

reduce the overabundance of forest fuels that place national resources at high risk of catastrophic wildfire, and prepare a National prescribed Fire Strategy that minimizes risks of escape.

AMENDMENT NO. 3430

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3430 proposed to H.R. 3009, a bill to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3431

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3431 proposed to H.R. 3009, a bill to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3433

At the request of Mr. REID, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3433 proposed to H.R. 3009, a bill to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself and Mr. SPECTER):

S. 2534. A bill to reduce crime and prevent terrorism at America's seaports; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the "Reducing Crime and Terrorism at America's Seaports Act." This important legislation will update Federal law to address critical security issues at seaports in the United States and, in concert with recent efforts by my good friend Senator HOLLINGS and others, will help keep America safe and secure.

Last October, I chaired a hearing of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Drugs on "Defending America's Transportation Infrastructure." At the hearing, we heard testimony from experts that confirmed what many of us have known and preached for years: this Nation's transportation infrastructure, our railways, our highways, our seaports, is especially vulnerable to terrorist threats and other nefarious activity. Our trains, trucks and sea vessels, and the systems that carry them, are ripe targets and, if compromised, could jeopardize American lives and devastate the American economy.

The U.S. Government has known of this tremendous vulnerability but, until the tragic events of September 11, assessed the risk of an actual attack, at least with respect to seaports, as relatively low. Well, we all know how mistaken that assessment is now. While no one can predict with certainty where the next attack might be,

most clear thinkers agree that there will be another attempt. The real question before us is will we cower in a web of fear and bureaucratic inaction, or will we focus on creative problem-solving, building partnerships, and collaboratively fighting the well-funded and well-organized network of criminals that seek to topple us. The choice, my friends, is clear.

In the aftermath of September 11, Congress moved expeditiously to bridge the gaps in homeland security, passing landmark anti-terrorism legislation, strengthening security at airports, and providing additional funding for emergency law enforcement and domestic preparedness. Despite our early efforts, however, there is much that remains to be done. We have tackled the obvious and the easy. We must now move as swiftly to resolve the more difficult, but no less pressing, problems. And, as gateways to our largest cities and industries, the protection of U.S. seaports must be at the top of our priority list.

Failing to protect our Nation's ports will jeopardize American lives, as well as property. It threatens to undermine national security, especially where terrorists and other criminals illegally traffic weapons, munitions and critical technology. And it will significantly disrupt the free and steady flow of commerce.

Let me say a word about the threat to commerce. Ports connect American consumers with global products, and U.S. farmers and manufacturers with overseas markets. The U.S. marine transportation system moves more than 2 billion tons of domestic and international freight and imports 3.3 billion tons of oil. By some estimates, the port industry generates more than 13 million jobs and \$494 billion in personal income; it contributes nearly \$743 billion to the Nation's gross domestic product, and \$200 billion in Federal, State and local taxes. These extraordinary numbers underscore the critical role that seaports play in fueling economic growth. More importantly, they make the point, more forcefully than any number of speeches or platitudes, that port security will be a key element to building and sustaining a stable national economy.

With that in mind, I introduce legislation today that would substantially improve the inadequate protections currently contained in the Federal code: first, the effectiveness of Federal, State and local efforts to secure ports is compromised in part by criminals' ability to evade detection by under-reporting and misreporting the content of cargo, with little more than a slap on the wrist, if that. The existing statutes simply do not provide adequate sanctions to deter criminal or civil violations. As a consequence, vessel manifest information is often wrong or incomplete, and our ability to assess risks, make decisions about which containers to inspect more closely, or simply control the movement of cargo is

made virtually impossible. This bill would substantially increase the penalties for non-compliance with these reporting requirements.

Second, we know that cargo is especially vulnerable to theft once it arrives at shore and is transported between facilities within a seaport. To deter such larceny, this bill would significantly increase penalties for theft of goods from Customs' custody.

Third, there currently exists no standard system for safeguarding cargo; no requirement that all containers be sealed; and no consistent guidance or protocol to direct action in the event that a container's seal is compromised. This legislation would require the U.S. Customs Service to develop a uniform system of securing or sealing at loading all containers originating in or destined for the U.S.

Fourth, my friends at the Customs Service tell me that their ability to conduct "sting" operations to detect illicit arms trafficking is significantly curtailed by onerous pre-certification requirements. This bill would give Customs agents the flexibility they need to conduct these investigations where American lives and property are threatened.

Fifth, the bill would impose strict criminal penalties for the use of a dangerous weapon or explosive with the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury at a seaport. Notably, such a provision already exists with respect to international airports and other mass transportation systems. If my bill is enacted, we would take the common-sense step of extending that same coverage to seaports.

Finally, while by all accounts the amount of crime at U.S. seaports is great, there exists no national data collection and reporting systems that capture the magnitude of serious crime at seaports. Indeed, the Interagency Commission on Crime and Security in U.S. Seaports concluded that it was unable to determine the full extent of serious crime at the nation's 361 seaports, primarily because there is no consolidated database. This legislation would help correct this dearth of reliable information by authorizing pilot programs at several seaports that would enable victims to report cargo theft and direct the Attorney General to create a database of these crimes, which would be available to appropriate Federal, State and local agencies.

Let me be clear: my legislation is not a cure-all. Comprehensive and effective port security will require an inter-agency, intergovernmental strategy that works to prevent and deter criminal and terrorist activity, and, where those efforts fail, detect any wrongdoing before harm or destruction results. The Federal Government, with my support and oftentimes at my insistence, has established formal strategies and protocols to address drug trafficking, domestic and international crime, and airport security. But seaport security remains largely

unaddressed. If we are to win this new war and truly secure the homeland, not just in word, but also in deed, we must focus the attention of both the public and private sectors on safeguarding America's seaports. We must do it now, and we must do it without sacrificing the country's economic health.

My friends, September 11 was our clarion call. How we respond to that call to action will be the real challenge of leadership, and citizenship, in the 21st century.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 2535. A bill to designate certain public lands as wilderness and certain rivers as wild and scenic rivers in the State of California, to designate Salmon Restoration Areas, to establish the Sacramento River National Conservation Area and Ancient Bristlecone Pine Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, history books written about California always comment on the natural beauty of the State because our natural treasures have always been one of the things that makes California unique. But that beauty must not be taken for granted. That is why I am introducing the California Wild Heritage Act of 2002, the first statewide wilderness bill for California since 1984.

This legislation will protect more than 2.5 million acres of public lands in 81 different areas, as well as the free-flowing portions of 22 rivers. Every acre of wild land is treasure. But the areas protected in this bill are some of California's most precious, including: the old growth redwood forest near the Trinity Alps in Trinity and Humboldt Counties; 35 miles of pristine coastline in the King Range in Humboldt and Mendocino Counties; the Nation's sixth highest waterfall, Feather Falls, in Butte County; the ancient Bristlecone Pines in the White Mountains in Inyo and Mono Counties; and the oak woodlands in the San Diego River area.

The bill protects these treasures by designating these public lands as "wilderness" and by naming 22 rivers, including the Clavey in Tuolumne County, as "wild and scenic" rivers. These destinations mean no new logging, no new dams, no new construction, no new mining, no new drilling, and no motorized vehicles. Protection of the areas in this bill is necessary to ensure that these previous places will be there for future generations. Because much of our State's drinking water supply is made up of watersheds in our national forest, this bill also helps ensure California has safe, reliable supply of clean drinking water. This bill would also mean that the hundreds of plant and animal species that make their homes in these areas will continue to have a safe haven. Endangered and threatened species whose habitats will be protected by this bill include: the bald eagle; Sierra Nevada Red Fox, and Spring Run Chinook Salmon among others.

In short, this bill preserves, prevents, and it protects. It preserves our most important lands, it prevents pollution, and it protects our most endangered wildlife. That is why so many supporters are throwing their weight behind this bill. Thousands of diverse organizations, businesses, and others see the importance of this legislation and have given it their support. Additionally, hundreds of local elected officials have voiced support for the protection of their local areas. Unfortunately, despite the tremendous support of this bill, it is not without opponents. They will say this bill is too large and goes too far. Yet this bill is similar in size to other statewide wilderness bills that have already passed Congress. The 1984 California Wilderness Act protected approximately 2 million acres and 83 miles of the Tuolumne River. The most recent Wilderness bill, the California Desert Protection Act, protected approximately 6 million acres. And this must be taken in context. Only 13 percent of California is currently protected as wilderness. This bill would raise that amount to 15 percent.

The question is, how much wilderness is enough? For every Californian, there is currently less than half an acre of wilderness set aside. I think this is too little. During the last 20 years, 675,000 acres of unprotected wilderness, approximately the size of Yosemite National Park, lost their wilderness character due to activities such as logging and mining. As our population increases, and California becomes home to almost 50 million people by the middle of the century, these development pressures are going to skyrocket. If we fail to act now, there simply will not be any wild lands or wild rivers left to protect.

We must reverse this. Many of the areas in this bill would have been protected by the Clinton administration's Roadless Rule, but this rule has been gutted by the Bush Administration, leaving these lands with no guarantee of protection. That just makes the need for this bill even greater. The other big question that has been raised is whether this bill will limit public access to these areas. I do not believe this will be the case. While wilderness designation means the wilderness areas are closed to mountain bikers, they remain open to a myriad of recreational activities, including: horseback riding, fishing, hiking, backpacking, rock climbing, cross country skiing, and canoeing. Mountain bikers and motorized vehicles have 100,000 miles of road and trails in California that are not touched in my bill. Furthermore, numerous economic studies suggest wilderness areas are a big draw that attract outdoor recreation visitors, and tourism dollars, to areas that have received this special designation.

Those of us who live in California have a very special responsibility to protect our natural heritage. Past generations have done it. They have left us with the wonderful and amazing gifts

of Yosemite, Big Sur and Joshua Tree. These are places that Californians cannot imagine living without. Now it is our turn to protect this legacy for future generations, for our children's children, and their children. This bill is the place to start and the time to start is now.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 2536. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify that section 1927 of that Act does not prohibit a State from entering into drug rebate agreements in order to make outpatient prescription drugs accessible and affordable for residents of the State who are not otherwise eligible for medical assistance under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. STABENOW. I am pleased to rise today to introduce the Rx Flexibility for States Act along with Senators DURBIN, LEAHY, JEFFORDS, BOXER, LEVIN, DORGAN, SCHUMER and JOHNSON.

This legislation would give States the flexibility to set up programs to pass along Medicaid rebates and discounts to their citizens who do not have prescription drug coverage and who are not currently eligible for Medicaid.

One of the biggest challenges facing businesses, senior citizens, families and State governments is the rising cost of prescription drug prices. From 2000-2001, prescription drug prices rose 17 percent. This is causing health expenditures and health insurance premiums to go up rapidly.

In an attempt to respond to these skyrocketing prices, 30 States have enacted laws providing some type of prescription drug coverage to those without insurance, according to the National Governors' Association, NGA.

However, the drug makers' trade association, PhRMA, has mounted legal challenges against several States because it opposes State efforts to lower prescription drug prices and increase coverage for those without it. Specifically, they have filed lawsuits against Maine and Vermont because the drug lobby does not want to extend Medicaid rebates and discounts to non-Medicaid recipients.

While Maine's two programs have been upheld in Court, Vermont's has not and both States are embroiled in lengthy appeals processes. These legal challenges are very costly and may have deterred other States from establishing similar demonstration projects.

In the absence of a Federal Medicare prescription drug benefit and soaring price of prescription drugs, States should have the unfettered ability to pass on Medicaid rebate to their residents! We need this legislation now, because even if Congress passes a Medicare prescription drug program, it will be several years before it is fully phased in.

The Rx Flexibility for States Act would seek to remove the legal hurdles that are preventing States from providing lower priced prescription drugs to all their citizens.

Specifically, States would be able to extend Medicaid rebates and discounts for prescription drugs to non-Medicaid eligible persons.

State governments are closer to the people and deserve the flexibility to set up their own programs to lower the costs of prescription drugs for their citizens.

This bill will give them that flexibility. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2536

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 "Rx Flexibility for States Act".

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF STATE AUTHORITY RELATING TO MEDICAID DRUG REBATE AGREEMENTS.

Section 1927 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(1) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting a State from—

"(1) directly entering into rebate agreements that are similar to a rebate agreement described in subsection (b) with a manufacturer for purposes of ensuring the affordability of outpatient prescription drugs in order to provide access to such drugs by residents of a State who are not otherwise eligible for medical assistance under this title; or

"(2) making prior authorization (that satisfies the requirements of subsection (d) and that does not violate any requirements of this title that are designed to ensure access to medically necessary prescribed drugs for individuals enrolled in the State program under this title) a condition of not participating in such a similar rebate agreement."

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 273—RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CRATER LAKE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 273

Whereas Crater Lake, at 1,943 feet deep, is the deepest lake in the United States;

Whereas Crater Lake is a significant natural feature, the creation of which, through the eruption of Mount Mazama 7,700 years ago, dramatically affected the landscape of an area that extends from southern Oregon into Canada;

Whereas legends of the formation of Crater Lake have been passed down through generations of the Klamath Tribe, Umpqua Tribe, and other Indian tribes;

Whereas on June 12, 1853, while in search of the legendary Lost Cabin gold mine, John Wesley Hillman, Henry Klippel, and Isaac Skeeters discovered Crater Lake;

Whereas William Gladstone Steele dedicated 17 years to developing strong local support for the conservation of Crater Lake, of which Steele said, "All ingenuity of nature seems to have been exerted to the fullest capacity to build a grand awe-inspiring temple the likes of which the world has never seen before";

Whereas on May 22, 1902, President Theodore Roosevelt signed into law a bill establishing Crater Lake as the Nation's sixth national park, mandating that Crater Lake National Park be "dedicated and set apart forever as a public park or pleasure ground for the benefit of the people of the United States" (32 Stat. 202);

Whereas Crater Lake National Park is a monument to the beauty of nature and the importance of providing public access to the natural treasures of the United States; and

Whereas May 22, 2002, marks the 100th anniversary of the designation of Crater Lake as a national park: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes May 22, 2002, as the centennial of the establishment of Crater Lake National Park.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 115—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS THAT ALL WORKERS DESERVE FAIR TREATMENT AND SAFE WORKING CONDITIONS, AND HONORING DOLORES HUERTA FOR HER COMMITMENT TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF WORKING CONDITIONS FOR CHILDREN, WOMEN, AND FARM WORKER FAMILIES

Mr. KENNEDY submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 115

Whereas Dolores Huerta is a preeminent civil rights leader who has been fighting for the rights of the underserved for more than 40 years;

Whereas Dolores Huerta was born on April 10, 1930, in Dawson, New Mexico;

Whereas Dolores Huerta was raised, along with her 2 brothers and 2 sisters, in the San Joaquin Valley town of Stockton, California, where she was witness to her mother's care and generosity for local, poverty-stricken farm worker families;

Whereas after earning a teaching credential from Stockton College, Dolores Huerta was motivated to become a public servant and community leader upon seeing her students suffer from hunger and poverty;

Whereas Dolores Huerta defied cultural and gender stereotypes by becoming a powerful and distinguished champion for farm worker families;

Whereas in addition to her unyielding support for farm workers' rights, Dolores Huerta has been a stalwart advocate for the protection of women and children;

Whereas notwithstanding her intensity of spirit and her willingness to brave challenges, Dolores Huerta has always espoused peaceful, nonviolent tactics to promote her ideals and achieve her goals;

Whereas Dolores Huerta established her career as a social activist in 1955 when she founded the Stockton chapter of the Community Service Organization, a Latino association based in California, and became involved in the association's civic and educational programs;

Whereas in 1962, together with Cesar Chavez, Dolores Huerta founded the National Farm Workers Association, a precursor to the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, which was formed in 1967;

Whereas Dolores Huerta is the proud mother of 11 children and has 14 grandchildren; and

Whereas Dolores Huerta was inducted into the Women's Hall of Fame in 1993 for her relentless dedication to farm worker issues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) it is the sense of the Congress that all workers deserve fair treatment and safe working conditions; and

(2) the Congress honors Dolores Huerta for her commitment to the improvement of working conditions for children, women, and farm worker families.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3467. Mr. WELLSTONE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3468. Mr. WELLSTONE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3469. Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3470. Mr. REID (for Ms. LANDRIEU) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) supra.

SA 3471. Mr. BAYH (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DAYTON, and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3472. Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3473. Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself and Mr. BUNNING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3474. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3446 proposed by Mr. BROWNBACK to the amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) supra.

SA 3475. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3476. Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3477. Mr. CONRAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.