

friend, Harry Kizirian. The gentleman was a postal worker who had spent many years working for Harry. With gestures more than words, he expressed the sense of loss tempered by love and admiration that we all felt; a fitting epitaph, the unadorned and heartfelt words and sentiments of one of his workers, more poignant and profound than any sermon or speech.

When our colleague John Chafee died, I recalled these lines from the Irish poet, William Butler Yeats, fitting words for another Marine who goes to his rest.

The man is gone who guided ye, unwearied,
through the long bitter way.

Ye by the waves that close in our sad nation,
Be full of sudden fears,

The man is gone for his lonely station . . .
Mourn—and then onward, there is no return-
ing

He guides ye from the tomb;
His memory now is a tall pillar, burning
Before us in the gloom!

Harry's memory warms our heart and
lights our way.

He was a man who saw hard times, but refused to allow them to extinguish his generous spirit. He was a man who saw war in all its horror, but refused to surrender his soul to its brutality. He was a strong man, not for the sake of intimidation, but because he knew that true strength allows a man to be truly compassionate. He was humble. His greatest source of pride was the success of others, particularly his family. His memory, his example, sustains us and inspires us.

I close with the words of a song that I am sure Harry knew.

If the Army and the Navy
Ever look on Heaven's scenes
They will find the streets are guarded by
United States Marines

Harry Kizirian, United States Marine Corps, has joined that Heavenly guard mount.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I did not know Senator REED's friend, but after listening to what he said, I feel as though I did know him. The distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island is fortunate to have had such a friend, but I think his friend was fortunate to know Senator REED. I know the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Georgia, did not mind the reference to the U.S. Marine Corps. I saw the smile on his face when that reference was made.

THE 21ST CENTURY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday, the majority leader filed cloture on the bipartisan 21st Century Depart-

ment of Justice Authorization Act conference report. I commend him for doing that.

This is a conference report that passed 400 to 4 last week in the other body. We will be voting on that cloture motion tomorrow. I just want to take a few moments to let Members of this body know what is in the conference report.

It was signed by all conferees—Republican and Democrat—Senator ORRIN HATCH, and Representatives SENSENBRENNER, HENRY HYDE, LAMAR SMITH, myself, and others.

I thank Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON for coming to the floor yesterday to support this conference report. She has spoken to me many times about the need for more judgeships along the Texas border with Mexico to handle immigration and criminal cases. Certainly, from what Senator HUTCHISON has said about that need, she has made a compelling request, and I have included in this conference report three new judges for that part of Texas. Actually, the conference report has one more judge than we passed out of the Senate. We added another one in conference. I suspect technically one could say that was not a matter in conference, but the Senator from Texas made, I thought, a compelling reason for it.

I mention that because one of our Federal district judges from Vermont has actually gone down to Texas a couple times to help out, and every time he has gone down, he has called me up and said: They need more judges here because of the load.

So I thank Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON.

I also want to thank Senator SESSIONS for his statement in support of this conference report. I mentioned to him on the floor this morning—and I want to speak again to that—there is a piece of this legislation Senator SESSIONS originally opposed. If it were here as a freestanding bill, that particular part—a small part of the bill—I believe Senator SESSIONS would vote against it. But he supports the overall bill and is voting for the whole bill. I thank him for that.

I also thank him for his work and his aid on the provisions in the conference report on the Paul Coverdell Forensic Sciences Improvement Grants and the Centers for Domestic Preparedness in Alabama and other States. He had a great deal of input, and I appreciate what he did. We tried throughout all of this effort to make this a bipartisan bill, and he helped with that.

Senator FEINSTEIN spoke on behalf of this conference report. She has been a tireless advocate for the needs of California, including the needs of the Federal judiciary along the southern border. She has helped to improve that situation.

I was glad to see we could work through that because we had tried for 7 or 8 years to add these additional judges, and they had been blocked. But

I came back and said, even though it would be a different President appointing the judges—in this case, President Bush—I was in favor of adding the judges. They should be in there. Among other things, we included five judgeships for the southern district of California.

We have also included judges, as I said, for Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, Ohio, North Carolina, Illinois, and Florida. The statistics show all the judges are very much needed.

The senior Senator from California gave leadership on the James Guelff and Chris McCurley Body Armor Act, the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program reauthorization, and the anti-drug-abuse provisions in the conference report, and that has been extremely helpful.

I should tell my colleagues, this report will strengthen our Justice Department and the FBI, and increase our preparedness against terrorist attacks. It offers our children a safe place to go after school.

In this conference report, we put together years of work. Parts of about 25 different bills have been combined in this report.

I thought President Bush did absolutely the right thing after the attacks of a year ago, on September 11, as he moved very aggressively to try to clamp off money going to terrorist organizations around the world. As we know, al-Qaida received a lot of money from Saudi Arabia and other countries, and that money has floated all over.

The President moved very quickly to stop that. But then they find other ways to move it. We know they still have tens of millions—hundreds of millions of dollars perhaps—in these terrorist groups. But there is a thing in this conference report called the Madrid Protocol. If we agree to this protocol, this will greatly strengthen the hand of the President to go after this money. The White House supports it. All the antiterrorist groups and the Government support it. That is also in this bill.

I mentioned this because I have been asked questions by several Senators exactly what is included. I want them to know. I also want to thank Senator HATCH for his work in this endeavor. We spent a lot of hours in the conference. That is why it passed so overwhelmingly, with the support of both Republican and Democratic leadership in the other body. I would be happy to have it pass unanimously. We could pass it tonight for that matter. I know the legislation is a priority.

We have not authorized the Department of Justice in more than two decades. Some might ask: Why should we do it now? We have a far different Department of Justice than we had before September 11. We have a number of changes that had to be made, supported by Members on both sides of the aisle, both sides of the aisle in the other body, the President of the United States, the Attorney General, and so on.

What we have done is tried to assure the administration of justice in our Nation. Our Nation has been radically changed from a year ago. It doesn't have everything that I would have liked or everything everybody would have liked. That is because it is a conference report. It is a consensus document. We did it in a bipartisan way—Democratic chairman from this body and a Republican chairman from the other; a Republican ranking member from this body, a Democratic ranking member of the other body.

We know that it will strengthen our Justice Department and the FBI. We will increase our preparedness against terrorist attacks. We will improve our intellectual property and antitrust laws. I hope for the sake of the Justice Department and the Congress and the American people we can pass it. It is remarkable, the number of provisions in here that will help everything from an attack of terrorism, closing off money and so forth, to help with the growing drug problem that strikes not just in the big cities but our rural areas.

I come from largely a rural State. The difference between this and the other body, every Senator has significant rural areas. When my son was a student at Emory Law School, I remember going to the State of the distinguished Presiding Officer and traveling around with my son. I come from a rural area. I must say, there are some pretty rural areas in Georgia. But there are in California and Texas and New York and every other State. This helps those States, especially in small areas, do something about the scourge of drugs hitting our youngsters, our future generation.

I wanted to give a short summary. There is a lot more. This was so other Members who had been asking me in both parties what is in it, I wanted them to see. It will be voted on tomorrow. I hope as a result of this vote tomorrow we will then just pass it. The White House has indicated the President will be eager to sign it when it arrives.

This conference report will strengthen our Justice Department and the FBI, increase our preparedness against terrorist attacks, prevent crime and drug abuse, improve our intellectual property and antitrust laws, strengthen and protect our judiciary, and offer our children a safe place to go after school.

This conference report is the product of years of bipartisan work. The conference report was unanimous. By my count, the conference report includes significant portions of at least 25 legislative initiatives.

I had hoped that the conference report on H.R. 2215 would not take up much of the Senate's time. There are other matters we do need to address. The majority leader tried to pass this legislation without taking up any floor time last week, but was unable to do so because of an objection to proceeding

by unanimous consent. Proceeding by unanimous consent would have ensured that we not take up the Senate's time in debate on this bipartisan legislative package. Yesterday, I came to the floor and sought to allow for two hours of debate before a vote on final passage at 4:30 p.m. We then could have moved on to other matters. Again, that proposal would have taken up a limited amount of the Senate's time. Yet, again, that limited time agreement proposal was rejected. As a result of the objection to proceeding more quickly, we are still considering this conference report and the majority leader was forced to file a cloture petition to bring it to a vote.

This legislation is neither complicated nor controversial. It passed the House 400 to 4 in short order. It was signed by every conferee, Republican or Democrat, including Senator HATCH and Representatives SENSENBRENNER, HYDE, and LAMAR SMITH. Senators SESSIONS and HUTCHISON came to the floor yesterday to support it. There is no need for extensive debate in the Senate—we can move on to consider other matters as soon as the objection is lifted so we are able to have an up or down vote on the conference report.

This legislation is a priority. Congress has not authorized the Department of Justice in more than two decades. I know that Senator HATCH and Representatives SENSENBRENNER and CONYERS share my view that it is long past time for the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate and the Congress as a whole to restore their proper oversight role over the Department of Justice. Through Republican and Democratic administrations, we have allowed the Department of Justice to escape its accountability to the Senate and House of Representatives and through them to the American people. Congress, the people's representative, has a strong institutional interest in restoring that accountability. The House has recognized this, and has done its job. We need to do ours.

I agree with other Members who have spoken that we need to give anti-terrorism priority, but not lose sight of the other important missions of the Department of Justice. The conference report takes such a balanced approach. Some have said that there is nothing new in this legislation to fight terrorism. I think they missed some important provisions in the legislation as well as my floor statements outlining what the conference report contains to help in the anti-terrorism effort.

Let me repeat those remarks and highlight what the conference report does on this important problem. The conference report fortifies our border security by authorizing over \$20 billion for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration. It also authorizes funding for Centers for Domestic Preparedness in Alabama, Texas, New Mexico, Louisiana, Nevada, Vermont and Pennsylvania,

and adds additional uses for grants from the Office of Domestic Preparedness to support State and local law enforcement agencies. These provisions have strong bipartisan support, including that of Senator SESSIONS.

Another measure in the bill would correct a glitch in a new law that helps prosecutors combat the international financing of terrorism. I worked closely with the White House to pass this provision in order to bring the United States into compliance with a treaty that bans terrorist financing, but without this technical, non-controversial change, the provision may not be usable. This law is vital in stopping the flow of money to those who seek to harm our citizens. Worse yet, at a time when the President is going before the U.N. emphasizing that our enemies are not complying with international law, by blocking this minor fix, we leave ourselves open to a charge that we also are not in compliance with an important anti-terrorism treaty.

I agree with other Members who have spoken that we should do more to help the FBI Director in transforming the FBI from a crime fighting to a terrorism prevention agency and to help the FBI overcome its information technology, management and other problems to be the best that it can be. The Judiciary Committee reported unanimously the Leahy-Grassley FBI Reform Act, S. 1974, over six months ago to reach those goals, but an anonymous hold has stopped that legislation from moving forward. This conference report contains parts of that bipartisan legislation, but not the whole bill, which continues to this day to be blocked from Senate consideration and passage.

Since the attacks of September 11 and the anthrax attacks last fall, we have relied on the FBI to detect and prevent acts of catastrophic terrorism that endanger the lives of the American people and the institutions of our country. Reform and improvement at the FBI was already important, but the terrorist attacks suffered by this country last year have imposed even greater urgency on improving the FBI. The Bureau is our front line of domestic defense against terrorists. It needs to be as great as it can.

Even before those attacks, the Judiciary Committee's oversight hearings revealed serious problems at the FBI that needed strong congressional action to fix. We heard about a double standard in evaluations and discipline. We heard about record and information management problems and communications breakdowns between field offices and Headquarters that led to the belated production of documents in the Oklahoma City bombing case. Despite the fact that we have poured money into the FBI over the last five years, we heard that the FBI's computer systems were in dire need of modernization.

We heard about how an FBI supervisor, Robert Hanssen, was able to sell

critical secrets to the Russians undetected for years without ever getting a polygraph. We heard that there were no fewer than 15 different areas of security at the FBI that needed fixing.

The FBI Reform Act tackles these problems with improved accountability, improved security both inside and outside the FBI, and required planning to ensure the FBI is prepared to deal with the multitude of challenges we are facing. We are all indebted to Senator GRASSLEY for his leadership in the area. Working with Republicans and Democrats on the Senate Judiciary Committee we unanimously reported the FBI Reform Act more than 6 months ago only to be stymied in our bipartisan efforts by an anonymous hold.

Now, due to Republican objections, the conference report does not contain some of the important provisions in the FBI Reform Act that Senator GRASSLEY and I, and the other members of the Judiciary Committee, agreed were needed.

Among the items that are, unfortunately, not in the conference report and are being blocked from passing in the stand-alone FBI Reform bill by an anonymous hold are the following:

Title III of the FBI Reform bill that would institute a career security officer program, which senior FBI officials have testified before our Committee would be very helpful;

Title IV of the FBI Reform bill outlining the requirements for a polygraph program along the lines of what the Webster Commission recommended;

Title VII of the FBI Reform bill that takes important steps to fix some of the double standard problems and support the FBI's Office of Professional Responsibility, which FBI Ethics and OPR agents say is very important; and

Title VIII to push along implementation of secure communications networks to help facilitate FISA processing between Main Justice and the FBI. These hard-working agents and prosecutors have to hand-carry top secret FISA documents between their offices because they still lack send secure e-mail systems.

This needs to be fixed and the FBI Reform bill would help.

These should not be controversial provisions and are designed to help the FBI. Yet, passage is being blocked of both a stand-alone FBI Reform bill and those provisions we were able to include in this conference report.

Some in this body have complained that we included provisions in this conference report that were not contained in either the Senate or House-passed bills. Now, each of the proposals we have included are directly related to improving the administration of justice in the United States.

We were asked to include many of them by Republican members of the House and Senate. I would like to point, in particular, to our reauthorization of the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, which President Bush has sought to eliminate. On March 4 of this year, Senator KYL and Senator FEINSTEIN sent me a letter asking me to include an authorization for

SCAAP—which was not authorized in either the House- or Senate-passed bill—in the conference report.

I agreed with Senator KYL and Senator FEINSTEIN that we should authorize SCAAP. I still believe that it is the right thing to do.

We took the arguments seriously that we needed more judges in certain parts of the country, particularly in border States. We added another new judge for Arizona on top of the two that were added in 1998 and the third that was added in 2000. We added a number of other judges as well, as I have already detailed.

Some have criticized the conference report's authorization of funding for DEA police training in South and Central Asia, and for the United States-Thailand drug prosecutor exchange program. I believe that both of these are worthy programs that deserve the Senate's support.

I have listened to President Bush and others in his Administration and in Congress argue that terrorist organizations in Asia, including al-Qaida, have repeatedly used drug proceeds to fund their operations. The conferees wanted to do whatever we could to break the link between drug trafficking and terror, and we would all greatly appreciate the Senate's assistance in that effort.

Beyond the relationship between drug trafficking and terrorism, the production of drugs in Asia has a tremendous impact on America.

For example, more than a quarter of the heroin that is plaguing the northeastern United States, including my State of Vermont, comes from Southeast Asia. Many of the governments in that region want to work with the United States to reduce the production of drugs, and these programs will help. It is beyond me why any Senator would oppose them.

Some have complained that the conference report demands too many reports from the Department of Justice, and that these reporting requirements would interfere with the Department's ongoing counterterrorism efforts. It is true that our legislation requires a number of reports, as part of our oversight obligations over the Department of Justice. I assure the Senate, however, that if the Department of Justice comes to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees and makes a convincing case that any reporting requirement in this legislation will hinder our national security, we will work out a reasonable accommodation. I think, however, that such a turn of events is exceedingly unlikely, as no one at the Department has mentioned any such concerns.

Some Members have complained that the conference report includes pieces of legislation that had not received committee consideration. The Law Enforcement Tribute Act has been mentioned as falling in this category. In reality, the Committee reported that bill favorably on May 16.

Complaints have been raised about the motor vehicle franchise dispute resolution provision in the conference report and that this legislation was not considered by the Judiciary Committee. That complaint is misplaced. The Judiciary Committee fully considered this proposal and reported Senator HATCH's Motor Vehicle Franchise Contract Arbitration Fairness Act last October 31. It has been stalled from the Senate floor by anonymous holds. The same complaint was incorrectly leveled at the section dealing with FBI danger pay. Yet, the Judiciary Committee did consider and approve this proposal as part of the original DOJ Authorization bill, S. 1319. The complaint that the Federal Judiciary Protection Act was not considered by the Committee is likewise misplaced. On the contrary, this legislation, S. 1099, was passed the Judiciary Committee and the Senate by unanimous consent last year and in the 106th Congress, as well. The provisions on the U.S. Parole Commission were included in the conference report without Committee consideration but was included because the Bush Administration included it in its budget request and it makes sense.

Some have complained about the provision establishing the FBI police to provide protection for the FBI buildings and personnel in this time of heightened concerns about terrorist attacks. When this legislation was considered by the Judiciary Committee as part of the FBI Reform Act, S. 1974, which was reported unanimously on a bipartisan basis, no member on the Committee raised any objection at the time. Similarly, the complaint about the lack of Committee consideration of the report on information technology to keep the Congress better informed about how the FBI is updating its obsolete computer systems, is misplaced. This legislation was considered by the Judiciary Committee as part of the FBI Reform Act, S. 1974, and no objection was raised.

This conference report is a comprehensive attempt to ensure the administration of justice in our nation. It is not everything I would like or that any individual Member of Congress might have authored. It is a conference report, a consensus document, a product of the give and take with the House that is our legislative process. It will strengthen our Justice Department and the FBI, increase our preparedness against terrorist attacks, prevent crime and drug abuse, improve our intellectual property and antitrust laws, strengthen and protect our judiciary, and offer our children a safe place to go after school. I hope that it will merit the support of every Member of the U.S. Senate. At the very least, it deserves an up-or-down vote. I was pleased to see some Republicans come to the floor yesterday to support this conference report, and I urge those who are blocking its consideration to relent and let the Senate vote up or down without further delay or tactics of obstruction. I hope that the critics will

reconsider their opposition and their filibuster of this conference report and permit the Senate to vote up or down on this bipartisan bill. For the sake of the Justice Department, the U.S. Congress, and the American people, we should pass this legislation today.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, with the passage of the Judiciary reauthorization bill, this body will pass a provision to extend our program to allow states to recommend J-1 visa waiver for physicians willing to practice in medically underserved areas.

It is one of the great privileges of my life to represent one of the most rural States in the Nation. For many around the world, Kansas represents rural life in America. The image is quaint; and, somehow insulated from the world by a field of wheat that arcs off into the horizon. However, as my colleagues from the heartland know, that image does not represent modern rural life.

In the Beloit co-op, Kansans gather as often to talk about global commodities futures as they do the weather. Our farmers are as likely to be reviewing GPS Satellite readings as they are next years model line of John Deeres. And, when they go to the doctor, rural Kansans are very likely in the waiting room of an Indian or Canadian citizen.

Just as Kansas relies on the world as a market, we rely on the world as a source for our health professionals. Since 1993, ninety-eight (98) waivers have been granted allowing foreign born physicians to remain in the country to practice medicine in the state of Kansas. Over fifty (50) physicians currently practicing in Kansas are in the state as a result of a J-1 visa waiver. Twenty (20) counties in the state of Kansas are considered fully served as a result of foreign born physicians who received J-1 visa waivers. Section 11018 of the Judiciary reauthorization bill before us represents a literal life-line for rural America.

The Senate passage of the bill also represents the hard work of several very dedicated legislators, including my fellow Kansan, Representative JERRY MORAN and our colleague from South Dakota Senator KENT CONRAD. It was their persistence and the hard work of several groups including: The American Hospital Association; the American Academy of Family Physicians; the Farm Bureau; the American College of Physician; the National Association of Community Health Centers; the National Rural Health Care Association; the American Immigration Lawyers Association and others, that kept this issue moving throughout this Congress.

Of course, there are many important provisions in this bill. However, for Kansans in the vast rural areas of the State, ensuring access to a doctor is one of the most significant. I thank the Chairman and Ranking member for fighting to ensure that this provision made it into the conference report.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I support the conference report to H.R. 2215,

the Department of Justice Reauthorization bill. I congratulate the chairman and the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee for their work in completing this bill and guiding it through a long and difficult conference.

I wanted to take a moment to set the record straight on the issue of the inclusion in the conference report to H.R. 2215 of the Motor Vehicle Contract Arbitration Fairness Act. The junior Senator from Arizona complained yesterday on the floor that this bill had been added to the conference report, depriving him of the opportunity to hear a debate and perhaps offer amendments to the bill. He implied that this was some kind of secret and nefarious deal to try to bypass floor discussion of legislation that has not had adequate consideration by this body. Nothing could be further from the truth.

S. 1140, on which the provisions in the conference report are based, was introduced by the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH, and now has 64 cosponsors. Almost exactly half of those cosponsors are Republicans and half are Democrats. A companion House measure has 225 cosponsors. The bill passed the House by voice vote in the last Congress. The inclusion of these provisions in the conference report was supported by all of the Senate conferees, including the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. The House conferees, led by the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, also supported including these provision in the conference report.

Now why was this necessary? Well, let me point out that this bill was reported by the Judiciary Committee almost a year ago. The majority leader asked for consent to proceed to the bill and have a limited debate with the opportunity for amendments no less than three times, on May 17, June 27, and September 25. Each time, a Senator on the Republican side objected and the Senate was prevented from having the separate debate and vote that the Senator from Arizona says he wanted. So if the Senator from Arizona has a beef here, it is not with the majority leader or the conferees, but with the member of his own party who exercised his right as a Senator to block the bill from consideration on the floor of the Senate.

That Senator was exercising his right to object to a unanimous consent request, but with time running out in this Congress, the rest of the Senate has rights too. And including this bill in the conference report, with bipartisan support in the conference and in the Senate, was a reasonable step to take so that the will of a supermajority of the body would not be thwarted.

These provisions are very important to address a real unfairness that is being perpetrated on the auto dealers of this country. Franchise agreements for auto and truck dealerships are typically not negotiable between the manufacturer and the dealer. The dealer ac-

cepts the terms offered by the manufacturer, or the dealer loses the dealership, plain and simple. Dealers, therefore, have been forced to rely on the States to pass laws designed to balance the manufacturers' far greater bargaining power and to safeguard the rights of dealers.

The first State automobile statute was enacted in my home State of Wisconsin in 1937 to protect citizens from injury caused when a manufacturer or distributor induced a Wisconsin citizen to invest considerable sums of money in dealership facilities, and then canceled the dealership without cause. Since then, all States except Alaska have enacted substantive law to balance the enormous bargaining power enjoyed by manufacturers over dealers and to safeguard small business dealers from unfair automobile and truck manufacturer practices.

A little known fact is that under the Federal Arbitration Act, FAA, arbitrators are not required to apply the particular Federal or State law that would be applied by a court. That enables the stronger party, in this case the auto or truck manufacturer, to use arbitration to circumvent laws specifically enacted to regulate the dealer/manufacturer relationship. Not only is the circumvention of these laws inequitable, it also eliminates the deterrent to prohibited acts that State law provides.

A majority of States have created their own alternative dispute resolution mechanisms and forums with access to auto industry expertise that provide inexpensive, efficient, and non-judicial resolution of disputes. For example, in Wisconsin, mandatory mediation is required before the start of an administrative hearing or court action. Arbitration is also an option if both parties agree. These State dispute resolution forums, with years of experience and precedent, are greatly responsible for the small number of manufacturer-dealer lawsuits. When mandatory binding arbitration is included in dealer agreements, these specific State laws and forums established to resolve auto dealer and manufacturer disputes are effectively rendered null and void with respect to dealer agreements.

A strong bipartisan majority of this body, and of the House, has come together to say "no" to these unfair contract provisions. So I commend the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee for their work to include this important legislation in the DOJ authorization bill conference report. As I said before, we could have had a debate and voted on amendments to this bill if consent had been granted. That was our preferred course as well. But one Senator did not want to have that debate, and so it was necessary, in the interests of justice, to proceed in this manner.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding the time for morning business has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each until 6:30 this evening.

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

The Senator from Louisiana.

HURRICANE ISADORE, WETLANDS, AND IRAQ RESOLUTION

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise to speak on three important matters. Let me begin with the most important matter to the people of Louisiana at this moment, which is the pending hurricane. Hurricane Lili is in the Gulf of Mexico, and she is headed Louisiana's way. Unfortunately, this will be the second major storm in less than a week we have had to protect ourselves against and prepare for the consequences of the aftermath.

Let me begin by thanking the President and FEMA, and particularly all of the FEMA officials who are now down in Louisiana helping us prepare again. FEMA Director Joe Albaugh was with us in Louisiana last week, as we dodged a bullet with Isadore—a storm that was huge in its mass but short in its intensity. As a result, while there was some sporadic flooding and some very damaging flooding to approximately 1,000 homes and businesses, including some that were ruined completely, it wasn't the widespread damage we have become familiar with in the Gulf South from hurricanes.

Hurricane Lili is packing winds of 140 miles per hour; barreling toward our coast and is likely to hit somewhere between New Orleans and Galveston. It could hit Lafayette or Lake Charles, somewhere on the coast of Louisiana.

The reason I rise to speak about this storm is not because there is a whole lot we can do in Washington, today. We will be down there this weekend. We will get to assess the damage. We can't do anything today. But there is a great deal we can do from Washington in the future to help the Gulf Coast the coasts of Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Alabama, Georgia and Florida.

From Washington, we can begin to focus on the kind of investments we should be making along the Gulf Coast that help protect us against the consequences of such storms—particularly as it comes to protecting the energy infrastructure in this Nation, which is so vital and crucial to the economic stability and well-being of the Nation.

We produce about 80 percent of all of the offshore oil and gas in the Nation off the coast of Louisiana. Right now, as I speak, the Gulf of Mexico has been evacuated. I have been on the phone with officers of chemical companies, and oil and gas companies, and they are shutting down refineries and platforms in the Gulf of Mexico. Why? Because you cannot keep them running when you have storms such as this, or you could gravely endanger the lives of those working out in the Gulf. I wish I could paint a more vivid picture, but over 20,000 miles of pipeline, many refineries, and thousands of platforms out in the gulf, all of which are critical to America's energy supply, will be directly threatened by Hurricane Lili. We take a lot of taxes out of the gulf region. There are a lot of taxes that the oil and gas industry pays, and that money leaves south Louisiana and Texas and goes right up to the Federal Treasury. Then it funds various projects all over the country.

You would think some of that money might come back to Louisiana to invest in Louisiana to elevate and improve our highways and provide better security to this infrastructure. After all, its through these highways and this infrastructure that energy is carried and produced to support not just Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas, but to turn the lights on in the entire country. Even when the winds are blowing down south, we keep the lights on up north. At the energy conference—my able partner, Senator BREUX, is going to be carrying this message as a member of the energy conference. Of course, Congressman TAUZIN from Louisiana is chairing the conference. We are going to carry this message directly into the energy conference to see if there is something we can get the Congress to do in a bipartisan way that says, yes, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas—the oil and gas-producing States—should share in some of these revenues so we can invest on the front end in terms of what the Gulf South needs to secure these energy resources. Congress must be fair to people in Louisiana, who are happy to serve as hosts to this offshore oil and gas industry. We are proud of the way we are doing it in a much more environmentally sensitive way. But we need help to ensure we receive a fair share of the royalties that come from our rich natural resources.

The country does not also realize the great loss of wetlands and the erosion Louisiana has experienced. Think about this. There is a hurricane coming off the Gulf of Mexico. The only thing between it and the cities or towns is the marsh. The bigger that marsh is, the greater the buffer is from the storm. It will break the wind, break the tides. As that marsh erodes away, there is nothing to break the wind or the tide, so the destruction becomes greater and greater, year after year after year.

The reason the marsh is subsiding is that we have tamed the Mississippi

River. We have levied it. We levied it not just for the people in Louisiana so we would not flood, but so the ships can take grain from Kansas and Iowa. This commerce then comes down the Mississippi and can go to any number of countries. Louisiana is an importing and exporting station for so many of the goods coming into and out of this country. This benefits everyone. We are telling you and begging this Senate and this Congress to recognize benefits Louisiana provides to the Nation. Louisiana is proud of that, but we need extra Federal help to secure this marshland, to help rebuild it, and protect us. If Louisiana does not receive help the wetlands will disappear, and the people of Louisiana will be sitting ducks for future floods and storms.

I am sure Senator BREUX and I will be back on the Senate floor on Monday and Tuesday trying to explain to everybody the horrible damage that has occurred because of Hurricane Lili and the importance of trying to be smart and invest some of these monies on the front end in Louisiana. This is not only fair and the right thing to do, but for the taxpayers, we would just as soon pay a little now or we are going to pay a lot in claims when these homes and businesses are destroyed in the Gulf South.

There is nothing we can do about keeping hurricanes from coming ashore. We cannot prevent them. People say: Senator, can't you do something? I say: If I could pass a resolution, I would. But, of course, there is nothing we can do about that. But we can be more prepared than we are.

While we are making progress, we have a long way to go. So whether it is at the energy conference, where I hope we will have a positive outcome, or in the new transportation bill where we can talk about the highways and evacuation routes in south Louisiana and the Gulf South need our attention. Not only do they serve as economic highways that are really necessary for commerce to flourish, but, as you know, when the hurricanes come, it is the only way for people to flee the storm. We don't have trains, as people do in the Northeast, to get out of harm's way. All we have in Louisiana are highways dangerously crowded with automobiles and pickup trucks. We need to make sure people can get north to higher ground. Hundreds of thousands of people in my state are jamming the highways to escape Lili and head for higher ground in north Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Texas. Hotel rooms are scarce, and people will have trouble finding safe-haven from Lili.

So we will be back talking about it. There are opportunities in the transportation bill, and when we debate the Corps of Engineers bill, to try to make right this situation. The Senate will then debate whether to help Louisiana in a direct way—not just Louisiana, but the whole gulf coast region.

The final point I want to share is a figure I came across a couple years ago