diligence, too. Senators STEVENS and INOUYE navigated difficult waters and came up with a good bill, and for that I am appreciative.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am very pleased we were able to maintain continued strong funding for the Army Peer-Reviewed Breast Cancer Research Program, BCRP, and for a number of other medical research programs in this bill. The BCRP has made a real difference in supporting innovative, effective research to help the many women and men who get breast cancer in this country. Because of its success, other medical research programs have been added, and there is always interest in adding more. The chairman has expressed concern about the potential effect of these new requests on the Defense budget, and the committee report includes language requesting the Department to look at possible additional sources of funding. I look forward to working with the Department, the Institute of Medicine, and others to ensure that this review strengthens the medical research programs and does not undermine or bias them, and I look forward to working with the chairman to ensure continued strong funding for these important programs.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for morning business.

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on Friday, July 11, 2003, I was unavoidably absent from the Senate and missed three rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall vote Nos. 272, 273 and 274. I particularly want the record to indicate my support for the Legislative Branch and Military Construction appropriations measures.

PROTECTING THE NATION'S PASSENGER AVIATION SYSTEM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last week I joined Massport CEO Craig Coy, Logan Airport's Federal Security Director George Naccara, and Congressman Stephen F. Lynch to mark a significant milestone in our efforts to better protect the Nation's passenger aviation system. The occasion was the announcement that the Transportation Security Administration and Massport had reached an agreement concerning Federal reimbursements for Massport's installation of a comprehensive explosive detection baggage screening system.

That the announcement was made at Logan Airport was fitting because since 9/11 Massport has been a leader among airport operators in strengthening aviation security. In fact, Logan was the only major airport in the country to have met the deadline mandated by Congress in the Aviation and Transportation Security Act by having its permanent baggage screening system up and running by December 31, 2002.

In order to accomplish this feat, Massport had to invest nearly $146 million of its own money before it was clear that the Federal Government would reimburse any of these costs. Additionally, meeting this deadline required the around-the-clock efforts of over 700 laborers who completed 2 years of construction in less than 6 months. Finally, this effort required Massport to work in close collaboration with the Transportation Security Administration, an agency headed by dedicated and talented professionals, but also one that, having just been created, was still working to define its mission and scope in the 9/11 environment.

While there are still many security enhancements to be completed at Logan—as there are at every major airport in the country—solid and consistent progress is being made under Massport's new CEO, Craig Coy, and his management team. Just as they have done with regard to the new baggage screening system, Massport's leadership, security officials, and professional staff continue to work to define complex security challenges and to meet those challenges. And I believe they are setting a very strong example for those public agencies across the country charged with the complicated and costly responsibilities of protecting key pieces of our Nation's transportation, energy transmission, and public health infrastructure.

The manner in which Massport is approaching these new challenges is outlined succinctly in an April 1 Boston Business Journal editorial by John A. Quelch, a Harvard Business School professor and the current chairman of the board of the Massachusetts Port Authority. The performance model Quelch describes is, I think, instructive for other public agencies—and some corporate boards—that are struggling to adopt a governance structure that encourages performance and works to eliminate obstacles to achievement.

I ask unanimous consent to print the text of Chairman Quelch's article in the RECORD.

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

[From the Boston Business Journal, Apr. 1, 2003]

BETTER GOVERNANCE IN PUBLIC AGENCIES?

(By John A. Quelch)

Corporate executives say they're concerned that new and improved governance requirements will prove onerous and irrelevant, dissuade talented people from serving as nonexecutive directors, and eat up valuable board time that could be spent better on discussing the health of the business.

To ease their minds, these executives need look no further than well-run public agencies, where tough governance practices enhance professionalism and can be a source of competitive advantage.

Take, for instance, the Massachusetts Port Authority. With $350 million in annual revenues, Massport runs Logan Airport and the Port of Boston. Massport is governed by a politically balanced board of six members plus a chairman, appointed for staggered seven-year terms of the Massachusetts Governor. Following the tragedy of 9/11, an independent commission called for reduced political patronage in Massport appointments. A professional CEO with corporate experience was appointed following a nationwide search. A new, politically independent, chairman was also appointed.

Massport has since become a model of public agency governance. Consider these practices from which many corporations could learn a thing or two:

Frequent Oversight. The Board meets ten times a year, typically for four hours. Meeting agendas follow a systematic pattern, varying with the annual planning and budgeting cycle. Five committees, each chaired by a board member and with its own charter, meet at least twice a year and report back to the Board. These committees cover audit, human resources and compensation, security, community affairs, and facilities and real estate.

Zero Compensation. Board members are not compensated. Yet, despite the workload, attendance is consistent and commitment is high. Members are attracted by a shared interest in transportation and economic development challenges, and by the opportunity to apply their professional expertise in the public interest.

Voting Transparency. The state public meeting law requires all Massport board and board committee meetings open to the public. Discussions of security issues, litigation and real estate and collective bargaining negotiations can be held in executive session if agreed to by a public roll call vote of board members. Any member can request a roll call vote if (s)he wishes to put each board member on the record.

Patronage Control. A sunshine policy adopted by Massport requires that requests for patronage appointments be reported to legal counsel. All job openings have to be posted internally and externally and requests for charitable contributions are all channeled through an employee committee which disburses an annual budget and reports to the board.

Conflicts of Interest. Each board member maintains a Register of Interests, recording his or her outside employment, directorships in public companies and any governmental appointments. State law requires disclosure and/or recusal where conflicts arise.

Audit Independence. Massport's auditors provide no other consulting services to the agency and the audit partner must be rotated every five years. An internal audit function reports directly to and is evaluated by the board.

Shared Leadership. The roles of the chairman and chief executive are, by board resolution, separated, as is common practice in European companies but not the USA. The CEO is selected and evaluated by the board. All decision-making authority of the CEO is delegated from the board. Senior management appointments, as well as substantial financial commitments, require board approvals.

Improved governance is essential to enhancing Massport's newfound political independence and managerial professionalism. These efforts are enhancing the pride and commitment of the pro bono bond members, and commanding the respect of bond rating agencies and other stakeholders.

Though public agencies are not required to do so, Massport is now in compliance with almost all relevant New York Stock Exchange corporate governance recommendations. In addition, Massport's CEO and CFO