trying to fill them. They could have long ago been filled by nominees from President Clinton, but the fact is the Republicans refused to even allow a vote. We are not doing the same.

Unlike the many judicial nominees who were given a hearing but never allowed to be considered by the committee because the Senate and Bush’s nominees get both a hearing and a vote by the committee. Until Judge Edith Clement of Louisiana received a hearing on her nomination to the Fifth Circuit last year, after the shift in majority, there had been no hearings on Fifth Circuit nominees since 1994 and no confirmations since 1995. In fact, we confirmed the first new judge of the Fifth Circuit in 6 years, even though there was a judicial circuit emergency.

Judge Clement was nominated to the Fifth Circuit in 1997 and never received a hearing on his nomination, or a vote, in 15 months. Enrique Moreno was nominated for the Fifth Circuit in 1999 and he never received a hearing on his nomination or a vote by the committee.

H. Alston Johnson was also first nominated to the fifth circuit in 1999 and never confirmed on his nomination or a vote by the committee in 1999, 2000, or the beginning of 2001. Despite the support of both of his home State Senators, his nomination to a Louisiana seat on the fifth circuit was also languished without action for 23 months.

In contrast, under the Democrat-led Senate, President Bush’s nominees to the fifth circuit, Judge Edith Brown Clement and Judge Charles Pickering, were treated fairly. Both received hearings less than 6 months after their nominations.

In fact, Judge Clement was the first fifth circuit nominee to receive a hearing since Judge James Dennis had a hearing when he was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1994. She is the first person to be confirmed to that circuit since Judge Dennis’ confirmation in 1995.

In contrast to recent, past practices, we are moving expeditiously to consider and confirm Randy Crane, who was nominated in September, received his ABA peer review in November, participated in a hearing in February, was reported by the committee in March and is today being confirmed.

This nomination highlights the stark difference between the nominees of the new Senate majority and minority nominees. Both received hearings and were confirmed.

I recall that even in our disappointment after the Republicans rejected the nomination of Judge Ronnie White in a party-line vote in 1998, I proposed a vote for the confirmation of Ted Stewart of Utah.

The committee vote on the Pickering nomination was not a sneak attack or a “lynching.” It was a nomination of which Senators had indicated that would vote one way and then went into a closed party caucus and were instructed to vote another. It was not a party-line vote insisted upon by party leaders. It was not a matter in which the committee held a pro forma hearing and then refused over a period of weeks and months to bring the matter to the committee agenda for an up or down vote.

It was not a circumstance where the nominee was not afforded the opportunity to hear Senators’ concerns and respond to those concerns. It was not a circumstance where the nominee was not asked about concerns and cases and his own actions at his hearing. This would be an atypical case in which I responded to the request of a Senator to proceed to schedule a quick hearing on a judicial nomination.

As Senators reviewed this nomination, they had concerns. They asked the nominee about those concerns. The committee assembled a record, which was the record of the nominee’s official actions as a Federal judge. The committee then held a follow-up hearing to allow the nominee another opportunity to respond to the concerns of Senators’ concerns and then provided a further opportunity through written questions and answers.

After delaying committee action for 2 weeks at the request of the Republican leader and the ranking Republican on the committee, we met and debated the merits of the nomination for over 4 hours before voting.

I believe that the members of the Judiciary Committee based their votes on their review of the record and their understanding of the nominee against the standard each Senator must develop for voting on lifetime appointments to the Federal courts. I regret
that some are questioning the motives of Senators. The Senators on the Judiciary Committee, both Republican and Democratic, are seeking to exercise their responsibilities with respect to their votes and their responsibility to the Senate. In accord with their standards for such matters.

In spite of fair treatment, hearings and a vote, on Thursday, attacks arose suggesting that Senate Democrats have imposed an unconstitutional religious test to the nomination of Judge Pickering to the appellate court. I hesitate to dignify such a scurrilous allegation with a response, but I feel I must set the record straight. The Democratic members of the committee have never inquired into Judge Pickering’s religion. It had no place in the deliberations.

These charges, that the Democratic Senators on the committee have voted against Judge Pickering based in any way on his religion are outrageous, unfounded, and untrue. Whether a nominee goes to church, temple, or mosque, or not, has not been used by anyone in this Senate in the consideration of a judicial or any nomination.

Article VI of the United States Constitution requires that “no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.” In accordance with the separation of church and state embodied in our Constitution, no religious test has been applied to this nominee or any other.

I recall the recent reports indicated that Justice Scalia had recently commented on the religion of judges and suggested that Federal judges who are Catholic should consider resigning if imposing the death penalty was a moral problem for them. But no Senator, at any time during the consideration of the Pickering nomination, commented unfavorably on his religion.

The responsibility to advise and consent on the President’s nominees is one that I take seriously and the other members of the Judiciary Committee take seriously. Senator SCHUMER and Senator FEINSTEIN chaired fair hearings on Judge Pickering’s nomination. I regret that they and others on the committee have been subjected to unfounded criticism and attacks for fulfilling their duties.

Some of our Democratic Senators have been receiving calls and criticism based on their religious affiliations. That is wrong. Other Senators have been insulted and called names for asking questions of the nominees and for disagreeing with this choice for the court of appeals. That is regrettable.

There are strongly held views on both sides. But while Democrats and most Republicans have kept the merits of this nomination, it is unfortunate that some have chosen to vilify, castigate, unfairly characterize, and condemn without basis Senators working conscientiously to fulfill their constitutional responsibilities.

I also want to express concerns about recent statements from the administration, including from the President, that the Senate’s treatment of judicial nominees is under scrutiny. This statement reveals an unsettling misunderstanding of the fundamental separation of powers in our Constitution and the checks and balances in the Founder’s democracy.

In our democracy, the President is not given unchecked powers to pack the courts and to give lifetime appointments to anyone who shares certain ideological views. Instead, the Constitution provides a democratic check on the President. This democratic check on the President’s appointment power demonstrates our democracy in action, not action that “hurts our democracy.” By having fair hearings and voting on nominees, up or down, the Judiciary Committee is proceeding as it should.

The administration should not throw gasoline onto this combustible situation. It could, instead, recognize its role in nominations to the Senate and seek to work with us to find and appoint consensus nominees.

Unlike the many judicial nominees who did not get hearings or were accorded a hearing but were never allowed to vote, the committee is attempting to accord nominees whose paperwork is complete and whose blue slips are returned both a hearing and a fair up or down vote.

Those who assert that the Democrats have caused a vacancy crisis in the Federal courts are ignoring recent history.

There were an unusually high number of retirements taken by Federal judges after the November 2000 election. Moreover, by the time the Senate was permitted to reorganize after the change in majority, the number of vacancies had reached 105 and was rising to 111, including 32 vacancies on the courts of appeals. That is the situation I inherited and the Democratic majority in the Senate was faced with last summer.

Since then this is the 42d judicial nominee to be confirmed, including nominees whose appointments have been filibustered. Contrary to what some might say, the Democratic majority has actually been keeping up with attrition and we have started moving the vacancy numbers in the right direction—down. By contrast, from January 1995, when the Republican majority took control of the Senate until they relinquished it in June 2001, Federal judicial vacancies rose by 65 percent, from 63 to 105.

Already, in less than 9 months in the majority, we have made more progress than was made in 4 whole years of Republican leadership, 2000, 1999, 1997, and, of course, 1996.

With over the past 9 months, after the change in majority, we have confirmed 42 judges, including 7 to the courts of appeals.

In all of 2000, the Senate confirmed fewer, only 39 judges, and in 1999 fewer still, only 33 judges, with 7 to the courts of appeals.

We are doing what the Republican majority did not do: keeping up with the rate of attrition and moving the numbers in the right directions. Tomorrow we are scheduled to hold another hearing on another court of appeals nominee, at the request of Senator Enzi.

I hope this nominee will turn out to be uncontroversial and well-regarded by people from both sides of the aisle. Our task is made easier by the President works with members of both parties to nominate consensus nominees who are not outside of the mainstream and whose record demonstrates that they will follow precedent, not try to find a way around it.

Tomorrow’s hearing will be our 15th for judicial nominees within the last 9 tumultuous months. That is more hearings on judges than the Republican majority held during any full year. In only 9 months we have confirmed as many judicial nominees as seven, as the Republican majority averaged per year while they were in control.

Indeed, in the 76 months in which a Republican majority recently controlled the pace of judicial confirmation, over 47 judges were confirmed to the 78 vacancies that existed on our Federal courts of appeal. We have confirmed seven in less than 9 months already. The Republicans went one entire congressional session, 1996, refusing to confirm even a single court of appeals nominee.

We are holding more hearings for more nominees than in the recent past. We have moved away from the anonymous holds that so dominated the process from 1996 through 2000. We have made home State Senators’ blue slips public for the first time. We have drastically shortened the average time for confirmation proceedings.

What had grown during Republican control to over 2300 unconfirmed vacancies is now down to 74 days from receipt of the ABA peer review to confirmation for the 42 judges we have confirmed over the last 9 months.

However, because the Republicans refused to hold hearings on so many of President Clinton’s nominees, there were an enormous number of vacancies we inherited. Under Democratic leadership, we have tried to fill those vacancies as quickly as possible.

By moving first on nonideological nominees, we will qualify President Bush’s nominees we can fill the most vacancies in the least amount of time. With controversial, less qualified
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judges we spend much more of time. With consensus, well-qualified nominees we could have confirmed a dozen judges in the same amount of time the committee devoted over the last 5 months to the Pickering nomination.

It is not possible to repair the damage caused by long standing vacancies in several circuits overnight, but we are contributing to improved conditions in the 5th, 10th, and 8th circuits, in particular. We will do our best to remedy as many circumstances as possible.

I understand we have time before the vote. The distinguished ranking member has come to the floor. I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. I will say a few words before the vote. I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to proceed for a few minutes.

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the vote will still be at 5:50 because Senators have commitments.

Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Robert Randall Crane to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

I have had the pleasure of reviewing Mr. Crane’s distinguished legal career, and I have come to the conclusion that he is a fine lawyer who will add a great deal to the federal bench in Texas.

Randy Crane is a native Texan who graduated with honors from the University of Texas School of Law when he was only 22 years old. He clerked for the McAllen, Texas, firm of Atlas & Hall during the summers of 1986 and 1987, joined the firm as a full-time associate in 1988, and became a partner in 1994. During his fourteen-year legal career, Mr. Crane has handled primarily civil cases, including commercial litigation, personal injury matters, and toxic torts. He has also gained valuable experience in several criminal cases, including a large federal drug conspiracy case.

Mr. Crane currently serves as a Director of the Texas-Mexico Bar Association, which seeks to promote cross-border dialogue of common legal issues, resolution of cross-border legal issues between United States and Mexico legal systems, and attorney networking for answering questions about the two legal systems.

I have every confidence that Randy Crane will serve with distinction on the federal district court for the Southern District of Texas.

Mr. President, I must take a moment to respond to some of the comments made by my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, regarding the pace of judicial confirmations. The Senator has made much of comparing the pace of confirmations under Republican and Democratic control of the Judiciary Committee. This has involved comparing 9 months to 12 months, 9 months to 9 months, 3 months to 3 months, and so on. Of course, anyone knows that you can manipulate statistics to achieve the result you want. I find the bottom line numbers to tell a more compelling story. And the bottom line is that we have 94 vacancies in the Federal judiciary today—the exact same number as we did at the end of last session, and only slightly fewer than we did when the Democrats took control of the Senate in June of last year.

The bottom line numbers are even more compelling when you look at the number of circuit court vacancies. When Senate Democrats took over the Judiciary Committee in June of last year, there were 31 circuit court vacancies, and there remain 31 circuit court vacancies today. This does not represent progress—it represents stagnation.

In contrast, at the end of 1995, which was the Republicans’ first year of control of the Judiciary Committee during the Clinton administration, there were only 13 circuit vacancies.

In fact, during President Clinton’s first term, circuit court vacancies never exceeded 15 at the end of any year—including 1996, a presidential election year, when the pace of confirmations has traditionally slowed.

Moreover, there were only 2 circuit nominees left pending in committee at the end of President Clinton’s first year in office. In contrast, 23 of President Bush’s circuit nominees were left hanging in committee at the end of last year.

Last Thursday, Senator LOTT introduced a resolution calling for the confirmation of each of the circuit court judges nominated by President Bush on May 9 of last year.

We are coming up on the one-year anniversary of those nominations, and yet only 3 of the nominees have had hearings and confirmation votes. All of these nominees have received qualified or well-qualified ratings from the American Bar Association.

This is problematic because it is no secret that there is a vacancy crisis in the federal circuit courts, and that we are making no progress in addressing it.

A total of 22 circuit nominations are pending in the Judiciary Committee. But we issued only 11 circuit court judges this year, and only seven since President Bush took office.

In light of the vacancy crisis, we cannot afford to let only 10 Senators defeat a circuit nominee. This is a question of process, not of seeking favorable treatment.

For all these reasons, it is imperative to support Senator LOTT’s resolution to get hearings and votes for our longest pending circuit nominees. Given the vacancy crisis in our circuit courts, I cannot imagine anyone voting against it.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on behalf of Randy Crane, who is the next nominee for the Federal judiciary who will be voted on by the Senate this afternoon. I am proud to support Randy Crane’s nomination to be a Federal judge for the Southern District of Texas.

The Southern District has the third highest number of filings of criminal cases in the country. It is tremendously overburdened. The nonpartisan Judicial Conference of the United States has designated the court as “judicial emergency.”

Randy Crane has an outstanding record of academic qualifications, legal experience, and public service to make him an excellent Federal judge. He has been unanimously approved by the American Bar Association.

A graduate of the University of Texas at Austin, Randy Crane received his law degree with honors at the University of Texas School of Law at the age of 22. He is currently a partner with one of the outstanding law firms of Texas, Atlas & Hall, a law firm in McAllen, TX. He has been active in the State bar of Texas and a director of the Texas-Mexico Bar Association.

Randy Crane is a native of south Texas, and he is of Mexican American heritage. Randy Crane has strong relationships within the local community. He is highly respected and has been very active in McAllen. Everyone I have talked to who lives in McAllen knows Randy Crane and thinks so highly of him.

His community involvement includes working with the McAllen Independent School District by helping children, trying to make sure they have a quality public education system in McAllen. He is active with the American Cancer Society, youth soccer, and Little League baseball.

I urge my colleagues to support the nomination of Randy Crane to the Federal bench. This is a vacancy that needs to be filled quickly, and we have a quality candidate to fill that need.

President Bush has made this nomination, and his nomination has received bipartisan support. So I look forward to a unanimous vote on behalf of Randy Crane, and getting help down to this Southern District that so desperately needs the attention because of its high caseload.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Randy Crane to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) are necessarily absent.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the
Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) are necessarily absent. I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LINCOLN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yea 91, nays 0, as follows:

(Roll Call Vote No. 52 Ex.)

YEAS—91

Akaka
Allard
Allen
Baucus
Bayh
Bennett
Biden
Ringman
Boxer
Bunning
Bunning
Burns
Byrd
Campbell
Campbell
Cantwell
Carnahan
Carper
Chafee
Cleland
Clinton
Collin
Conrad
Cornyn
Corzine
Dorgan
Feinstein
Feingold
Enzi
Harkin
Helms
Hollings
Hutchinson
Inouye
Hutchison
Inhofe
JimWebn
Johnson
Judd
Kerry
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Joe Lieberman
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the 1999 version of this report, Mr. Walpole said the missile threat to the United States had increased in significant ways. He also said specifically, where it was previously judged that the United States would probably face an intercontinental ballistic missile threat to Iran by 2015, it is now said by our intelligence community to be most likely the same level of threat assigned to North Korea. And North Korea’s Taepo Dong-2 missile, which previously was assessed at having a range of up to 6,000 kilometers, is now judged to have a range of 10,000 kilometers if configured with two rocket stages, and 15,000 kilometers if it is equipped with a third stage, as was its predecessor.

A 15,000 kilometer range is sufficient, according to Mr. Walpole, to reach all of North America with a payload large enough to carry a nuclear weapon. The report notes that the proliferation of missile technology also has become worse. The witness said Iran was now assumed to be a significant supplier of this technology to other nations. Finally, Mr. Walpole noted that the United States needs to be vigilant against both terrorism and long-range missile threats, saying:

‘We’ve got to cover both threats.

As we fight a war against terrorism, we cannot lose sight of the fact that other threats are just as serious. The CIA’s report on the missile threat is a timely reminder of that, and last Friday’s successful missile defense test is an encouraging sign that we are making progress in preparing to answer that threat.’

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for a period not to exceed 10 minutes each.

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

90TH ANNIVERSARY OF GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise on this occasion to wish a happy 90th Anniversary to the Girl Scouts of the USA, and invite my colleagues to join me in recognizing the organization in their 90th year of building character, confidence, and skills necessary for success in girls throughout the country. Founded on March 12, 1912, when Juliette Gordon Low assembled 18 girls in Savannah, GA, the Girl Scouts of the USA has grown to a current membership of 3.8 million, making it the largest organization for girls in the world. On March 16, 1950, the Girl Scouts of the USA became the first national organization for girls in the world. They were granted a Federal charter by Congress.

I am proud to say that Girls Scouts in the State of Mississippi are active and growing stronger every day. I recently visited with Kitty Mauffray, Dorothy Shaw, Ann Billick, Jean Lee, Dr. Mary Cates, and Rowell Saunders, representatives from the Girl Scouts Councils of Mississippi. I am pleased to know that at the present time, with 45,000 girls in Mississippi, the city of Jackson, home of the University of Mississippi is a Girl Scout. I am sure that these numbers will continue to grow.

I would also like to recognize the Girl Scouts of Mississippi for their commitment to community service. Not only do they routinely visit nursing homes, help to beautify our cities and towns, and work to improve the quality of life for children less fortunate than themselves, but I understand that in the aftermath of September 11, Girl Scouts across Mississippi worked to collect donations and created many cards of sympathy and support for victims of this national tragedy. The Girl Scout Law states that each scout will do a good turn daily; I do not think that "make the world a better place," and I think that these girls have done just that.

Girl Scouts of the USA recognizes that girls need leadership skills, self-assurance, and social conscience to build upon their self confidence and values. I offer my sincere congratulations to the Girl Scouts of the USA for fulfilling this need, and wish them the best of luck in the future as they continue to help girls grow strong and instill values that will last a lifetime.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the Girl Scouts on their 90th anniversary celebration which took place on March 12, 2002.

The first Girl Scout meeting took place in Savannah, GA on March 12, 1912 when Juliette Gordon Low gathered eighteen girls together. Ninety years later, with 3.7 million members, the organization continues to offer girls of all ages and socio-economic backgrounds the opportunity to grow, develop friendships, challenge themselves, and gain valuable life experiences.

There are 40,000 Girl Scouts in my home state of Washington. These girls are among millions nationwide who are preparing themselves to be future leaders. By examining high-tech careers, developing money management skills, participating in the arts and sports, and helping others, Girl Scouts of the USA are making themselves well rounded individuals who will no doubt lead our country in great things in the years to come. Girl Scouts serve to better our environment, our community and our country. I would like to highlight the accomplishments of one of my constituents, Girl Scout Katie Grimes. Katie is one of ten women to receive the National Women of Distinction Award which recognizes women who have demonstrated excellence in our country and the world.

Katie, using many of the skills she developed in the Girl Scouts, founded the Federal Way Autism Support Group in Federal Way, Katie, who herself is autistic, is well aware of the acute needs of autistic individuals and their families and worked diligently to establish the first support group in her community. I am pleased that the Federal Way Autism Support Group now serves as a national model to provide comfort and assistance to the thousands of people who are afflicted with autism.

I am thrilled to have been invited by my State Girl Scout Councils to join in the first Honorary Congressional Girl Scout Troop. I am pleased to join my female colleagues, Representatives Jo Ann Emerson and Ellen Tauscher, and Senators Hutchison and Mikulski as a member of this troop. I look forward to working with my colleagues in Troop Capitol Hill, and Girl Scout troops across the country to identify the many challenges facing girls and women today and ways we can assist them to overcome these obstacles.

Again, I wish to congratulate the Girl Scouts on their 90th anniversary milestone and thank them for the important and valuable work that they continue to do.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of the 90th anniversary of the Girl Scouts of the USA. Girl Scouting began on March 12, 1912, when Juliette Gordon Low assembled 18 girls from Savannah, GA. She believed all girls should be given the opportunity to develop physically, mentally and spiritually. Girl Scouts of the USA was chartered by the U.S. Congress on March 16, 1952.

That belief in personal development has evolved into today’s Girl Scout mission; to help all girls grow strong.

The Girl Scouts have grown leaps and bounds from that first meeting of 18 girls to more than 233,000 troops throughout the United States and Puerto Rico available to all girls ages 5-17. Today, there is a membership of 3.8 million worldwide, making it the largest organization in the world for girls. More than 50 million women are Girl Scout alumnae, including my wife, Susan, and our daughter, Tyler.

We celebrate today the principles on which the Girl Scouts were founded: preparing girls to develop the principles to current issues with programs that encourage girls to be future leaders; by examining high-tech careers, developing money management skills, participating in the arts and sports, and helping others;

Girl Scouting continues to apply

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
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Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the Girl Scouts of America on their 90th Anniversary.

Since Juliette Gordon Low founded the Girl Scouts in 1912, this organization has provided young girls with the leadership skills to make a difference in their communities and our world. Girl Scouts teach self-confidence, responsibility and integrity at a young age and these core values stay with girls for the rest of their lives.

Today, more than 3.7 million girls in over 233,000 troops are learning new skills, developing talents and building friendships across geographic, ethnic and socioeconomic lines. Through scouting, Girl Scouts participate in community service projects, cultural exchanges, athletic events and educational activities. None of this would be possible without the generosity and commitment of parents and community members who donate their time to help shape the lives of young girls through the Girl Scouts.

In Nebraska, I represent more than 20,000 Girl Scouts. I am also a proud Girl Scout parent.

I congratulate and thank the Girl Scouts on their 90th year.

46TH ANNIVERSARY OF TUNISIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge the anniversary on March 20 of the independence of Tunisia, an Arab republic and friend of the United States for forty-six years.

Mr. Speaker, Tunisia, an Arab republic and friend of the United States for forty-six years, of the United States for forty-six years. Of the independence of Tunisia, an Arab republic and friend of the United States for forty-six years.

Mr. Speaker, Tunisia, an Arab republic and friend of the United States for forty-six years.

Ladies and gentlemen:

This body and the American people today can thank Tunisia for its steadfast support during its membership on the United Nations Security Council in 2001. In the weeks and months after September 11, the Security Council adopted several resolutions that embodied U.S. objectives for combating global terrorism and freeing Afghanistan.

I would like to take a few minutes today to remind my colleagues about how 4-H evolved into what it is today. In doing so, we need to step back and remember what our Nation was like at the beginning of the 20th century and how the field of agriculture was suffering from the industrial revolution.

As a result of the industrial revolution, our nation experienced, for the first time, a greater number of people living in cities than in rural agricultural communities. A new generation of farmers was talking about moving to the big city. They were fearful of the traditional teaching techniques in which parents taught their children how to farm. Additionally, the industrial revolution brought about new technologies, many of which greatly affected farming techniques. At first, unfortunately, few people knew how to use them. As concerns continued to grow, many communities were forced to develop programs that sought new and innovative ways of teaching the next generation of farmers.

The most successful of these programs was created in Springfield, OH. It was there, in 1902, that Albert B. Graham, superintendent of the Clark County school system, first established agricultural classes. Recognizing that many people would have a difficult time with the concept of learning farming outside of the family, Graham established Saturday morning classes in the basement of the county building. Families coming into town to do their weekly shopping could drop off their children at the courses. In a sense, it was a form of daycare, but one in which the boys and girls were kept busy learning how to examine soil with litmus paper and how to tie knots and splice ropes. They even examined droplets of milk under microscopes.

Eventually, Graham expanded this program with help from the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station and the dean of agriculture at The Ohio State University. It grew into a statewide organization. Ohio State took quickly to this course concept, as it offered the university an effective way to communicate with farmers throughout Ohio. By 1903, Graham's agriculture club had over 100 members, and by 1904, 13 such county-wide clubs had been organized in Ohio. You might say that Graham had planted the seed for the 4-H organization, and it sprouted quickly.

It didn't take long before similar clubs grew nationally. Around this time, the clover became the most commonly known symbol for club members, who wore the symbol on their lapels. Another landmark for 4-H came in 1906, when Thomas Campbell, an assistant to George Washington Carver, was asked to establish youth farming organizations for African-American farmers in the south. At a time in our Nation when the racial divide ran deep, 4-H was clearly ahead of its time.

By 1914, a mere decade after 4-H's creation, President Woodrow Wilson signed the Smith-Lever Act into law, establishing the Cooperative Extension System. This system offered a mechanism through which 4-H programs could receive Federal funds.

Now jump forward to today. The 4-H organization continues to be one of the most active youth organizations in our Nation, with chapters not only in the United States, but throughout the world. 4-H clubs have expanded from rural to urban areas, and they provide a new of group kids with essential leadership skills and community service involvement. National 4-H meetings have even become platforms for presidents and other national officials to voice their ideas for agriculture and other policies.

The fear of an agriculture system eroding away with the expansion of cities continues to this day, as we have witnessed the massive growth in urban populations. But, this problem has the need for 4-H. Although today's 4-H organization may be larger than the original 100 members and our communication has increased from town meetings to Internet chat rooms, the organization's principles of Head, Heart, Hands, and Health remain the same. Without question, the lessons and skills 4-H members learn will last a lifetime.

I am proud to know that organizations like 4-H are there to help guide our next generation of farmers, teachers, and even elected officials toward a better tomorrow. I also am proud to say that my wife, Fran, and I have had
TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL JOHN S. PARKER

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Maj. Gen. John S. Parker of the U.S. Army Medical Corps. Major General Parker has served our Nation for more than 39 years. He has distinguished himself and the Army Medical Command while serving in several positions of increasing responsibility. Major General Parker capped his illustrious career as Commander of the United States Army Medical Research and Material Command at Fort Detrick, MD.

During his extraordinary military service, General Parker has shaped every part of the Army Medical Department, from direct patient care, training, personnel management, and installation management, to doctrine development, policymaking, research and medical product development. His mark on military medicine extends far beyond the Department of Defense and into the international community.

We in the Senate saw the important work of Ft. Detrick in researching defenses against biological attacks when Senator DASCHLE received an anthrax-laden letter last October. Major General Parker’s command responded by swiftly and accurately identifying the anthrax here on Capital Hill.

Major General Parker’s service embodies the best traditions our military services have to offer. This soldier, statesman, scientist, and commander has displayed the highest level of commitment to our most precious resource, America’s armed forces.

I thank John and his wife Julie for their tireless dedication to serving the United States and the Army. They have served our Nation with honor. I wish John and Julie well as they enter a new phase of their lives.

TRIBUTE TO AGNES SCULLY FISTER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Agnes Scully Fister, who died January 9, 2002, at the age of 85.

Agnes made it easy for people to remember her, leaving behind a legacy as a loving wife, mother, grandmother, and friend. She was a unique individual who cherished life, enjoyed going to church, and loved meeting and talking to people. She married Louis A. Fister and was blessed with a wonderful family that included four sons and two daughters. Agnes will be remembered for many different reasons, not the least of which is her dedication to her family and friends.

A native of Kentucky, Agnes was born in Lexington to Ed and Sarah Scully. She graduated high school from St. Catherine’s Academy and later went on to study child care and clothing at a local clothing buyer for retail stores such as Purcell’s, Embry’s, Wolfe Wiles, McAlpins, and Tots ‘n Teens.

Agnes was a devoted Catholic and a long-time member of St. Paul Catholic Church. St. Paul’s plays a significant role in Agnes’ life and is where she was baptized, received first Holy Communion, was confirmed, and married. Upon her passing away, St. Paul is also where her family and friends gathered to say their goodbyes and to celebrate her life.

I am certain the legacy left behind by Agnes Fister will live on. I offer my deepest condolences to her family, especially her children, 20 grandchildren, and 26 great grandchildren. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the memory of Agnes Scully Fister. She was an outstanding Kentuckian and will be missed.

TRIBUTE TO DUANE HARRIS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition and honor of my friend and an outstanding public servant, Mr. Duane Harris of St. Simons Island, GA. Duane was retiring on April 1 of this year from his position as the Director, Coastal Resources Division, of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources. His retirement comes after some three decades of service to the people of the State of Georgia and this Nation.

Duane has served in the very important position of Coastal Director since 1982, during a time of extraordinary challenge for the Department of Natural Resources. The Coastal Division encompasses all coastal areas of beautiful Golden Isles where we take great pride in our magnificent beaches, salt water and fresh water wetlands, and the living creatures that depend on those ecosystems for life itself.

In Georgia, as elsewhere in our Nation, the coastal area is where we find some of the greatest pressures for development and population growth, and the inevitable confrontation between those pressures and environmental protection. And in this difficult arena, Duane Harris has served with remarkable distinction.

Duane joined the Georgia DNR on July 1 of 1970. His service to the State’s coastal resources through the years has been diverse and distinguished. In his initial job of Wildlife Biologist, he worked in developing the baseline characterization of marine fisheries resources in Georgia, including assessing shrimp and blue crab stocks and formulating management decisions regarding harvests in specific areas. He conducted a coast-wide inventory of Georgia’s oyster resources and was one of the founders of Georgia’s very popular Artificial Reef Program in the 1970’s. He has championed that program’s growth to a system that now consists of more than 30 inshore and offshore reefs, providing an essential marine habitat.

Duane was instrumental in the establishment and expansion of the Coastal Division’s 24-hour on-call network, which has provided round-the-clock response to fish kill, sea turtle and marine mammal strandings since the 1980’s. He has personally responded to numerous situations involving strandings and injured birds, sea turtles, and porpoises. Duane is the contact that local officials, the Coast Guard, Law Enforcement, and coastal citizens call upon when no one can be reached. He has also worked tirelessly as a volunteer for DNR’s annual Week-end for Wildlife celebration since its inception in 1989.

Let me also note that Duane is not simply someone who works to enforce a rulebook. He is an innovative and thoughtful planner who helps shape new policies. For example, during the 1980’s he played a pivotal role in the passage of far-reaching legislation to benefit Georgia’s unique coastal environment when he spearheaded the successful regulatory implementation of The Protection of Tidewaters Act, O.C.G.A. Sections 52-1-1 through 52-1-10, and the Right of Passage Act, O.C.G.A. 52-1-30 through 52-1-38, in 1992, culminating in the removal by 1999 of the last remaining river houses that were causing environmental degradation and other problems.

Duane worked very hard to provide information to local municipalities and county governments about the benefits of a federally-approved Georgia Coastal Management Program, and has assisted in the development of the Georgia Coastal Management Act, O.C.G.A. Section 12–5–320, in 1997, and its very successful implementation since that time.

Over the past 4 years, Duane Harris spearheaded the efforts to regulate driving on Georgia’s remote barrier island beaches in a manner consistent with the Shore Protection Act. Duane took the lead on all required administrative procedures, facilitating a lengthy citizen advisory process initiated in August 1998. He formulated the resulting regulations to afford the needed protection to shorebirds, nesting sea turtles, and the fragile dune environment while also serving the interests of legally-recognized property holders. This was a sensitive and controversial issue, for which he forged a reasonable system of regulation. Following adoption of these rules in December 1998, he helped to implement them prior to the onset of the 1999 sea turtle nesting season.

Duane recently led the deliberations of a diverse Marsh Hammocks Advisory Council in an examination of the issue of development of coastal marsh hammocks and barrier islands. His regional and national conservation service includes serving as chairman of...
both the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

At the State and local level, he has brought a marine conservation perspective to the numerous boards, steering committees, and volunteer service organizations on which he has served, including the Leadership Georgia Board of Trustees, the Brunswick Rotary, the Brunswick-Golden Isles Chamber of Commerce, and the Keep Brunswick Clean and Beautiful Board. In recognition of his marine conservation expertise and contributions, he is member of the Skidaway Foundation Board.

The son of Duane, Duane’s career gives us an appreciation of his professional record, but it does not come close to illuminating the strength of his career. It takes a leader of special qualities to meet the challenges of administering the laws and regulations that impact the coast areas. It takes a person of accomplishment in scientific skills, but it also takes a person of patience, honesty, and integrity. And it takes a person who can deal directly and effectively with immediate and difficult problems.

That is why Duane, in my mind, embodies the special qualities of public service that are so important to this Nation. I know that many of my colleagues have distinguished careers of service to local and State governments prior to their election to the Senate. Service in the Senate is an extraordinary honor and an extraordinary responsibility and opportunity. At the same time, we are in many ways insulated from the direct consequences of policies on the lives of people.

As Lieutenant Governor and then Governor of Georgia, I had the privilege of having a distinguished governor with the vision and political ability to serve the needs of the people. I am proud to have known Duane Harris for many, many years as a dedicated public servant and a friend. I will also add that he is one of the best fishermen you will ever have the opportunity to meet, and I understand that after some 30 years of service to the State of Georgia, that is exactly what he plans to do, go fishing. Except that he will be doing that as a professional fishing guide with his own boat.

Duane is a young man, and I know that as a private citizen he and his accomplished wife, Carol, will continue to be a source of great strength and leadership to their community. He is the kind of man who will always carry out his work with unfailing energy and sound values.

On behalf of all of my colleagues in the United States Congress, I would like to thank Duane Harris for his devotion to his duty and express my heartfelt thanks for a job well done.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-5744. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department’s Report concerning Energy Fleet Alternative Fuel Vehicle Acquisition for Fiscal Year 2002; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-5745. A communication from the Acting Associate Department Administrator for Management and Administration, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position of Deputy Administrator, received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-5746. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of the General Counsel, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled Federal Institute for钝化 Property Program: Emissions Limitations” (RIN 1320-AD09/54 FR 72796) received on March 14, 2002; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5747. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning the Commission’s Budget Request Justification for Fiscal Year 2003; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-5748. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Special Monthly Compensation for Women Veterans Who Lose a Breast as a Result of a Service-Connected Disability” (RIN 2100-0056) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-5749. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Claims Based on Exposure to Ionizing Radiation” (RIN 2100-0057) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-5750. A communication from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “17 CFR Part 41, Listing Standards and Conditions for Trading Security Futures Products” (RIN 3038-AB87) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5751. A communication from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “17 CFR Parts 1, 3, 4, 140, and 155; Rules Relating to Intermediaries of Commodity Interest” (RIN 3038-AB89) received on October 23, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5752. A communication from the Under Secretary, Research, Education, and Economics, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Agricultural Statistical Service” (CFR Part 3601) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5753. A communication from the Under Secretary, Research, Education and Economics, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Availability of Information, Economic Research Service” (RIN 0570-0271) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5754. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Horse Protection Enforcement for calendar year 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5755. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning Student Loan Interest Rate Amendments; to the Committee on Budget.

EC-5756. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, report numbers 571 through 575 for the Pay-As-You-Go Calculations dated December 25, 2002; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-5757. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, report numbers 572 and 573 for the Pay-As-You-Go Calculations dated December 25, 2002; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-5758. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Radon in Drinking Water: A Small Entity Compliance Guide”; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5759. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position of Assistant Administrator for Solid Waste and Emergency Response, received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5760. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, a report concerning the Commission’s licensing and regulatory duties; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5761. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a change in previously submitted reported information regarding a nomination confirmed for the position of Assistant Administrator for Solid Waste and Emergency Response, received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5762. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report concerning the Commission’s licensing and regulatory duties; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5763. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a change in previously submitted reported information regarding a nomination confirmed for the position of Assistant Administrator for Solid Waste and Emergency Response, received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.
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Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Secondary Direct Food Additives and Color Additives. Food for Human Consumption: Correction” (Doc. No. 06F–1482) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5776. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Sunscreen Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use; Final Monograph; Final Rule” (RIN 0910–AA61) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5777. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Exports: Notification and Record Keeping Requirements” (Doc. No. 06F–991) Act. FR 29759, Del. 1, Jul. 15, 2002; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5778. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Prescription Drug User Fees, Reporting, and Fee Registration and Listing” (RIN0995–AB21) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5779. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Supplemental Security Income; Disclosure of Information to Consumer Reporting Agencies and Overpayment Recovery Through Administrative Offset Against Federal Payments” (RIN0969–AF31) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5780. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Partial Stay; Final Rule” (Doc. No. 05C–084) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5781. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “LMSB Fast Track Dispute Resolution Pilot Program” (Notice 2001–67, 2001–49) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5782. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “LMSB Fast Track Dispute Resolution Pilot Program” (Notice 2001–67, 2001–49) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5783. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Weighted Average Interest Rate Update Notice” (Notice 2002–9) received on March 13, 2002; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5784. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first Report of the Task Force on the Prohibition of Importation of Products of Forced or Prison Labor; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5775. A communication from the Administrator of the Department of Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification on the status of the report on the impact of payment rates adopted by states Medicaid programs when they meet their obligation to cover services on behalf of qualified Medicare beneficiaries (QMBs) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5776. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Medicaid Program: Modifications of the Medicaid Upper Payment Limit for Non-State Government-Owned or Operated Hospitals” (42 CFR Part 477) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5777. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations 66 FR 53112” (Doc. No. FEMA–D–5751) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5778. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations 66 FR 53115” (Doc. No. FEMA–P–7606) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5779. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations 66 FR 53114” (Doc. No. FEMA–P–7605) received on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.


EC–5781. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Veterans Affairs for their disability.”

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

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself and Mr. LOTT):

S. 205. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special payment for recipients of the Medal of Honor and to make that special pension effective from the date of the act for which the recipient is awarded the Medal of Honor and to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the criminal penalties associated with using fraud related to the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 206. A bill to authorize the use of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for projects and activities to address proliferation threats outside the states of the former Soviet Union, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. DE WINE, and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 207. A bill to implement effective measures to stop trade in conflict diamonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 170. At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend title 10 . United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay by reason of their years of military service and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability.

S. 920. At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 920, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code 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. 1140. At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1140, a bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9, United States Code, to provide for greater fairness in the arbitration process relating to motor vehicle franchise contracts.

S. 1295. At the request of Ms. STABENOW, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1295, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to revise the requirements for the management of Federal Prison Industries to meet needs of federal agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1739. At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut...
At the request of Mr. Huffman, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Lieberman) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1707, a bill to amend title twenty-six of the Energy Policy Act of 2001 to provide for the use of existing authorizations for the first two years of the program established by that act.

Amendment No. 3008

At the request of Mr. Dayton, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Harkin) was added as a co-sponsor of S. Res. 219, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should continue to be a leader in the international community to promote the peaceful resolution of disputes and to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS—MARCH 14, 2002

By Mr. Bingaman:

S. 1986: A bill to establish the T'uf Shur Bien Preservation Trust Area within the Cibola National Forest in the State of New Mexico to resolve a land claim involving the Sandia Mountain Wilderness lands for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; jointly, pursuant to the order of March 14, 2002, with instructions that the one Committee reports, the other Committee have twenty calendar days, excluding any period where the Senate is not in session for more than three days, to report or be discharged.

Mr. Bingaman: Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce a bill that would create a unique area within the Cibola National Forest in New Mexico, entitled the T'uf Shur Bien Preservation Trust Area. The importance of this bill cannot be overstated. It would resolve, through a negotiated settlement agreement, the Pueblo of Sandia land claim to Sandia Mountain, an area of significant value and use to all New Mexicans. The bill would also maintain full public ownership and access to the National Forest and Sandia Mountain Wilderness lands within the Pueblo's claim area; clear title for affected homeowners; and grant the necessary rights-of-way and easements to protect private property interests and the public's ongoing use of the area.

The need for this bill and the basis for Sandia Pueblo's claim arise from a 1748 grant to the Pueblo from a representative of the King of Spain. That grant was recognized and confirmed by the United States in 1858, 11 Stat. 374. There remains, however, a dispute over the location of the eastern boundary of the Pueblo that stems from an 1859 survey of the grant. That survey fixed the eastern boundary roughly along the top of a foothill on the western slope of the mountain, which is not the true crest of the mountain. The Pueblo has contended that the interpretation of the grant, and thus the survey and subsequent patent, are erroneous, and that the true eastern boundary is the crest of the mountain.

In the early 1980's, the Pueblo approached the Department of the Interior seeking a resurvey of the grant to locate the eastern boundary of the Pueblo along the main ridge of Sandia Mountain. In December 1988, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior issued an opinion rejecting the Pueblo's claim. The Pueblo sought the opinion in federal district court and in 1998, the court issued an order setting aside the 1988 opinion and remanding the matter to Interior for further proceedings. Pueblo of Sandia v. Babbitt, Civ. No. 94-2024, D.C. July 15, 1998. The Order was appealed but appellate proceedings were stayed for more than a year while a settlement was being negotiated. Ultimately, on April 4, 2000, a settlement agreement was executed between the United States, Pueblo, and the Sandia Peak Tram Company. That agreement was conditioned on congressional ratification, but remains effective until November 15, 2002.

At the request of Mr. Bentsen, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. Boxer) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1786, a bill to expand aviation security by prohibiting the ongoing use of the Area.

S. 2043: A bill to establish the Shur Bien Preservation Trust Area within the Cibola National Forest in the State of New Mexico to resolve a land claim involving the Sandia Mountain Wilderness lands for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; jointly, pursuant to the order of March 14, 2002, with instructions that the one Committee reports, the other Committee have twenty calendar days, excluding any period where the Senate is not in session for more than three days, to report or be discharged.

Mr. Bingaman: Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce a bill that would create a unique area within the Cibola National Forest in New Mexico, entitled the Shur Bien Preservation Trust Area. The importance of this bill cannot be overstated. It would resolve, through a negotiated settlement agreement, the Pueblo of Sandia land claim to Sandia Mountain, an area of significant value and use to all New Mexicans. The bill would also maintain full public ownership and access to the National Forest and Sandia Mountain Wilderness lands within the Pueblo's claim area; clear title for affected homeowners; and grant the necessary rights-of-way and easements to protect private property interests and the public's ongoing use of the area.

The need for this bill and the basis for Sandia Pueblo's claim arise from a 1748 grant to the Pueblo from a representative of the King of Spain. That grant was recognized and confirmed by the United States in 1858, 11 Stat. 374. There remains, however, a dispute over the location of the eastern boundary of the Pueblo that stems from an 1859 survey of the grant. That survey fixed the eastern boundary roughly along the top of a foothill on the western slope of the mountain, which is not the true crest of the mountain. The Pueblo has contended that the interpretation of the grant, and thus the survey and subsequent patent, are erroneous, and that the true eastern boundary is the crest of the mountain.

In the early 1980's, the Pueblo approached the Department of the Interior seeking a resurvey of the grant to locate the eastern boundary of the Pueblo along the main ridge of Sandia Mountain. In December 1988, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior issued an opinion rejecting the Pueblo's claim. The Pueblo sought the opinion in federal district court and in 1998, the court issued an order setting aside the 1988 opinion and remanding the matter to Interior for further proceedings. Pueblo of Sandia v. Babbitt, Civ. No. 94-2024, D.C. July 15, 1998. The Order was appealed but appellate proceedings were stayed for more than a year while a settlement was being negotiated. Ultimately, on April 4, 2000, a settlement agreement was executed between the United States, Pueblo, and the Sandia Peak Tram Company. That agreement was conditioned on congressional ratification, but remains effective until November 15, 2002.

At the request of Mr. Bentsen, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. Boxer) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1786, a bill to expand aviation security by prohibiting the ongoing use of the Area.

S. 2043: A bill to establish the Shur Bien Preservation Trust Area within the Cibola National Forest in the State of New Mexico to resolve a land claim involving the Sandia Mountain Wilderness lands for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; jointly, pursuant to the order of March 14, 2002, with instructions that the one Committee reports, the other Committee have twenty calendar days, excluding any period where the Senate is not in session for more than three days, to report or be discharged.

Mr. Bingaman: Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce a bill that would create a unique area within the Cibola National Forest in New Mexico, entitled the Shur Bien Preservation Trust Area. The importance of this bill cannot be overstated. It would resolve, through a negotiated settlement agreement, the Pueblo of Sandia land claim to Sandia Mountain, an area of significant value and use to all New Mexicans. The bill would also maintain full public ownership and access to the National Forest and Sandia Mountain Wilderness lands within the Pueblo's claim area; clear title for affected homeowners; and grant the necessary rights-of-way and easements to protect private property interests and the public's ongoing use of the area.

The need for this bill and the basis for Sandia Pueblo's claim arise from a 1748 grant to the Pueblo from a representative of the King of Spain. That grant was recognized and confirmed by the United States in 1858, 11 Stat. 374. There remains, however, a dispute over the location of the eastern boundary of the Pueblo that stems from an 1859 survey of the grant. That survey fixed the eastern boundary roughly along the top of a foothill on the western slope of the mountain, which is not the true crest of the mountain. The Pueblo has contended that the interpretation of the grant, and thus the survey and subsequent patent, are erroneous, and that the true eastern boundary is the crest of the mountain.

In the early 1980's, the Pueblo approached the Department of the Interior seeking a resurvey of the grant to locate the eastern boundary of the Pueblo along the main ridge of Sandia Mountain. In December 1988, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior issued an opinion rejecting the Pueblo's claim. The Pueblo sought the opinion in federal district court and in 1998, the court issued an order setting aside the 1988 opinion and remanding the matter to Interior for further proceedings. Pueblo of Sandia v. Babbitt, Civ. No. 94-2024, D.C. July 15, 1998. The Order was appealed but appellate proceedings were stayed for more than a year while a settlement was being negotiated. Ultimately, on April 4, 2000, a settlement agreement was executed between the United States, Pueblo, and the Sandia Peak Tram Company. That agreement was conditioned on congressional ratification, but remains effective until November 15, 2002.

At the request of Mr. Bentsen, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. Boxer) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1786, a bill to expand aviation security by prohibiting the ongoing use of the Area.
great significance to the public and in particular, the people in the State of New Mexico, including the residents of the Counties of Bernalillo and Sandoval and the City of Albuquerque, who use the claim area for recreational and other purposes and who desire that the public interest and natural character of the area be preserved.

Because of the complexity of the situation, including the significant and overlapping interests just mentioned, Congress acted in德尔。

In particular, concerns about the settlement were expressed by parties who did not participate in the final stages of the negotiations. I have worked with those parties to address their concerns while still trying to maintain the benefits secured by the parties in the Settlement Agreement. I believe the legislation that I have introduced today is a fair compromise. It provides the Pueblo specific rights and remedies for the Pueblo, while still trying to work with those parties to address their concerns. In particular, concerns about the overlapping interests just mentioned, Congress acted in the Settlement Agreement.

The bill I am introducing today is a fair compromise. It provides the Pueblo specific rights and remedies for the Pueblo, while still trying to work with those parties to address their concerns. In particular, concerns about the overlapping interests just mentioned, Congress acted in the Settlement Agreement.

The bill I am introducing today is a fair compromise. It provides the Pueblo specific rights and remedies for the Pueblo, while still trying to work with those parties to address their concerns. In particular, concerns about the overlapping interests just mentioned, Congress acted in the Settlement Agreement.

SEC. 3. CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR UNAUTHORIZED PURCHASE OR POSSESSION OF MEDAL OF HONOR OR FALSE PERSONATION AS A RECIPIENT OF MEDAL OF HONOR.

(a) UNAUTHORIZED PURCHASE OR POSSESSION.—Section 704 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "IN GENERAL—Whoever" and inserting "IN GENERAL—Except as provided in subsection (b), who ever"

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) MEDAL OF HONOR.—Whoever knowingly wears, possesses, manufactures, purchases, or sells a Medal of Honor, or the ribbon, button, or rosette of a Medal of Honor, or any colorable imitation thereof, except when authorized under regulations made pursuant to law, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(2) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subsection:

(A) The term ‘Medal of Honor’ means—

(i) a medal of honor awarded under section 3741, 4241, or 8741 of title 10 or under section 491 of title 14;

(ii) a duplicate medal of honor issued for the period beginning as of the first day of the month in which the person had the person received special pension begun or ended with the last day of the month preceding the month that such person’s special pension in fact commenced.

Such payment shall be in the amount equal to the total amount of special pension that the person would have received had the person received special pension during the period beginning as of the first day of the month that began after the date of the act for which that person was awarded the Medal of Honor and ending with the last day of the month preceding the month that such person’s special pension in fact commenced.

For each month of such period, the amount of special pension shall be determined using the rate of special pension that was in effect for that month.

(b) FALSE PERSONATION.—(1) Chapter 43 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"618. Medal of honor recipient

(a) Whoever falsely or fraudulently holds himself out as having been, or represents or pretends himself to have been, awarded a medal of honor shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(b) As used in this section, the term ‘Medal of honor’ means a medal awarded under section 3741, 4241, or 8741 of title 10 or under section 491 of title 14.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"618. Medal of honor recipient."
By Mr. LUGAR:
S. 2010. A bill to authorize the use of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for projects and activities to address proliferation threats outside the states of the former Soviet Union, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Nunn-Lugar/CTR Expansion Act. My bill would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use up to $50 million of unobligated Nunn-Lugar/Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for non-proliferation projects and emergencies outside the states of the former Soviet Union.

In 1991, I helped to create the Nunn-Lugar/Cooperative Threat Reduction legislation with former Senator Sam Nunn of Georgia. The program was designed to assist the states of the former Soviet Union in dismantling weapons of mass destruction and to establish enforceable safeguards against the proliferation of those weapons. For more than 20 years the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program has been our country’s principal response to proliferation threats that resulted from the disintegration of the custodial system guarding the Soviet nuclear, chemical, and biological legacy.

The Nunn-Lugar program has destroyed the vast arsenals of the former Soviet Union’s weaponry, including 443 ballistic missiles, 427 ballistic missile launchers, 92 bombers, 483 long-range nuclear air-launched cruise missiles, 368 submarine ballistic missile launchers, 238 submarine-launched ballistic missiles, 21 strategic missile submarines, 194 nuclear test tunnels, and 5,809 nuclear warheads that were mounted on strategic systems aimed at us. All this has been accomplished at a cost of less than one-third of one percent over Department of Defense’s annual budget.

In addition, Nunn-Lugar facilitated the removal of all nuclear weapons from Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus. Nunn-Lugar has also launched aggressive efforts to safeguard and eliminate the former Soviet chemical and biological weapons arsenals. The Nunn-Lugar Program has been used to upgrade the security surrounding these dangerous substances and to provide civilian employment to tens of thousands of Russian weapons scientists. We are now beginning efforts to construct facilities that will destroy the Russian arsenal of chemical warheads.

The continuing experience of Defense Department and for associated defense contractors. These individuals understand how to implement non-proliferation programs and how to respond to proliferation emergencies. The bill I am introducing today would permit and direct the use of Nunn-Lugar expertise and resources when non-proliferation threats around the world are identified.

The Nunn-Lugar/CTR Expansion Act would be a vital component of our national security strategy in the wake of the September 11 attacks. The problem we face today is not just terrorism. It is the nexus between terrorists and weapons of mass destruction. There is little doubt that Al Qaeda and al-Qaeda would have used weapons of mass destruction if they had possessed them. It is equally clear that they have made an effort to obtain them.

The al-Qaeda attacks on the United States were planned to kill thousands of people indiscriminately. The goal was massive destruction of institutions, wealth, national morale, and innocent people. We can safely assume that those objectives have not changed. As horrible as the tragedy of September 11th was, the death, destruction, and disruption to American society was minimal compared to what could have been inflicted by a weapon of mass destruction.

Victory in this war must be defined not only in terms of finding and killing Osama bin Laden or destroying terrorist cells in this or that country. We must also attack a more ambitious goal of comprehensively preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Let me propose a fairly simple and clear definition of victory. Imagine two lists. The first list is of those nations-states that house terrorist cells, voluntarily or involuntarily. Those states can be highlighted on a map illustrating who and where they are. Our multilateral partners should be to shrink that list, nation by nation. Through intelligence sharing, termination of illicit financial channels, support of local police work, diplomacy, and public information, a coalition of nations led by the United States should seek to root out each cell in a comprehensive manner for years to come and maintain a public record of success that the world can observe and measure. If we are diligent and determined, we can terminate or cripple most of these list. But there should also be a second list. It would contain all of the states that possess materials, programs, or weapons of mass destruction. We should demand that each of these nation-states account for all of the materials, programs, and weapons in a manner that is internationally verifiable.

We should demand that all such weapons and materials be made secure from theft or threat of proliferation, using the funds of that country and supplemented by international funds if required. We should work with each nation to formulate programs of continuing accountability and destruction. Clearly, that work is not strictly NATO: we must keep the world’s most dangerous technologies out of the hands of the world’s most dangerous people. This requires diligent work that shrinks both lists. Both lists should be clear and finite. The war against terrorism will not be over until all nations on the lists have complied with these standards.

Despite the tremendous progress realized by the Nunn-Lugar program in the former Soviet Union, the United States continues to lack even minimal international confidence about many foreign weapons programs. In most instances, there is little information regarding the number of weapons or amounts of materials a country may have produced, the storage procedures they employ to safeguard their weapons, or plans regarding further production. We must pay much more attention to making certain that all weapons and materials of mass destruction are identified, continuously guarded, and systematically destroyed.

As the United States and our allies have sought to address the threats posed by terrorism and weapons of mass destruction in the aftermath of September 11, we have come to the realization that, in many cases, we lack the appropriate tools to address these threats. Traditional approaches such as arms control treaties and various multilateral sanctions regimes have met with some success, but there is still much work to do. In some cases, it is unlikely that the existing multilateral frameworks and non-proliferation tools retain much utility. In fact, several nations have announced their intention to continue to flout international norms such as the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Beyond Russia and other states of the former Soviet Union, Nunn-Lugar style cooperative threat reduction programs aimed at weapons dismantle-ment and counter-proliferation do not exist. The ability to apply the Nunn-Lugar model to states outside the former Soviet Union would provide the United States with another tool to confront the threats associated with weapons of mass destruction.

The precise replication of the Nunn-Lugar program will not be possible everywhere. Clearly, many states will continue to avoid accountability for programs related to weapons of mass destruction. When nations resist such accountability, other options must be explored. When governments continue to contribute to the WMD threat facing the United States, we must be prepared to apply diplomatic and economic power, as well as military force.

Yet we should not assume that we cannot forge cooperative non-proliferation programs with some critical nations. The experience of the Nunn-Lugar program in Russia has demonstrated that the threat of weapons of mass destruction can lead to extraordinary outcomes based on mutual interest. No one would have predicted in the 1980s that American contractors and DOD officials would be on the ground in Russia destroying thousands of strategic systems. If we are to protect ourselves during this incredibly dangerous period, we need new non-proliferation partners and aggressively pursue any non-proliferation opportunities that appear.
The Nunn-Lugar/CTR Expansion Act would be a first step down that road. Ultimately, a satisfactory level of accountability, transparency, and safety must be established in every nation with a WMD program.

My legislation is designed to empower the Administration to respond to both emergency proliferation risks and less-urgent cooperative opportunities to further non-proliferation goals. When the Defense Department identifies non-proliferation opportunities that are not time sensitive, when the near-term threat of diversion or theft is low, it should consult with Congress. In such a scenario my bill would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the appropriate congressional entities of his intent to utilize unobligated Nunn-Lugar funds and to describe the legal and diplomatic framework for the application of non-proliferation assistance. Congress would have time to review the proposal and consult with the Department of Defense. This process would closely parallel the existing notification and obligation procedures that are in place for Nunn-Lugar activities in the former Soviet Union.

However, proliferation threats sometimes require an instantaneous response. If the Secretary of Defense determines that we must move more quickly than traditional consultation procedures allow, my legislation provides the Pentagon with the authority to quickly and legally spend Nunn-Lugar funds. The terms and conditions under which the assistance was provided. The review process permits Congress to investigate the incident and decide if the authority needs to be restricted or amended.

In consulting with the administration on this legislation, we explored how to create the flexibility necessary to respond to WMD threats while protecting congressional prerogatives and maintaining the necessary checks and balances. Accordingly, I have included several conditions beyond the stringent reporting requirements.

First, my bill permits the Secretary of Defense to use equipment, goods, and services but does not include authority to provide cash directly to the project or activity. This preserves one of the basic tenets of the program: Nunn-Lugar is not foreign aid. In fact, more than 80 percent of Nunn-Lugar funds have been awarded to American firms to carry out dismantlement and non-proliferation assistance programs in the former Soviet Union.

The bill also requires the Secretary of Defense to avoid singling out any particular existing Nunn-Lugar project as an exclusive or predominate source of funds for emergency projects outside the former Soviet Union. In other words, it is my intent that the Pentagon utilize resources from a number of different Nunn-Lugar projects so as to reduce any impact on the original, on-going Nunn-Lugar program in the former Soviet Union. The Secretary also is required to the maximum extent practicable, to replace any program funds taken on emergency operations in the next annual budget submission or supplemental appropriations request.

Lastly, if the Pentagon employs the emergency authority to carry out non-proliferation or dismantlement activities in two consecutive years in the same country, the Secretary of Defense must submit an additional report to Congress. This report would analyze whether a new Nunn-Lugar-style program should be established with the country in question. If the Pentagon has successfully carried out cooperative threat reduction activities 2 years in a row with a country, we should explore how to expand this cooperation. We should also recognize that where sustained cooperation has been developed it is likely to be more efficient to provide assistance through an established Nunn-Lugar-style program.

The Nunn-Lugar/CTR Expansion Act can make valuable contributions to the implementation of the war on terrorism and our non-proliferation policy. It is not a silver bullet, and it cannot be used in every circumstance, but it is our best option in carrying out cooperative non-proliferation activities outside the former Soviet Union.

There are other risks when expanding a successful venture into new areas, but we must give the Administration every opportunity to interdict and neutralize the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. This new venture, like its predecessor, will take time to organize and to establish operating procedures. But I am hopeful that a decade from now, we will look back on this effort and rejoice in our persistent and successful efforts to provide great security for our country and the world at critical moments of decision.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in passing this important legislation.

By MR. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. DeWINE and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 2027. A bill to implement effective measures to stop trade in conflict diamonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today I have introduced a new bill along with Senator Mike DeWine, a Republican from Ohio, and Senator Russ Feingold, a Democrat from Wisconsin, which intends to address the U.S. response to the scourge of conflict diamonds.

The war-torn areas in Africa and the Middle East, has had a long history of dealing in conflict diamonds. While the conflict diamond trade comprises anywhere from an estimated 3 to 15 percent of the legitimate diamond trade, it threatens to damage an entire industry worldwide, an industry that is critical to the economies of many countries and critical to a number of developing countries in Africa.

How does it work? The terrorists go into the diamond fields where the natives of West Africa are trying to find these alluvial diamonds in the streams and the mud as they used to pan for gold in California and Alaska. They line up the natives in the streams and the mud as they used to pan for gold in California and Alaska. They line the natives in a row and walk through and hack off their feet and their hands until the natives and the miners in the circumstance are absolutely terrified. They threaten them with mutilation, with rape, and torture, destroying their villages and their lives. They literally become slaves to these terrorists, who then grab the diamonds and sell them into the terrorist networks.

Governments, the international diamond industry, and nongovernmental religious organizations have worked hard to address this complicated issue. They have set an impressive example of public and private cooperation. For the last 18 months, many countries involved in the Kimberly Process have been working to design a new regimen to govern the trade in rough diamonds. About 70 percent, by some estimates, of all the diamonds that are mined and found in the world are sold in the diamond industry. The United States needs to show a leadership role in dealing with conflict diamonds so the terrorists know it is not going to be easy. We
are going to make it more difficult. We are going to try to establish controls so we know if diamonds were brought into the trade by illegal or legal means.

Last year, I introduced a bill called the Clean Diamonds Act, S. 1084, along with Senators DeWine and Feingold, to reflect the consensus that had developed between the religious and human rights communities and the diamond industry on the U.S. response to this issue. Senator Ben Cardin, who had introduced his own amendment to legislation dealing with this issue in the past, joined in cosponsoring our bill, as did a bipartisan group of 11 additional Senators.

In the House of Representatives, Congressmen TONY HALL and FRANK WOLF have been leaders on this issue. They introduced several bills to address it. They worked with the Ways and Means Committee and the administration to pass the bill last November, H.R. 2722, the Clean Trade Act of 1999, which, while a step forward, I am afraid, did not do enough to meet the original intent of our congressional effort. I had hoped Senator DeWine, Senator Feingold, and I might be able to work out an agreement with the administration to make some changes to strengthen the House-passed bill, but unfortunately that has not happened.

In the meantime, the international effort is continuing. Talks that we hope will lead to a final session of the Kimberly Process are underway today, tomorrow, and Wednesday in Ottawa. I am concerned key issues remain unresolved or have been addressed in ways that could undermine the whole initiative, leading to the failure to produce an effective Kimberly agreement.

Specifically, the negotiators need to address the issues of independent monitoring, the collection of reliable statistics, and the need for a coordinating body to implement the agreed-upon system of controls on rough diamond exports. In addition, the U.S. General Accounting Office, in its February 13 testimony entitled “Significant Challenges Remain in Deterring Trade in Conflict Diamonds,” outlined other potential witnesses in transparency, accountability, and risk assessment, particularly relating to controls from the mine to export.

We are convinced we need to introduce a new, stronger Senate version of the Clean Diamonds Trade Act to move this issue forward and to address developments such as the revelations about terrorist exploitation of diamonds and the potential weaknesses in the international system.

Think about these diamonds moving across the world. You can put a fortune in your hand, put it into your pocket, and walk through any metal detector undetected. You can carry them on an airplane around the world, use them as people would use gold ingots or checking accounts. They are fungible wherever you go.

Our bill includes a broad definition of conflict diamonds, so it covers the conflicts in the Democratic Republic of Congo, not simply areas that have been singled out by the United Nations Security Council resolutions. Our definition also covers the terrorists named by President George Bush in his Executive Order 13224.

The House bill does not give the authority to the President that he has already under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and has already used for implementing existing U.N. Security Council resolutions, nor does the House bill require the President to do anything to respond to this problem.

Our bill requires the President to prohibit the importation of rough diamonds from countries not taking effective measures to stop the trade in conflict diamonds if that prohibition is in the foreign policy interest of the United States.

It is my hope that those responsible for the conflict diamond trade will stop at nothing in their efforts to circumvent the international efforts being negotiated. To transform a rough diamond into a polished diamond for purposes of importing them into the United States, all someone needs to do is make one cut. That distinction in the House-passed bill is a terrible loophole. The importation of polished diamonds or jewelry containing diamonds is a potentially huge market. If all the conflict diamonds could have been imported into the United States, the House-passed bill did not protect against that loophole.

The House bill also does not require but only permits the President to prohibit the importation of specific shipments of polished diamonds or jewelry containing diamonds into our country, if he has credible evidence they were produced from conflict diamonds. Our bill requires it.

Our bill also permits the President to prohibit the importation of polished diamonds and jewelry containing diamonds from countries that do not take effective measures to stop the trade in conflict diamonds.

With these two provisions, we hope to send a strong message that the United States will close the polished diamond and diamond jewelry loophole so that American consumers can have confidence that the diamond they buy for an anniversary, or another milestone in their lives is from a legitimate and responsible source.

Finally, our bill eliminates the safe harbor provision contained in the House bill which would allow circumvention of the Kimberly Process before an agreement were even formalized. While these negotiations are proceeding and while we are trying to secure the cooperation of all parties concerned, this is not the time to undercut it.

The world was shocked and horrified by the murder, mutilation, and terror imposed on the people of Sierra Leone by rebels funded with conflict diamonds. The moral outcry by religious and human rights groups galvanized governments and the diamond industry to address the problem. Now is the time to close the deal and to secure an effective agreement, not an exercise in public relations. Now is also the time to have strong U.S. legislation to say to the world the United States will do as much as it can to stop this scourge.

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

S. 2012

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 “Clean Diamond Trade Act”.

SECTION 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Funds derived from the sale of rough diamonds are being used by rebels, state actors, and terrorists to finance military activities, overthrow legitimate governments, subvert international efforts to promote peace and stability, and perpetrate horrific atrocities against unarmed civilians. During the past decade, another 6,500,000 people have died during diamond-fueled conflicts.

(2) The countries caught in this fighting are home to nearly 70,000,000 people whose societies have been torn apart not only by fighting but also by terrible human rights violations.

(3) Human rights advocates, the diamond trade as represented by the World Diamond Council, and the United Nations recently began working to block the trade in conflict diamonds. Their efforts have helped to build a consensus that action is urgently needed to end the trade in conflict diamonds.

(4) The United Nations Security Council has acted at various times under chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations to address threats to international peace and security posed by conflicts linked to diamonds. Through these actions, it has prohibited all states from exporting weapons to certain countries affected by such conflicts. It has further required all states to prohibit the direct and indirect import of rough diamonds from Angola and Sierra Leone unless the diamonds were controlled by a certificate of origin and fully prohibiting the importation of rough diamonds from Liberia. In order to put an end to the emergency situation in international relations, to maintain international peace and security, and to protect its essential security interests, and pursuant to its obligations under the United Nations Charter, the United States is now taking further action against trade in conflict diamonds.
(6) Without effective action to eliminate trade in conflict diamonds, the trade in legitimate diamonds faces the threat of a consumer backlash that could damage the economic interests not involved in the trade in conflict diamonds and penalize members of the legitimate trade and the people they employ. To prevent that, South Africa and other countries involved in working, through the “Kimberley Process,” toward devising a solution to this problem. As the consumer of a majority of the world’s supply of diamonds, the United States has an obligation to help sever the link between diamonds and conflict and press for implementation of an effective solution.

(7) Articles XX and XXI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 allow members of the World Trade Organization to take measures to deal with situations such as that presented by the current trade in conflict diamonds without violating their World Trade Organization obligations.

(8) Failure to curtail the trade in conflict diamonds or to differentiate between the trade in conflict diamonds and the trade in legitimate diamonds could have a severe negative impact on the legitimate diamond trade in countries such as Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, and Tanzania.

(9) Initiatives of the United States seek to resolve the problem in such a way that countries in Africa which facilitate the trade in conflict diamonds.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.
In this Act:
(1) CONFLICT DIAMONDS.—The term “conflict diamonds” means—
(A) rough diamonds the importation of which is prohibited by United Nations Security Council Resolutions because that trade is financing conflict;
(B) in the case of rough diamonds not covered by subparagraph (A), any rough diamonds extracted in the territory of the exporting country, subject to inspection and verification by authorized government authorities in accordance with national regulations; and
(C) With respect to countries that reexport rough diamonds, a system of controls designed to ensure that no conflict diamonds have entered the legitimate trade in rough diamonds.
(D) Verifiable recordkeeping by all companies and individuals engaged in mining, import, and re-export of rough diamonds within the country of origin, total carat weight, and value.
(E) Government publication of a periodic basis of official rough diamond export and import statistics.
(F) Implementation of proportionate and dispositive penalties against any persons who violate laws and regulations designed to combat trade in conflict diamonds.
(G) Full compliance by the United Nations or other official international bodies examining the trade in conflict diamonds, which is especially with the Kimberley Process, and monitoring of the trade in rough diamonds.
(2) CONCLUDING.—The provisions of this section do not apply to—
(A) rough diamonds imported by or on behalf of a person for personal use and accompanying a person upon entry into the United States;
(B) rough diamonds previously exported from the United States and reimported by the same importer, without having been advanced in value or improved in condition by any process or other means while abroad, if the importer declares that the reimportation of the rough diamonds satisfies the requirements of this paragraph.

SEC. 4. MEANS TO FORBID IMPORTS OF CONFLICT DIAMONDS.
(a) AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President, in a national emergency or war, may prohibit the importation into the United States of conflict diamonds, and may prohibit the importation into the United States of polished diamonds and jewelry containing conflict diamonds imported from any country that does not take effective measures to stop trade in conflict diamonds as long as the prohibition is consistent with the foreign policy interests of the United States, including the international obligations of the United States, or is necessary to United Nations Security Council Resolutions on conflict diamonds.
(b) EFFECTIVE MEASURES.—For purposes of this Act, effective measures are measures that—
(1) meet the requirements of United Nations Security Council Resolutions on trade in conflict diamonds;
(2) meet the requirements of an international arrangement on conflict diamonds, including the recommendations of the Kimberley Process, as long as the measures also meet the requirements of United Nations Security Council Resolutions on trade in conflict diamonds; or
(3) contain the following elements, or their functional equivalent, if such elements are sufficient to meet the requirements of United Nations Security Council Resolutions on trade in conflict diamonds:
(A) With respect to exports from countries where rough diamonds are extracted, secure packaging, accompanied by officially validated documentation certifying the country of origin of the rough diamonds;
(B) With respect to exports from countries where rough diamonds are extracted, a system of verifiable controls on rough diamonds from the country of origin to the country of reimportation;
(C) With respect to countries that reexport rough diamonds, a system of controls designed to ensure that no conflict diamonds have entered the legitimate trade in rough diamonds.

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION OF POLISHED DIAMONDS AND JEWELRY.
The President shall prohibit specific entries into the customs territory of the United States, including the importation of polished diamonds and jewelry containing diamonds in which the President has credible evidence that such polished diamonds and jewelry were produced with conflict diamonds; or

SEC. 6. ENFORCEMENT.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Diamonds and jewelry containing diamonds imported into the United States in violation of any prohibition on importation section 4 or 5 are subject to the seizure and forfeiture laws, and all criminal and civil laws of the United States shall apply, to the same extent as any other violator of the customs and navigation laws of the United States.
(b) PROCEEDS FROM FINES AND FORFEITED GOODS.—In addition to any other provisions of law, the proceeds derived from fines imposed for violations of section 4(a), and from the seizure and forfeiture of goods imported in conflict with this Act, shall be available only for—
(1) the Leahy War Victims Fund administered by the United States Agency for International Development or any successor program to assist victims of foreign war; and

SEC. 7. REPORTS.
(a) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than one year after the effective date of this Act, and every 12 months thereafter, the President shall transmit to Congress a report—
(1) describing actions taken by countries that have exported diamonds to the United States during the preceding 12-month period to implement effective measures to stop trade in conflict diamonds;
(2) describing any new technologies since the preceding report in detecting diamonds or determining the origin of rough diamonds;
(3) identifying those countries that have exported diamonds to the United States during the preceding 12-month period and are not implementing effective measures to stop trade in conflict diamonds and whose failure to do so has significantly increased the likelihood that conflict diamonds are being imported into the United States;
(4) describing appropriate actions, which may include actions under section 4, to ensure that control systems are not being imported into the United States from such country; and
(5) identifying any additional countries involved in conflicts linked to rough diamonds that are not the subject of United Nations Security Council Resolutions on conflict diamonds.
(b) SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.—For each country identified in subsection (a)(3), the President shall, every 6 months after the initial report, or every 12 months thereafter, the President shall transmit to Congress a report that explains what actions have been taken by the United States or such country since the previous report, and that the conflict diamonds are not being imported from that country to the United States. The requirement to issue a semiannual report with respect to a country under this subsection shall remain in effect until such time as the country implements effective measures.

SEC. 8. GAO REPORT.
Not later than 3 years after the effective date of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall transmit a report to Congress on the effectiveness of the provisions of this Act in preventing the importation of conflict diamonds under section 4. The Comptroller General shall include in the report any recommendations on any modifications to this Act that may be necessary.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS.
(a) INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENT.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should take the necessary steps to negotiate an international arrangement in concert with the Kimberley Process referred to in section 2(6), to eliminate the trade in conflict diamonds. Such an international arrangement should create an effective global system of controls covering countries that export and import rough diamonds, should
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Mr. PRESIDENT, I believe the United States must take this leadership role so we can get ultimately the strongest possible bill. That is the message I believe our bill sends today. I will spend a few minutes talking about why this bill is so important and why it is vital we get a strong measure passed and eventually signed into law.

The diamond trade is one of the world’s most lucrative industries. With its extreme profitability, it is not surprising a black market trade has emerged alongside the legitimate industry. The sale of illicit diamonds has yielded disturbing reports in the media linking even Osama bin Laden to this trade. On February 22, 2001, the United States District Court trial, United States v. Osama bin Laden, attests to this.

Additionally, there is an established link between Sierra Leone’s diamond trade and well-known Lebanese terrorists.

It is also not surprising that diamond trading has become an attractive and sustainable income source for violent rebel groups around the world, particularly in Africa. The information I am talking about today in regard to terrorists has been reported in the public media. Currently in Africa, where the majority of the world’s diamonds are found, there is ongoing strife and struggle resulting from the fight for control of the precious gems. While violence has erupted in several countries, including Sierra Leone, Angola, the Congo, and Liberia, Sierra Leone in particular has one of the worst records of violence.

In that nation, rebel groups, most notably the Revolutionary United Front, the RUL, have seized control of many diamond fields. Once in control of a diamond field, the rebels confiscate the diamonds. Then they launder them on to the legitimate market through other nearby nations, such as Liberia, and ultimately finance their terrorist regimes and their continued efforts to overthrow the government.

Over the past decade, the rebels reaped the benefits of at least $10 billion in smuggled diamonds, and the fact is it could be a lot more than that. Since the start of the rebel quest for control of Sierra Leone’s diamond supply, the children of this small nation have borne the brunt of the insurgency. For over 8 years, the RUF has conscripted children, often as young as 7 or 8 years old. These soldiers and their makeshift army have ripped an estimated 12,000 children from their families. After the RUF invaded the capital of Freetown in January 1999, at least 3,000 children were reported missing.

As a result of deliberate and systematic brutalization, children soldiers have become some of the most vicious and effective fighters within the rebel factions. The rebel army, child soldiers included, has terrorized Sierra Leone’s population, killing, abducting, raping, and hiding off the limbs of victims with machetes. This chopping off of limbs is the RUF’s trademark strategy. I believe we can do something about this. We can, in fact, make a difference.

We have the power to help put an end to the indiscriminate suffering and violence in Sierra Leone and elsewhere in Africa. As the world’s biggest diamond customer, purchasing the majority of the world’s diamonds, the United States has tremendous clout. With that clout, we have the power to remove the lucrative financial incentives that drive the rebel groups to trade in diamonds in the first place.

Simply put, if there is no market for their diamonds, there is little reason for the rebels to engage in their brutal campaigns to secure and then protect their diamonds. That is why our legislation is aimed at removing the rebels’ market incentive. We need to work together with the international community to facilitate the implementation of a system of controls on the export and import of diamonds so that buyers can be certain their purchases are not fueling the rebel campaign.

Specifically, our new bill attempts to move this issue forward and to strengthen U.S. policy. For example, our bill would require the President to prohibit the importation of rough diamonds from countries not taking effective measures to stop the trade in conflict diamonds.

It also addresses potential loopholes associated with polished diamonds and diamond jewelry and includes a broader definition of conflict diamonds so that it includes conflicts in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and other areas as well.

These are a few of the important provisions that were omitted in the House version, provisions that are essential in this legislation to make the difference we want to make. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support this new bill and send an important message to the international community. As I see it, we do have an obligation, not just to eliminate the financial incentives for the illicit traders, but to those who unwittingly buy these conflict diamonds but, more importantly, we owe it to the children who have suffered far too long.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3031. Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. DURbin, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. CARNANAH, Mr. TORICELLI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LEARY, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 offered by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) to authorize funding the Department of Energy to enhance its mission areas through technology transfer and partnerships 2002 through 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.
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SA 3031. Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BAYH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. CARNAN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) to authorize funding the Department of Energy to enhance its mission areas through technology transfer and partnerships for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

**TEXT OF AMENDMENTS**

**SA 3031.**

(a) PERMITTING MAINTENANCE OF FISCAL YEAR 2001 FMAP FOR LAST 3 CALENDAR QUARTERS OF FISCAL YEAR 2002.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, but subject to subsection (g), if the FMAP determined without regard to this section for a State for fiscal year 2002 is less than the FMAP determined without regard to this section for fiscal year 2001, the FMAP for the State for fiscal year 2001 shall be substituted for the State’s FMAP for the second, third, and fourth calendar quarters of fiscal year 2002, before the application of this section.

(b) PERMITTING MAINTENANCE OF FISCAL YEAR 2002 FMAP FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, but subject to subsection (g), if the FMAP determined without regard to this section for a State for fiscal year 2002 is less than the FMAP determined without regard to this section for fiscal year 2001, the FMAP for the State for fiscal year 2001 shall be substituted for the State’s FMAP for each calendar quarter of fiscal year 2003, before the application of this section.

(c) PERMITTING MAINTENANCE OF FISCAL YEAR 2003 FMAP FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, but subject to subsection (g), if the FMAP determined without regard to this section for a State for fiscal year 2003 is less than the FMAP as so determined for fiscal year 2002, the FMAP for the State for fiscal year 2002 shall be substituted for the State’s FMAP for each calendar quarter of fiscal year 2003, before the application of this section.

(d) GENERAL 1.50 PERCENTAGE POINTS INCREASE THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 2004.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, but subject to subsection (g), if the FMAP determined without regard to this section for a State for the second, third, and fourth calendar quarters of fiscal year 2002 and each calendar quarter of fiscal years 2003 and 2004, the FMAP (taking into account the application, of subsection (a), (b), and (c)) shall be increased by 1.50 percentage points.

(e) FURTHER INCREASE FOR STATES WITH HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT RATES THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 2004.—

(1) In general.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, but subject to subsection (g) and (h), the FMAP for a high unemployment State for the second, third, and fourth calendar quarters of fiscal year 2002, or any calendar quarter of fiscal year 2003 or 2004, that is a high unemployment State for the second, third, and fourth calendar quarters after the first such calendar quarter for which the State is a high unemployment State regardless of whether the State continues to be a high unemployment State for the subsequence such calendar quarters) shall be increased (after the application of subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) by 1.50 percentage points.

(2) HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT STATE.—

(A) In general.—For purposes of this subsection, a State is a high unemployment State for any fiscal year if the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate for such fiscal year, or for the second, third, and fourth calendar quarters of such fiscal year, as determined without regard to this section for a period the length of which is equal to the sum of the seasonally adjusted unemployment rates for the second, third, and fourth calendar quarters of each of the calendar years 2002 through 2004, before the application of this section, is equal to or greater than 8.5 percent.

(B) AVERAGE WEIGHTED UNEMPLOYMENT RATE.—For purposes of paragraph (A), the “average weighted unemployment rate” for such period is—

(i) the sum of the seasonally adjusted unemployment rates for the second, third, and fourth calendar quarters of each of the calendar years 2002 through 2004, before the application of this section, divided by

(ii) the sum of the civilian labor force in each State and the District of Columbia for the period, divided by

(iii) the sum of the seasonally adjusted unemployment rates for the second, third, and fourth calendar quarters of each of the calendar years 2002 through 2004, before the application of this section.

(f) INCREASE IN CAP ON MEDICAID PAYMENTS TO PROVIDERS OF NON-MEDICAID SERVICES.—

(1) In general.—For purposes of this section, the increases in the Federal medical assistance percentage, as defined in section 1903(b) of the Social Security Act, for an increase in its FMAP under subsection (a) (as in effect on October 1, 2001).

(2) sunny increase.—

(A) DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE HOSPITAL PAYMENTS.—For purposes of this section, the increases in the Federal medical assistance percentage, as defined in section 1903(b) of the Social Security Act, for an increase in its FMAP under subsection (a) (as in effect on October 1, 2001).
Kim Richard Widup, of Illinois, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Illinois for the term of four years.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will return to legislative session.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 2002
Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 10 a.m. on Tuesday, March 19; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 2356, the Campaign Finance Reform Act; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly party conferences.

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

PROGRAM
Mr. REID. As negotiations continue on campaign finance reform, we expect to resume consideration of the energy bill tomorrow. There are a number of important amendments on which we can work. The Feinstein amendment has been pending, and Senator KYL, I hope, will be ready to offer his amendment so we can finalize the debate on the alternative energy consideration in this bill. There are a lot of things to do tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW
Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:03 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 19, 2002, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS
Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 18, 2002:

THE JUDICIARY
RANDY CRANE, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS;

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
DON SLAZINIK, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS;

KIM RICHARD WIDUP, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.
IN MEMORY OF STEVE M. NATHAN
HON. KEN CALVERT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 2002
Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication to the community and to the overall well being of the city of Norco, California, was unparalleled. Norco was indeed fortunate to have such a dynamic and dedicated businessman and community leader who willingly and unselfishly gave of his time and talents to make his community a better place in which to live and work. The individual I am speaking of is Steve M. Nathan. I was fortunate to have been able to call him my friend. He passed away last week at the Corona Regional Medical Center after complications from surgery at the age of 76.

With true valor and love of country he served in the United States Air Force and saw combat during World War II as a B-26 Aerial Gunner where he flew 26 missions over Germany. After 25 years of service, he retired as a Senior Master Sergeant in 1968 and moved to Norco. Steve then founded and operated Norco Alarms, Inc. until his retirement in 1990. A fixture in the community, Steve was a talented businessman and never shied away from community involvement.

Mr. Nathan gave much during his years to his community and the whole Inland Empire. He began his record of community service by becoming a member of the Norco Planning Commission in 1970, served over 12 years on the Norco City Council and was elected Mayor twice during that span. Steve was also elected and served as Chairman of the Riverside Transit Agency, appointed to the Riverside County Jury in 1993, serve on the California Grand Jurors Association Board, was the current three term President of the Norco Historical Society, a member of the California Rehabilitation Center Citizen Advisory Board, the Corona Masonic Lodge, Norco Lions Club, the Norco American Legion Post 328 and the Norco Chamber of Commerce.

His passion for community service was matched by his passion for hunting for artifacts. He traveled many parts of the world as he enjoyed his metal detecting hobby and spent two weeks each summer in England where he hunted for artifacts. He was an avid Board Member of the Riverside Treasure Hunters Club.

He is survived by his wife, Audry Murphy Nathan, two sons, Scott Nathan and his wife Emmi, Dennis Nathan and his wife Jane, two grandchildren, Nicole and Bryan, his sister Toni Nathan and brother-in-law Chuck Nathan. Steve was preceded in death by his wife of 54 years, Doris Nathan. My prayers go out to them for their loss.

Mr. Speaker, looking back at Steve’s life, we see a man dedicated to his family and community—an American whose gifts to the Inland Empire and southern California led to the betterment of those who had the privilege to come in contact or work with him. Honoring Steve’s memory is the least that we can do today for all that he gave over his lifetime.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 1ST ANNUAL QUEEN CITY CLASSIC CHESS TOURNAMENT
HON. ROB PORTMAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 2002
Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 1st Annual Queen City Classic Chess Tournament, which will be held in the clubhouse of Cincinnati’s Paul Brown Stadium on April 6, 2002.

Chess has been played for centuries, and it is one of the oldest games still played today by literally millions of people around the world. It is a challenging game for youth which can improve a child’s ability to concentrate and can boost his or her self-esteem, which often leads to improved performance in the classroom. Chess also teaches players of all levels important skills (logical sequencing, careful planning, patience, strategy and good sportsmanship) that will be invaluable throughout their lives.

The 1st Annual Queen City Classic Chess Tournament was organized by a local community leader, Penny Pomeranz, as a way to provide children in the Cincinnati region with a competitive environment and to encourage children to learn to play chess early in life. It will bring together kindergartners to high school seniors from Ohio, Kentucky and Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing Cincinnati’s 1st Annual Queen City Classic Chess Tournament. All of us in the Cincinnati area appreciate Penny’s hard work, and we wish her and all the organizers the best on the Tournament’s debut on April 6.

HONORING JANICA KOSTELIC
HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 2002
Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Janica Kostelic for her spectacular performance at the 2002 Winter Olympics. Ms. Kostelic is a 20 year-old young lady from Croatia who won four medals (three gold and one silver) during the Olympics in Salt Lake City. In celebration, her home country has placed her picture on a postage stamp. Over 100,000 people gathered to meet Janica upon her return to Zabreg, Croatia. People missed work and schools canceled classes so they could greet the newly dubbed “Snow Queen”. This skiing sensation finished two runs in 2 minutes, 30.01 seconds. Janica is the first Alpine skier to win four medals at a single Winter Olympics. She won gold in the giant slalom, the slalom, and the combined event, and silver in the super giant slalom; she was the only Croatian to win a medal. Janica’s brother, Ivica, also competed at the 2002 Winter Olympics.

The Kostelic family has endured many setbacks while trying to support their children’s Olympics aspirations. Their country only has two ski resorts, so the family had to travel...
around Europe often sleeping in their car and living on salami and pickle sandwiches. Their tremendous efforts and fortitude, however, paid off tremendously for Janica and Ante, her father and coach, the family made many sacrifices, but their willpower allowed for Janica’s incredible victories.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Janica Kostelic on her outstanding achievements at the 2002 Winter Olympics. I invite my colleagues to join me in wishing Ms. Kostelic and her family many more years of continued success.

A TRIBUTE TO THE DOWNEY EAGLE

HON. STEPHEN HORN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 2002

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, on March 29, 2002, Barbara and Jerry Andrews will suspend publication of The Downey Eagle after nine years. This news was greeted with sadness by all those who have admired the paper for all these years. Because of the importance of The Downey Eagle to the City of Downey and surrounding areas, I wish to pay tribute to the Andrews family for their commitment and devotion to their community.

The Downey Eagle has provided its readers with all of the elements that make community newspapers so essential: news from the city council, civic groups, community organizations, cultural, educational, and arts events, wedding announcements and obituaries, opinion columns based on local insights and a lively letters page for the community to discuss local opinions and events. All this with wonderful photos which accompanied many stories. A publication such as this not only provides information, but also helps to promote progress. The Downey Eagle has helped build cohesion and a sense of community among its readers.

Because my wife’s father, uncle, and grandfather were all in the community newspaper business, I appreciate the difficulties involved with getting out a local paper week after week. In addition to the sheer physical challenge of producing a first class publication every seven days, a publisher must balance the competing interests of various and very passionate groups. Making these decisions takes sensitivity, and both Barbara and Jerry Andrews have been available and responsive throughout the publication of The Downey Eagle. They presented balanced civic news, people news, and editorial commentary.

Essential to the success of The Downey Eagle has been its energetic and talented editor, John Adams. A veteran newspaperman, who previously worked for the San Francisco Chronicle, among other major publications, John has been the chief writer, editor, and photographer for the paper. He has tirelessly covered thousands of community events, conducted similar numbers of follow-up interviews, and produced article after article that was fair, accurate, and insightful.

As The Downey Eagle Ceases to publish later this month, Barbara, Jerry, and John can take great pride in all that they have accomplished over the past decade. They have set a high standard for what a community newspaper can and should be, and they take the grateful thanks of all of us as they pursue new challenges.

GIRL SCOUTS CELEBRATE 90 YEARS

HON. DON YOUNG
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 2002

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 90th anniversary of the Girl Scouts. Girl Scouting began on March 12, 1912, when founder Juliette Gordon Low assembled 19 girls from Savannah, Georgia, for a local Girl Scout meeting. She believed that all girls should be given the opportunity to develop physically, mentally and spiritually. The Girl Scout mission is to help all girls grow strong values and ideals which will serve them throughout their lives. In Alaska alone 8,000 girls and 3,000 volunteers annually participate in Girl Scouts. This program is especially important to me because I married a former Girl Scout, Lu Young. My wife’s former troop leader, Evelyn Melville continues to be a very close friend. At the time my wife was a Girl Scout her troop was the furthest North, eight miles above the Arctic Circle. Through Girl Scouting girls make friendships that last a lifetime, acquire self-confidence, take on responsibility, and are encouraged to think creatively. Girl Scouts have a bright and promising future. Some of the Girl Scouts future goals include addressing the digital divide and encouraging girls to pursue careers in science, math, and technology. Happy birthday Girl Scouts and I look forward to hearing of your future accomplishments.

GIRL SCOUTS OF THE USA

HON. BRIAN D. KERNS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 2002

Mr. KERNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Girl Scouts of the USA. This week, the Girl Scouts celebrate their 90th Anniversary. For nearly a century, this organization has helped millions of girls develop into responsible, respectful, and caring young women. By actively promoting patriotism, integrity, community service, and self reliance the Girl Scouts of the USA is empowering each of its members to develop to her full potential as both an individual and as a thoughtful, civic-minded citizen. There are currently almost 3 million young ladies involved in the Girl Scouts—and each one is committed to making our nation and the world a better place. By embracing and acting upon the values of the Girl Scouts, they are doing just that.

The Girl Scouts is dedicated to involving young ladies in every community; rural farm communities, urban centers, and suburban neighborhoods. Indeed, the Girl Scouts of the USA plays a role throughout each of our districts, and it is helping shape a future generation of teachers, doctors, computer specialists, mothers, and even Members of Congress. The Girl Scouts has and will continue to demonstrate that young ladies, through hard work and discipline, can become anything they aspire to be.

On the 90th anniversary of the founding of the Girl Scouts, I rise to share my thanks to the great service they are doing for young women, the State of Indiana, and for our Nation. Our country is truly a better place because of Girl Scouts of the USA.

HONORING JOHN SMALE AS HE IS INDUCTED INTO THE ADVERTISING HALL OF FAME

HON. ROB PORTMAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 2002

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a friend and distinguished constituent, John Smale (ADA) of The Procter & Gamble Company and former Chairman of General Motors Corporation, who will have the honor of being inducted into the American Advertising Federation’s Advertising Hall of Fame in New York City on March 19, 2002.

The Advertising Hall of Fame is the most prestigious honor bestowed in the advertising industry. It is awarded to individuals who have set the standard for lifetime advertising excellence. John Smale joins a notable group of industry luminaries that includes David Ogilvy, Ray Kroc, Jay Chiat, William Bernbach and William Paley.

John Smale was selected because he has been a major proponent of the power of advertising to build brands and an advocate of the importance of building global brand loyalty through advertising. He is truly a pioneer and an innovator. He joined Procter & Gamble in 1952 and later, as an associate advertising manager in 1958, he began informing the American Dental Association (ADA) about Crest toothpaste’s fluoride-based anti-cavity research. After the ADA awarded Crest its first seal of approval in 1960, Crest became the category leader with its “Look Ma, no cavities” advertising campaign.

Under his leadership as Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer in the 1980s, John engineered an aggressive series of landmark changes that restructured the company from the coveted brand management system—where products compete against one another—to a broader one of category management. Significantly, this allowed the P&G manager to oversee both the product and its advertising. He was committed to new product development and invested $2 billion into new acquisitions that resulted in tremendous growth, making the company the nation’s leading personal care products company. He did this while emphasizing P&G’s strengths in market research and without compromising its basic values. During his tenure, the company expanded from 24 categories to 39, and owned the leading brand in most of them.

John Smale engineered other important company changes, many targeted to the company’s enormous global expansion. In Japan, the world’s second largest consumer market, he hired Japanese managers, and required those from the U.S. to study Japanese language and culture. In 1992, he was elected Board Chairman of the General Motors Corporation where he also designed a major re-structuring program.
But his significant influence didn’t end in the corporate boardroom; he is also an effective civic leader. In the late 1980s, he unselfishly chaired the Cincinnati Infrastructure Commission—known as the Smale Commission—and enlisted other community leaders in an examination of ways to make critical improvements in the city’s infrastructure. The Commission’s report is widely viewed as the most comprehensive assessment of the city’s physical assets. He has also served on the Board of Directors of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, the Nature Conservancy, and the National Park Foundation; a trustee of the Cincinnati Institute of Fine Arts and the Cincinnati Museum Association; a member of the Board of Governors of United Way and the National Advisory Board of Goodwill Industries of America.

John Smale is an innovator and achiever. One veteran corporate analyst ranked him as one of the top three chief executives of the past half century. As he receives advertising’s most prestigious honor, we congratulate him and thank him for his vision, his commitment and his service to his community and his country.
SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This requirement will ensure that such committees notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 19, 2002 may be found in the Daily Digest of today’s RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 20

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine issues with respect to the collapse of the Enron Corporation, focusing on credit rating agencies.
SD–342

Armed Services
Personnel Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2003 for the Department of Defense, focusing on recruiting and retention in the military services.
SR–232A

Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine competition in the local telecommunications marketplace.
SR–253

10 a.m.
Judiciary
Technology, Terrorism, and Government Information Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine identity theft and information protection.
SD–226

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Crime and Drugs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation requiring accounting and investor protection issues raised by the fall of the Enron Corporation and by other public companies.
SD–342

Budget
Business meeting to mark up a proposed concurrent resolution setting forth the fiscal year 2003 budget for the Federal Government.
SD–538

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to mark up S. 1992, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve diversification of plan assets for participants in individual account plans, to improve disclosure, account access, and accountability under individual account plans; and S. 1335, to support business incubation in academic settings.
SD–430

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine legislative initiatives that would impose limits on the shipments of out-of-State municipal solid waste and authorize State and local governments to exercise flow control.
SD–406

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings to examine an overview of intelligence programs.
S–407 Capitol

1:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2003 for the Office of Management and Budget.
SD–192

2 p.m.
Veterans’ Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentations of America’s Ex-Prisoners of War, the Vietnam Veterans of America, the Retired Officers Association, the National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs, and AMVETS.
345 Cannon Building

Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2003 for public health, nutrition and regulatory agencies.
SD–138

2:30 p.m.
Armed Services
Strategic Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2003 for the Department of Defense, focusing on national security space programs and strategic programs.
SR–232A

Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine pending intelligence matters.
SH–219

MARCH 21

9 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Business meeting to consider issuance of various subpoenas to employees of Enron.
SD–342

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine airport capacity expansion plans in the Chicago area.
SR–253

Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine reform of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, focusing on lessons learned from the Oklahoma City bombing.
SD–226

Finance
To hold hearings on the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Utah, to be Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs.
SD–215

9:45 a.m.
Indian Affairs
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SR–485

10 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 588, to provide for the use and distribution of the funds awarded to the Western Shoshone identifiable group under Indian Claims Commission Docket Numbers 326-A–1, 326-A–3, 326-K.
SR–485

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine the Individuals With Disabilities Act, as it applies to children and schools.
SD–430

Finance
To hold hearings to examine corporate tax shelters.
SD–215

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2003 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Drug Enforcement Administration, all of the Department of Justice.
SD–124

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine security challenges presented by transportation of cargo.
SD–138

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue oversight hearings to examine accounting and investor protection issues raised by the fall of the Enron Corporation and by other public companies.
SH–216

Armed Services
Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2003 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on the readiness of U.S. Armed Forces for all assigned missions.
SR–232A

11 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2003 for the National Institutes of Health of the Department of Health and Human Services.
SD–192

2 p.m.
Judiciary
Crime and Drugs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine homeland defense, focusing on assessing the needs of local law enforcement.
SD–226

Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2003 for the District of Columbia Courts, Court Services, and Offender Supervision Agency.
SD–192

APRIL 9

2:30 p.m.
Armed Services
SeaPower Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislationauthorizing funds for fiscal year 2003
for the Department of Defense, focusing on Navy equipment required for fielding a 21st century capabilities-based Navy.

**APRIL 10**
10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Antitrust, Competition and Business and Consumer Rights Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine cable competition, focusing on the ATT-Comcast merger.

**CANCELATIONS**

MARCH 21
2 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2003 for the Department of the Interior.

**POSTPONEMENTS**

MARCH 20
10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2003 for the General Accounting Office, Congressional Budget Office, and Government Printing Office.

MARCH 21
2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine federal research and development issues.
Monday, March 18, 2002
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Senate

Chamber Action


Measures Introduced Today: Three bills were introduced, as follows: S. 2025–2027. Pages S2009–14


Campaign Finance Reform: Senate began consideration of H.R. 2356, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a cloture vote will occur on Wednesday, March 20, 2002.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 10 a.m., on Tuesday, March 19, 2002. Page S2002

Appointment:

Library of Congress Trust Fund Board: The Chair, on behalf of the Republican Leader, in consultation with the Democratic Leader, pursuant to Public Law 68–541, as amended by Public Law 102–246, appointed Tom Luce, of Texas, as a member of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a term of five years.

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By unanimous vote of 91 yeas (Vote No. 52), Randy Crane, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Don Slazinik, of Illinois, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Illinois for the term of four years.

Kim Richard Widup, of Illinois, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Illinois for the term of four years.

Executive Communications:

Additional Cosponsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Additional Statements:

Amendments Submitted:

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—52) Page S2002

Adjournment: Senate met at 3 p.m., and adjourned at 7:03 p.m., until 10 a.m., on Tuesday, March 19, 2002. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S2016).

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION


FEDERAL WORKFORCE REFORM

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services held hearings to examine proposed legislation to give federal agencies new management tools to handle recruitment and retention of skilled federal employees, in order to avoid a human capital crisis which may be brought by large-scale retirements expected in the near future, including S. 1603, to provide for reform relating to Federal employment, and S. 1612, to provide Federal managers with tools and flexibility in areas such as personnel, budgeting,
property management and disposal, receiving testimony from Kay Coles James, Director, Office of Personnel Management; David M. Walker, Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office; Colleen M. Kelley, National Treasury Employees Union, Jerry G. Shaw, Jr., Senior Executives Association, and Bobby L. Harnage, Sr., American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO, all of Washington, D.C.; and John Priolo, Federal Managers Association, Alexandria, Virginia.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

---

House of Representatives

**Chamber Action**

**Measures Introduced:** 8 public bills, H.R. 3983–3990; and 2 resolutions; H. Con. Res. 354 and 355, were introduced. **Page H937**

**Reports Filed:** Reports were filed today as follows:

- Filed on Friday, March 16, H. Con. Res. 353, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2003 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2007 (H. Rept. 107–376);
- S. 1622, to extend the period of availability of unemployment assistance under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act in the case of victims of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 (H. Rept. 107–377);
- H.R. 2804, to designate the United States courthouse located at 95 Seventh Street in San Francisco, California, as the “James R. Browning United States Courthouse” (H. Rept. 107–378); and
- H.R. 3925, to establish an exchange program between the Federal Government and the private sector in order to promote the development of expertise in information technology management, amended (H. Rept. 107–379). **Pages H936–37**

**Speaker Pro Tempore:** Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Otter to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H935**

**Senate Messages:** Message received from the Senate today appears on page H935.

**Referrals:** S. 1372 was held at the desk and S. 2019 was referred to the Committee on Financial Services. **Page H935**

**Quorum Calls Votes:** No quorum calls or recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 2:04 p.m.

**Committee Meetings**

No committee meetings were held.

---

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 2002**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

**Senate**

**Committee on Appropriations:** Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2003 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Federal Trade Commission, 10 a.m., SD–138.

Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2003 for the Department of the Treasury, focusing on the International Affairs Programs, 2 p.m., SD–192.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2003 for the Department of the Navy and Air Force military construction, 2:30 p.m., SD–138.

**Committee on Armed Services:** to hold hearings to examine the worldwide threat to United States interests (to be followed by closed hearings in SH–219), 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Subcommittee on SeaPower, to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2003 for the Department of Defense, focusing on maximizing fleet presence capability, ship procurement, and research and development, 2:30 p.m., SR–222.

**Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:** to resume oversight hearings to examine accounting and investor protection issues raised by the fall of the Enron Corporation and by other public companies; followed by a vote on the nominations of JoAnn Johnson, of Iowa, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board, and Deborah Matz, of New York, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board, 9:30 a.m., SD–358.

**Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:** to hold hearings on the nomination of Vice Admiral Thomas Collins to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, and Fisheries, to hold oversight hearings to examine the budget of the United States Coast Guard, 3 p.m., SR–253.

**Committee on Environment and Public Works:** to hold hearings to examine mobility, congestion, and intermodalism, focusing on fresh ideas for transportation demand, access, mobility, and program flexibility, 2:30 p.m., SD–406.
Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy, with the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, Subcommittee on Children and Families, to hold joint hearings to examine working families and child care issues, 2:30 p.m., SD–215.

Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy, with the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, Subcommittee on Children and Families, to hold joint hearings to examine affordable child care and improving links between the welfare work requirements and child care for low income, working families, 2:30 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine threat reduction of chemical and biological weapons, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. Res. 213, condemning human rights violations in Chechnya and urging a political solution to the conflict; H.R. 2739, to amend Public Law 107–10 to require a United States plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual summit of the World Health Assembly in May 2002 in Geneva, Switzerland; and S. Res. 205, urging the Government of Ukraine to ensure a democratic, transparent, and fair election process leading up to the March 31, 2002, parliamentary elections, 2:15 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, to continue hearings on Federal workplace reform proposals, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Children and Families, with the Committee on Finance, Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy, to hold joint hearings to examine working families and child care issues, 2:30 p.m., SD–215.

Subcommittee on Children and Families, with the Committee on Finance, Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy, to hold joint hearings to examine affordable child care and improving links between the welfare work requirements and child care for low income, working families, 2:30 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings on the nomination of Terrence L. O’Brien, of Wyoming, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit; the nomination of Lance M. Africk, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana; the nomination of Paul G. Cassell, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah; and the nomination of Legrome D. Davis, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, 10 a.m., SD–226.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, on National Institutes of Health Panel: Fundamental Research: Biomedical Science in the Future, 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Veterans’ Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, on Department of Housing and Urban Development, 9:30 a.m., and 1:30 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Procurement, hearing on the U.S. defense industrial base, 3 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality, hearing on the reauthorization of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act and the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, oversight hearing on “The INS March 2002 Notification of Approval of Change of Status for Pilot Training for Terrorist Hijackers Mohammed Atta and Marwan Al-Shehhi,” 4 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands, hearing on the following: H.R. 2982, to authorize the establishment of a memorial within the area in the District of Columbia referred to in the Commemorative Works Act as “Area I” or “Area II” to the victims of terrorist attacks on the United States, to provide for the design and construction of such a memorial; H.R. 3380, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue right-of-way permits for natural gas pipelines within the boundary of Great Smoky Mountains National Park; and a measure to designate and provide for the management of the Shoshone National Recreation Trail, 2 p.m., 1354 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Water and Power, hearing on H.R. 3881, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in studies relating to enlarging Pueblo Dam and Reservoir and Sugar Loaf Dam and Turquoise Lake, Fryingpan-Arkansas Project, Colorado, 10:30 a.m., 1354 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to consider the following: H.R. 3925, Digital Tech Corps Act of 2002; and H. Con. Res. 353, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2003 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2007, 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Rural Enterprises, Agriculture and Technology, hearing on Access to Health Care in Rural America, 2 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, hearing on Joint Military Intelligence Programs/Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities, 4 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

Joint Meetings

Conference: meeting of conferees on H.R. 2646, to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011, 9 a.m., 1300 LHOB.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Tuesday, March 19

Senate Chamber
Program for Tuesday: Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2356, Campaign Finance Reform. Also, Senate expects to resume consideration of S. 517, Energy Policy Act.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m., for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
12:30 p.m., Tuesday, March 19

House Chamber
Program for Tuesday: Consideration of suspensions:

(1) H.R. 3928, University of Utah Museum of Natural History Facility in Salt Lake City;
(2) H.R. 706, Lease Lot Conveyance Act;
(3) H.R. 1712, National Park of American Samoa Boundary Adjustment;
(4) H.R. 3985, Gila River Indian Community Lease Act;
(5) H. Res. 368, Commending the Pentagon Renovation Program and its Restoration of the Pentagon;
(6) S. 2019, Extension of Export-Import Bank Authority until April 30, 2002;
(7) H.R. 2509, Bureau of Engraving and Printing Security Printing Amendments;
(8) H.R. 3924, Freedom to Telecommute Act of 2002;
(9) H.R. 3986, Extension of unemployment assistance for those made eligible by the September 11 terrorist attacks;
(10) H.R. 2804, James R. Browning United States Courthouse, San Francisco, California; and
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