

crimes legislation. In the last Congress Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred July 6, 2001 in Grand Junction, CO. Eric Valdez, 19, was stabbed to death by Sjon Elmgreen, 19, after leaving a grocery store. The incident began when Elmgreen's fiancée called him to say that two Hispanic teens had just been flirting with her at the grocery store. She later told police that the teens had not been rude or threatening in the store. Nonetheless, Elmgreen and his roommate walked from their home to confront the teens. Elmgreen's fiancée told police that the confrontation turned into a fist fight, during which Elmgreen yelled racial epithets. After the fight, Elmgreen stabbed Valdez.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

#### DISCHARGE OF GAY LINGUISTS FROM THE MILITARY

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the military's recent discharge of several linguists who are critically needed in our Nation's fight against terrorism but who, in the military's eyes, are unfit for the job because of their sexual orientation. The military's treatment of these individuals is not only a grave injustice to these talented men and women who have bravely volunteered to defend our Nation, but it poses a serious threat to our Nation's preparedness.

After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, our Nation's security agencies and all branches of the military recognized that they must increase the recruitment and training of linguists who can speak and interpret languages such as Arabic, Farsi, Korean, Mandarin Chinese, and Russian. Understanding these languages is critical to ensuring our Nation's security. Those who are able to communicate in these languages can translate communications that may be made by terrorists or others intent on doing us harm. In fact, a large portion of the intelligence information retrieved by the U.S. security agencies currently cannot be translated, hindering the ability of the Federal Government to protect our country.

According to a study released by the U.S. General Accounting Office in January 2002, the Army is facing a serious shortfall of linguists in five of the six languages it categorizes as most critical—Arabic, Korean, Mandarin Chinese, Farsi, and Russian. The Army has

met only 50 percent of its need for linguists who speak Arabic, 63 percent of its need for Korean speakers, 62 percent of its need for Mandarin Chinese speakers, 32 percent of its need for Farsi speakers, and 63 percent of its need for Russian speakers. This leads to a 44 percent total shortfall in translators and interpreters for 5 of the 6 critical languages. Furthermore, the Army only has 75 percent of the cryptology linguists needed who speak Korean and Mandarin Chinese, and has a 13 percent shortfall of Army Human Intelligence Collectors in five of the languages found to be of critical importance. Spanish is the only language for which the Army has met its linguist needs.

Although the military faces a crisis in the linguistics field, linguists with a high level of proficiency in languages determined critical by the military and security agencies have continued to be discharged from the Armed Forces simply because they are gay, lesbian, or bisexual.

In 1993, the military instituted a plan known as "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue, Don't Harass," known more commonly as the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy. The basic premise of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy is that, while military leaders know that gays, lesbians, and bisexuals have always played an important part in America's military, homosexual members of the military are not allowed to be asked about or to tell anyone about their sexual orientation. Furthermore, the Department of Defense generally cannot conduct investigations regarding the sexual orientation of service members, and the Armed Forces has a policy that does not tolerate harassment of anyone based on perceived or actual homosexuality.

The "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy has been, by most accounts, a failure. Homosexual military personnel continue to be harassed within all the branches of the Armed Forces. In fact, according to the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, SDLN, an advocacy organization dedicated to aiding gay, lesbian, and bisexual service members who face discrimination in the armed services, in 2001 the armed services fired more than 1,250 gay, lesbian, and bisexual Americans B more than any other year since 1987. Furthermore, since the initiation of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, more than 7,800 American service members have lost their jobs because of anti-gay sentiment.

Not only does the "Don't Ask Don't Tell" policy needlessly discriminate against courageous Americans, it also wastes millions in taxpayer dollars. For example, according to SLDN, the government spent \$36 million to replace gays, lesbians, and bisexuals who were discharged from the military in 2001. Even more staggering is the fact that the government has spent over \$234 million to train replacements for homosexual service members since the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy was en-

acted in 1993. Thus, instead of using those millions of dollars on fighting terrorism, the military is spending it to replace linguists that they already have in their ranks.

Not only does the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy waste time, money and linguistic skill, it also initiates discrimination against those who simply want to serve their country. One of these Americans is Alastair Gamble. He had been in training in Arabic for only a few months at the Defense Language Institute when the terrorist attacks of September 11 occurred. After the attacks, he decided that his skills were needed more than ever. He continued his studies and soon was able to converse about military operations, economics, and politics in Arabic. He, however, would not be able to serve his country. Why? Because he was caught one night in his partner's room after hours. Though Gamble admits that he broke the military's policy, he states that many heterosexual couples also broke this same rule on that same night. The heterosexual couples, however, were only reprimanded. In stark contrast, Gamble's infraction led to a search of his room where military officials found evidence that led to the discovery of a relationship with another officer who was studying Korean at the time. Soon both Gamble and his partner were dismissed from the Army, and the American people were denied the service of two young men who were learning badly needed language skills.

Gamble and his partner are not alone. From October 2001 through December 2002, seven other linguists specializing in critical languages were also discharged after telling superiors that they were gay.

Gamble and the eight other linguists should not be treated this way. It is past time for the U.S. military to modernize its attitudes toward soldiers' sexual orientation. It is time for the U.S. military to recognize the contributions of gay, lesbian, and bisexual military officers and enlisted personnel by allowing them to serve in the Armed Forces without fear and prejudice. Currently, security organizations within the United States allow for open service—most notably, the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency. These openly gay men and women serve our country well. In fact, they sometimes serve along-side military men and women who cannot discuss their sexual orientation.

Not only do United States intelligence agencies allow for open service, but many other nations allow open service as well. Some of our closest allies—Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Australia, the Czech Republic, Sweden, Canada, Belgium, the Netherlands, Spain, Denmark, Norway, Luxembourg, Iceland and Italy—allow open service in their military. In fact, the United States and Turkey are the only two NATO countries that do not allow open military service for gay men.

Nations that allow for open military service have not reported any change in the way the military is run because of their policies. According to a study by Aaron Belkin, the Director of the Center for the Study of Sexual Minorities at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and Jason McNichol, senior officials, commanders, and military scholars within the Australian Defense Forces consistently praise the lifting of the gay ban, which occurred in 1992. The report states that there has been no overall pattern of disruption to the military, recruitment and retention have not suffered, and military performance was not affected because of the ban.

In January 2000, Britain too lifted its ban on gays in the military. According to PlanetOut News, a review of the policy by the British military, released in late 2000, found that there was no discernable impact on the military after it lifted the ban.

If some of our closest allies have been successful in allowing open service in the military, why not the United States?

Our military has been fighting terrorism and may soon go to war against Iraq. We desperately need the specialized language skills of our fellow Americans as resources. Our military should cease the discriminatory and counter-productive policy of discharging competent military personnel simply because of their sexual orientation. I hope that this administration will consider the consequences of the decision to discharge the linguists I have spoken about today and will give gay, lesbian, and bisexual Americans the chance to serve openly in the United States military.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to contribute to the public discourse and national debate we are witnessing with regard to a potential conflict—if diplomacy fails—with Saddam Hussein's brutal regime in Iraq. All of our offices have been inundated with calls, e-mails, and letters from concerned constituents about the consequences of war with Iraq. It is a timely debate of utmost gravity and importance. It is the essence of our democracy.

I, for one, have been supportive of our President's policies and intentions with regard to Iraq. I am firmly convinced that—should our efforts at the United Nations fail to convince Saddam Hussein to disarm—we must decisively end the menace that he represents to the world and to his own people. He has tyrannized his nation, the region and, indeed, the entire world for over two decades. I am proud that our President has shown the courage to bring this present and growing danger to the world's attention. It is not easy to muster the courage, in the face of widespread apprehension, to confront the truly evil elements of our global community. It is easier and more popular to procrastinate and defer decisions.

Our President is a man of principle however, who will not shrink from the dangers that threaten our Nation. He has carefully laid out a case against Saddam Hussein and has brought to the attention of the world the terrible threat this man and his regime represent to our national and global security. I am proud to stand with him and with my colleagues who have given the President the authority he needs to effectively confront Saddam Hussein, with military force, if necessary.

This morning's Washington Post contained a thoughtful editorial on this important subject: "Drumbeat on Iraq? A Response to Readers." It is an editorial that captures, in a balanced manner, the essence of the debate and is, in fact, responsive to the diverse readership of the Post.

I commend this editorial to my colleagues and my constituents. I further thank the Washington Post for this thoughtful contribution to the national debate on this subject. The prospect of conflict is never a pleasant option. The consequences of inaction in this case are unacceptable. Our President has enhanced the security and safety of our Nation by forcefully confronting those who would bring harm to our shores. We can no longer stand idly by. In the case of Saddam Hussein, I fully agree with the conclusion of this Washington Post editorial that, "... a long term peace will be better served by strength than by concessions." We must find the strength, as a nation—hopefully as an international community—to act if this last chance for diplomacy fails.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 27, 2003]

"DRUMBEAT" ON IRAQ? A RESPONSE TO READERS

"I have been a faithful reader of the Washington Post for almost 10 years," a recent e-mail to this page begins, "Recently, however, I have grown tired of your bias and endless drumbeating for war in Iraq." He's not the only one. The national and international debate over Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction, and our editorials in favor of disarming the dictator, have prompted a torrent of letters, many approving and many critical. They are for the most part thoughtful and serious; the antiwar letters in particular are often angry and anguished as well. "It is truly depressing to witness the depths Washington Post editors have reached in their jingoistic rush to war," another reader writes. It's a serious charge, and it deserves a serious response.

That answer, given the reference to "Washington Post editors," probably needs to begin with a restatement of the separation at The Post news and editorial opinion functions. Those of us who write editorials have no influence over editors and reporters who cover the news and who are committed to offering the wariest and most complete journalism possible about the standoff with Iraq. They in turn have no influence over us.

For our part, we might begin with that phrase "rush to war." In fact there is nothing sudden or precipitous about our view

that Saddam Hussein poses a grave danger. In 1990 and 1991 we supported many months of diplomacy and pressure to persuade the Iraqi dictator to withdraw his troops from Kuwait, the neighboring country he had invaded. When he failed to do so, we supported the use of force to restore Kuwait's independence. While many of the same Democrats who oppose force now opposed it then also, we believe war was the correct option—though it was certainly not, at the time, the only choice. When the war ended, we supported—in hindsight too unquestionably—a cease-fire agreement that left Saddam Hussein in power. But it was an agreement, imposed by the U.N. Security Council, that demanded that he give up his dangerous weapons.

In 1997 and 1998, we strongly backed President Clinton when he vowed that Iraq must finally honor its commitments to the United Nations to give up its nuclear, biological and chemical weapons—and we strongly criticized him when he retreated from those vows. Mr. Clinton understood the stakes. Iraq, he said, was a "rogue state with weapons of mass destruction, ready to use them or provide them to terrorists, drug traffickers or organized criminals who travel the world among us unnoticed."

When we cite Mr. Clinton's perceptive but ultimately empty comments, it is in part to chide him and other Democrats who take a different view now that a Republic is in charge. But it has a more serious purpose too. Mr. Clinton could not muster the will, or the domestic or international support, to force Saddam Hussein to live up to the promises he had made in 1991, though even then the danger was well understood. Republicans who now line up behind President Bush were in many cases particularly irresponsible; when Mr. Clinton did bomb Iraqi weapons sites in 1998, some GOP leaders accused him of seeking only to distract the nation from his impeachment worries. Through the end of Mr. Clinton's tenure and the first year of Mr. Bush's presidency, Saddam Hussein built up his power, beat back sanctions and found new space to rearm—all with the support of France and Russia and the acquiescence of the United States.

After Sept. 11, 2001, many people of both parties said—and we certainly hoped—that the country had moved beyond such failures of will and politicization of deadly foreign threats. An outlaw dictator, in open defiance of U.N. resolutions, unquestionably possessing and pursuing biological and chemical weapons, expressing support for the Sept. 11 attacks: Surely the nation would no longer dither in the face of such a menace. Now it seems again an open question. To us, risks that were clear before seem even clearer now.

But what of our "jingoism," our "drumbeating"? Probably no editorial page sin could be more grievous than whipping up war fever for some political or trivial purpose. And we do not take lightly the risks of war—to American and Iraqi soldiers and civilians first of all. We believe that the Bush administration has only begun to prepare the public for the sacrifices that the nation and many young Americans might bear during and after a war. And there is a long list of terrible things that could go wrong: anthrax dispersed, moderate regimes imperiled, Islamist recruiting spurred, oil wells set afire.

The right question though, is not "Is war risky?" but "Is inaction less so?" No one can provide more than a judgment in reply. But the world is already a dangerous place. Anthrax has been wielded in Florida, New York and Washington. Terrorists have struck repeatedly and with increasing strength over the past decade. Are the United States and

its allies ultimately safer if they back down again and leave Saddam Hussein secure? Or does safety lie in making clear that his kind of outlaw behavior will not be tolerated and in helping Iraq become a peaceable nation that offers no haven to terrorists? We would say the latter, while acknowledging the magnitude of the challenge, both during and especially after any war that may have to be fought. And we would say also that not only terrible things are possible: To free the Iraqi people from the sadistic repression of Saddam Hussein, while not the primary goal of a war, would surely be a blessing.

Nor is it useful merely to repeat that war "should only be a last resort," as the latest French-German-Russian resolution states, or that, as French President Jacques Chirac said Monday, Iraq must disarm "because it represents a danger for the region and maybe the world . . . but we believe this disarmament must happen peacefully." Like everyone else, we hope it does happen peacefully. But if it does not—if Saddam Hussein refuses as he has for a dozen years—should that refusal be accommodated?

War in fact has rarely been the last resort for the United States. In very recent times, the nation could have allowed Saddam Hussein to swallow Kuwait. It could have allowed Slobodan Milosevic to expel 1 million refugees from Kosovo. In each case, the nation and its allies fought wars of choice. Even the 2001 campaign against Afghanistan was not a "last resort," though it is now remembered as an inevitable war of self-defense. Many Americans argued that the Taliban had not attacked the United States and should not be attacked; that what was needed was police action against Osama bin Laden. We believed they were wrong and Mr. Bush was right, though he will be vindicated in history only if the United States and its allies stay focused on Afghanistan and its reconstruction.

So the real questions are whether every meaningful alternative has been exhausted, and if so whether war is wise as well as justified. The risks should not be minimized. Everyone agrees, for example, that the United States would be stronger before and during a war if joined by many allies, and even better positioned if backed by the United Nations. If waiting a month, or three months, would ensure such backing, the wait would be worthwhile.

But the history is not encouraging. The Security Council agreed unanimously in early November that Iraq was a danger; that inspectors could do no more than verify a voluntary disarmament; and that a failure to disarm would be considered a "material breach." Now all agree that Saddam Hussein has not cooperated, and yet some countries balk at the consequences—as they have, time and again, since 1991. We have seen no evidence that an additional three months would be helpful. Nor does it strike us as serious to argue that the war should be fought if Mr. Chirac and German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder agree, but not if they do not. If the war is that optional, it should not be fought, even if those leaders do agree; if it is essential to U.S. national security, their objections ultimately cannot be dispositive.

In 1998 Mr. Clinton explained to the nation why U.S. national security was, in fact, in danger. "What if he fails to comply and we fail to act, or we take some ambiguous third route, which gives him yet more opportunities to develop this program of weapons of mass destruction? . . . Well, he will conclude that the international community has lost its will. He will then conclude that he can go right on and do more to rebuild an arsenal of devastating destruction. And some day, some way, I guarantee you he'll use the arsenal."

Some argue now that, because Saddam Hussein has not in the intervening half-dec-

ade used his arsenal, Mr. Clinton was wrong and the world can rest assured that Iraq is adequately "contained." Given what we know about how containment erodes over time; about Saddam Hussein's single-mindedness compared with the inattention and divisions of other nations; and about the ease with which deadly weapons can move across borders, we do not trust such an assurance. Mr. Clinton understood, as Mr. Bush understands, that no president can bet his nation's safety on the hope that Iraq is "contained." We respect our readers who believe that war is the worst option. But we believe that, in this case, long-term peace will be better served by strength than by concessions.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, for thousands of mothers across the U.S., having a child is a momentous occasion filled with happiness and excitement. However, for a smaller percentage of women, childbirth brings about feelings of sadness, fear, and anxiety so overwhelming that they can no longer function normally. Postpartum depression, a mood disorder that is the culprit of these sentiments, severely affects the mental health of new mothers and places a strain on families. This is why I am proud to join my colleagues, Senator DURBIN and Senator FITZGERALD, in introducing the "Melanie Stokes Postpartum Depression Research and Care Act."

I firmly believe that postpartum depression is a national problem; it strikes women regardless of age, race, or economic status. Nearly 80 percent of new mothers experience baby blues, a very common, mild form of depression occurring in the first days or weeks after birth, but 10 to 20 percent suffer from the more severe postpartum depression. This is accompanied by irritability, despair, and anger, which can continue without treatment. The most acute form of depression, postpartum psychosis, can be accompanied by anxiety and fear, but also delusions and hallucinations. It strikes 1 in 1000 women. These two forms of postpartum depression contribute to a mother's sense of worth, inhibits a women's ability to complete her every day activities or enjoy the precious new moments with her child.

Despite these serious effects, there is alarmingly little research on postpartum depression. Additionally, while drops in hormone levels such as progesterone and estrogen have been linked to postpartum mood swings, there is no definite known cause for this disorder. This bill seeks to fill a glaring void in the understanding of this illness and provide treatment and care options for new moms. It establishes research programs to explore the causes, prevention, and prevalence of postpartum depression and psychosis. I also believe that women need real support in terms of comprehensive services at the community level. This legislation provides grants to help moms manage postpartum conditions at hospitals, community health centers, and shelters so they can access home based care, screening services, and other comprehensive treatments.

Motherhood should be a blessing, not a nightmare. Organizations and health

professionals all urge families and friends to inundate at risk or new moms with support as she takes on the complex task of raising a child. This bill is our way of supporting these moms. We hope to provide research results and necessary help to ensure a brighter future for new mothers caught in the fearful grip of postpartum depression. I will continue to support efforts to diminish the anguish of postpartum depression and improve efforts to safeguard the mental well-being for new mothers.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, last night I introduced the "State Criminal Alien Assistance Program Reauthorization Act of 2003," bipartisan legislation to authorize funds to relieve State and county governments of the some of the fiscal burdens associated with the incarceration of undocumented criminal aliens.

I am pleased that Senators MCCAIN, KYL, SCHUMER, BOXER, HUTCHISON, BINGAMAN and DOMENICI have joined me in introducing this important measure.

The broad principle on which this bill is based is simple: the control of illegal immigration is a Federal responsibility. When the Federal Government falls short in its efforts to control illegal immigration, it must bear the responsibility for the financial and human consequences of this failure.

More and more, however, the fiscal consequences of illegal immigration are being borne by the States and local counties.

The State Criminal Alien Assistant Program, SCAAP, Reauthorization Act of 2003 would properly vest the fiscal burden of incarcerating illegal immigrants, who are convicted of felonies or multiple misdemeanors, with the Federal Government.

The legislation would do so by authorizing up to \$750 million in Fiscal Year 2004 for Federal reimbursement to the States and county governments for the direct costs associated with incarcerating undocumented criminal aliens. It would authorize an additional \$850 million in Fiscal Year 2005, and \$950 million for the program in Fiscal Years 2006 through 2010.

The number of State and local governments seeking SCAAP funding has jumped 25 percent from the previous year. The combination of the increase, and the fact that all 50 States and the District of Columbia receive some funding from the program, suggests that no State is immune from the fiscal costs associated with crimes committed by illegal aliens.

Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to work with me to not only ensure that the SCAAP program survives, but also that it is adequately funded.

At a time when the administration is asking State and local governments to do even more with their local funds to enforce the nation's immigration laws, it is at the same time recommending the elimination of a vital source of funding that already falls far short of what states spend to incarcerate criminal illegal aliens.

High impact States, like California, continue to shoulder extraordinary costs for housing illegal aliens in its criminal justice system. The State prisons had an estimated 22,565 criminal aliens in its system out of a total population of 160,728.

In just a 3-month period last year, the State's county jails housed just under 10,000 criminal aliens. Overall, California taxpayers paid more than \$2.28 billion in 2001 to cover these costs.

In 2002, California received a SCAAP payment of \$220 million—less than 10 percent of the total costs to the State. This year, California taxpayers can expect to spend even more.

The SCAAP reauthorization bill would help California and all other States that are experiencing increasing costs from incarcerating undocumented felons—both low-impact and high-impact states.

Last year, the State of Wisconsin and its counties, for example, received more than \$3.5 million in funding; Massachusetts received over \$13 million; Pennsylvania received over \$2.6 million; Virginia received more than \$6.4 million; North Carolina received \$5.2 million; Michigan received \$2.9 million; Minnesota received \$1.8 million.

Thus, even states that have not traditionally had to confront the growth in illegal immigration are now bearing the costs of this Federal responsibility.

The administration's opposition to this program is puzzling.

I am particularly disappointed that an Administration headed by a former governor of a State highly impacted by the Federal Government's inability to control illegal immigration, would recommend the elimination of this important program.

Who pays when these costs go uncovered?

In California, the burden will fall on our law enforcement agencies—including sheriffs, officers on the beat, anti-gang violence units, district attorneys offices. At a time when the nation is focused on enhancing security within our borders, within our States and within our local communities, a vital program like SCAAP should not be vulnerable to being short-changed or eliminated.

I note that when the current president was governor of Texas, he was a strong supporter of Federal funding for SCAAP. He, too, recognized that controlling illegal immigration was a federal responsibility and that States cannot and should not be expected to handle the national burden on their own.

Certainly, the problems that were faced by Texas then with respect to the incarceration of criminal aliens have grown since then-Governor Bush wrote that letter. In 1997, the year in which the letter was written, the State of Texas incurred more than \$129 million in incarceration costs. In fiscal year 2002, those costs soared to more than \$1.17 billion.

It is inexplicable to me that this administration would now call for the

elimination for the program. I will include the letter then-Governor Bush wrote to Representative Hal Rogers, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies, for the RECORD.

After years of strongly supporting funding for the SCAAP program, President Bush's recent opposition to the program prompted Congress to cut the program by 56 percent this year, from \$565 million to \$250 million.

I urge my colleagues to reverse that course in Fiscal Year 2004 and consider restoring the cuts that were made when Congress considers the FY2003 supplemental appropriations request the administration is likely to submit in the next several weeks.

I thank my colleagues who joined me yesterday for their tireless efforts in ensuring that States and local counties receive some compensation for they do their part in securing their communities from criminal aliens who are in the country illegally.

I join them in introducing the SCAAP reauthorization legislation in hopes that it will go further to alleviate some of the fiscal hardships States and local governments incur when they must take on this Federal responsibility.

I ask unanimous consent to print the letter to which I referred in the RECORD.

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

STATE OF TEXAS  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
July 10, 1997.

Hon. HAL ROGERS,  
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, D.C. 20515.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROGERS: The cost of processing and housing criminal aliens in our state criminal justice system continues to grow. I am writing to ask you to support funding the \$650 million authorization to reimburse state and local governments for the costs of incarcerating undocumented criminal aliens. We are thankful for Congress' recognition of this problem in Texas and appreciate the funding we have already received.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service estimates that Texas incarcerates more than 8,000 undocumented aliens each year. At this current rate of incarceration, the annual cost to Texas exceeds \$129 million. During fiscal year 1996, Texas received \$51.9 million in reimbursement under the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP). Any additional funds dedicated to assist Texas in recapturing the costs of housing these criminal aliens would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter of importance to Texas. I will appreciate any action you can take on this matter.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. BUSH,  
Governor.

#### TRIBUTE TO VICTOR BAIRD

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Victor Baird,

who is retiring from his position as acting staff director and chief counsel to the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Ethics after more than 15 years of service.

For the last 2 years, I have had the privilege to serve on the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Ethics, an assignment that has provided me valuable insights into the workings and the ethical guidelines of this body. When I joined the committee, I was a relatively junior member, having served only 2 years in the Senate. I consider myself extremely fortunate that during this time, I have been able to draw on the wisdom and expertise of Victor Baird.

Following a distinguished legal career in Georgia, Victor came to Washington in 1987 to serve as counsel to the Ethics Committee. Over the ensuing 15 years, Victor has brought to the committee a sense of nonpartisan balance, careful legal judgment, historical perspective, and good humor—a collection of qualities that have served the committee well during some challenging times. His advice to committee members and his leadership of the committee staff have been invaluable during the last 15 years, and we owe him a debt of gratitude for his service.

I should note that, although the committee is losing a valuable asset in Victor Baird, we are fortunate in the choice of his successor—Rob Walker. Mr. Walker has served the past 4 years as chief counsel and staff director of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. But prior to that, he served as counsel to the Senate Ethics Committee, where he worked closely with Victor Baird. The Senate Ethics Committee is fortunate to have Rob back. I look forward to working with him, as I am sure that he will continue the tradition of fairness and excellence that his predecessor has established.

So as we say goodbye to Victor Baird, let's also thank him for his steady and dependable service in the committee for these last 15 years, and let's wish him well in his ventures in the years to come.

#### WAR ON TERROR AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, attention is understandably on Iraq this week as we move ever closer to a decision on use of military force there to disarm the regime of Saddam Hussein. But as we contemplate whether such action makes sense in terms of protecting our people from the threat of global terrorism, it is important that we not lose sight of important developments in other parts of the world.

Earlier this week, Secretary of State Powell visited Beijing, reportedly to seek the support of China's leaders in dealing with Iraq and North Korea. This makes sense, since China has the power to veto any U.N. resolution on Iraq and is reputed to have influence