



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2003

No. 133

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. STEVENS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, Dr. Sheila C. Gustafson, of the First Presbyterian Church in Sante Fe, NM.

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit of God, You are in all our beginnings and all our endings, and You are with us at the beginning of this day's session of the Senate. We pray for the Senators here gathered, and for those who are about our Nation's business in other places and in other ways, that this day might offer new opportunities for creative service.

We pray for them fresh perspectives on perplexing problems, and new opportunities for cooperation. May they model for our people, and for the people of the world, a process of corporate discernment which allows inspired solutions to emerge to the challenges we face as a Nation and global community. And grant each one of them, we pray, the physical, mental, and spiritual stamina to persevere in support of truth and justice.

Author of liberty, we are grateful that we are privileged to live in a nation of abundance and freedom. We know that to whom much has been given, much is expected. Bless the Senators who work on our behalf to fulfill our country's great calling and responsibility. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this morning the Senator will conduct a period of morning business to allow Senators to speak. Following morning business, at approximately 10:30, the Senate will begin consideration of the conference report to accompany the Defense appropriations bill. Senators STEVENS and INOUE will be ready to give their remarks at that time. It is my hope that we can schedule the vote on that conference report prior to noon.

Yesterday, we completed two conference reports—the Homeland Security and the legislative appropriations reports. I thank Senators COCHRAN, CAMPBELL, and the ranking members for assisting in getting these ready for the floor for full Senate consideration.

Following the Defense appropriations conference report passage, we will consider the remaining available judicial nominations and another two or three still on the Executive Calendar that hopefully we will be able to clear. There is a standing request from the other side of the aisle that a rollcall vote be held on judicial nominations and, therefore, we will schedule those votes accordingly.

We will resume consideration of the District of Columbia appropriations bill today. Senator DEWINE has been actively engaged in working through a number of possible amendments to that bill. I hope we can make substantial progress today toward finishing that measure.

We have a number of the appropriations bills and conference reports to consider, and we will consider those as they become available. I thank Members for their cooperation in this regard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could, through the Chair, ask the distin-

guished leader a question, we have a number of Jewish Members who are concerned about tomorrow. They want to be home by sundown. We have at least one Senator who would like to be home in California in time for observance of the holiday. I am wondering if the leader has made a decision about tomorrow yet because of the holiday.

Mr. FRIST. We will discuss tomorrow's schedule over the course of the morning. We will let people know. Obviously, we will take that into strong consideration in terms of scheduling votes for tomorrow. I do expect us to be voting in the morning. But in terms of specifics, we will have announcements as we go through the day.

Very shortly we will be going into morning business, but I want to make several comments.

As most people know, my colleagues and others, we have made a concerted effort to respond to the President of the United States in terms of emergency requests to support our troops and our military efforts overseas—the men and women who are fighting for freedom and democracy. Thus, over the course of this week, we have held a number of hearings at the committee level with the hopes that we would be able to end at a reasonable but as short a time as possible so as to bring that request to the floor of the Senate in order to have plenty of time to both look at amendments and to debate, discuss, and examine the specifics of that request.

We are going into a recess at the end of next week. That is what is anticipated now. As I said last week, knowing that the supplemental would be delivered last week, we immediately began to set up a 2-week period by which the Senators would have sufficient and adequate time to address this particular request. This week, we had over 30 hours of hearings at the committee level.

The distinguished President pro tempore attended most of those hearings.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S11929

There have been seven separate hearings in the Senate alone in addition to the hearings that are being held in the House of Representatives.

We have had attendance at the policy lunches to be briefed on both sides of the aisle by Ambassador Bremer. The President has given two national addresses that relate to this supplemental request.

I mention this because I have said I would schedule adequate time for consideration. It requires a lot of participation over the course of this time. Probably over 70 Members are participating in those particular hearings that are being held this week.

I think it is important to have us come to the floor so we can have a full debate and debate amendments on the floor as well.

That will be the goal for next week. Again, because at the end of next week we will go on a recess for greater than a week, I believe it is important to respond to the emergency requests by the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief, in a timely way. That means this week and next week.

AMBASSADOR BREMER

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I wanted to comment on Ambassador Bremer briefly.

I asked Ambassador Paul Bremer to come back and to participate in the hearings this week. He has really gone nonstop.

I express my deep appreciation for his presence every day—both in formal meetings, informal meetings, and hearings. He is the U.S. administrator of Iraq and head of the coalition of provisional authority.

Early last summer, Ambassador Bremer, who had already retired from government service, was asked by the President of the United States, on very short notice, to move to Iraq and to lead the coalition effort to stabilize the country; indeed, he volunteered to do so.

We all listen to him, and in listening to his testimony, we all realize what a daunting task he has. Iraq has been ruled by a vicious dictator for decades, the economy has deteriorated, as we all know, to near pre-industrial levels, the population is scarred by the ravages of this dictatorship, the Saddam Hussein regime, and now we have the foreign terrorists who on a daily basis seem to be sneaking in the country, adding to the disorder and death.

Through all this, Ambassador Bremer continues to lead. He does that in spite of personally being under constant threat of attack and even constant threat of assassination in that part of the world. Like many of our fine service men and women, he has left loved ones behind and is living in what we all know are tough conditions in Iraq to serve the United States of America.

Ambassador Bremer may set a record this week for the number of committees before which he is testifying.

There are at least 6 congressional committees over 5 days, in addition to speaking informally to our policy luncheons. He is a public servant in the truest sense of the word, a great man serving our Nation.

As we debate the appropriate policies in Iraq, I want everyone to remember that he and others, military and civilian, are sacrificing for us in Iraq. I know we will have our differences. I encourage all of our colleagues to be respectful of each other as we move forward and as we recognize the great, unselfish leadership of Ambassador Bremer.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico wants to speak regarding the Chaplain. I will finish in a minute.

While the majority leader is on the floor, I say to the distinguished majority leader, the reason I stepped off the floor is I got a call from one of our Jewish Senators indicating they were speaking for a number of other Senators of that faith. They not only have to, as I indicated, be home in time for the sundown services but also have to prepare meals and things of that nature. They wanted me to let you know, if there is some way we could meet the burdensome schedule we have tonight, it would sure be good for them because they have a lot of things to do other than be home by sundown.

I also say, while the majority leader is here—I am speaking for me—I want to do everything I can—and I think I can fairly speak for the Democratic caucus—to move this very important supplemental. Senator BYRD and others are extremely concerned, for example, about having the hearing on Monday. The distinguished President pro tempore has heard from Senator BYRD himself. He would rather have that on Tuesday and rather have some other witnesses.

We want to do everything we can to be fair and responsible and move this along. However, remember, the House is not going to mark up their legislation until the week we are gone.

The leader is right, we should do everything we can to move this along, but I don't want anyone thinking that Democratic Senators who have some concern about the large amount of this number, especially the reconstruction, are in any way trying to hold this up. We want to cooperate in any way we can.

Now, speaking only for this Senator, I think it may be to the advantage of the Senate to take this over and do whatever debate we need next week but not complete it until we get back. I have complimented the distinguished majority leader on a number of occasions since the Senator has taken over the Senate. We have had very few needs to file cloture on your side. We have tried to be as cooperative as possible. For example, without entering into unanimous consent agreements we simply have told you we will finish a bill on a certain night and generally we

have been able to live up to that. We are not trying in any way to slow down or stall this most important legislation, but there is not a question of running out of money tomorrow, the next day, or the next day. I don't think it would hurt until we got back to have some final time to complete this.

That is coming from this Senator, not the caucus. I am sure the Democratic leader will be in touch early in the day. We had a number of meetings yesterday to talk about this most important subject.

For the third time today, we want it understood we on this side are going to do everything we can to support the troops. There are serious questions about the reconstruction money and how we should handle that. I don't think anyone disputes the fact they need reconstruction money. I think we need to take a close look at that.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I respect what the assistant Democratic leader has put forward. I am not making accusations of stalling or obstruction at all. I do feel it is important as we turn on our television sets every morning or read the paper and we see the importance of the security in Iraq that we address the issue which has been brought by our leaders on the ground there, the security issues and the request for the supplemental, as expeditiously as possible and not delay unnecessarily. That is why from a leadership position I want to focus this body on that security issue and spend whatever time it takes right now to address that issue.

I understand we are working in good faith as we go forward. My intention is to continue to address thoroughly, with plenty of debate, maybe an unprecedented number of hearings in a short period of time, by most significant people, and to allow adequate time for floor debate. If we can keep working together, it is my goal to dispose of this appropriately over the next 9 days before we go on recess. I am going to have a hard time leaving the Senate to go on recess and not addressing a Presidential request.

The House of Representatives is staying here. They are not going on recess. They are going to be addressing it in early October. That is why at least from a schedule standpoint I want to do it as soon as possible.

Mr. REID. If I could just say this, the other problem we have is we do not want to have to go through this twice. Under the procedures of the Senate, when we just have a Senate bill, we are limited very much because points of order will be raised on most everything we do relative to amendments. I ask the distinguished majority leader to understand we do not need to go through this twice because when the bill comes back over from the House, we do not need to go through the same amendment procedure again.

I am not sure we gain anything by trying to complete this by next week. We would be well served to see what

the House gives us and work through that. That way there can be amendments that can be offered without points of order being issued to those. Otherwise, we are stuck offering amendments, points of order, then coming back with the House bill and doing the same thing again.

I see the distinguished Democratic leader on the floor and I certainly will not speak anymore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I see the Senator from New Mexico is ready to speak, as well, and I will be brief.

We had a caucus last night, and I don't know that I can recall ever having witnessed the depth of anger and deep-seated frustration expressed by all of our membership as a result of the scheduling decisions made with regard to the supplemental next week. It started with the decision that may have been necessary but made last week with regard to calling Ambassador Bremer to a hearing on Monday, the very day the hearing was scheduled in the afternoon. No Senators were notified ahead of time. Senators had very little time to prepare. Very few Senators could attend because they were out of town. Many expressed the view that this was orchestrated in a way to minimize the amount of scrutiny and attention Mr. Bremer would receive.

Throughout the week, similar experiences have been noted. And now we have a markup on Monday, when, again, Senators have made travel plans and the real prospect for a good attendance is minimal at best.

The frustration, the anger, the venting that I witnessed, and that most people felt, was as palpable as any caucus I can recall holding in the 9 years I have been leader. I have not had the opportunity—I just tried to call the majority leader, and I will talk to him in private in, hopefully, a couple minutes, but I would ask that we reconsider holding that markup on Monday. I would ask that in the name of comity, but also in the name of just ensuring that there be an opportunity to do this right, it be postponed until Tuesday. I think we would actually accelerate the prospects of completing the work.

I will guarantee you, there will be very little prospect for comity and accommodation as we go through this already very vexing and controversial supplemental request by the administration—in order for the Senate to complete its work, it is going to take cooperation. But when our caucus feels as jammed as they do, as shut out as they are, it will be very difficult to reach some degree of procedural accommodation. So I will tell you that this matter needs more thought. I would hope we could have more consultation. But I will say, unless some-

thing changes, this is going to be exceedingly difficult.

So I only put the Senate on notice. And, again, as I said, I attempted to call the majority leader prior to the time I came to the Senate floor to impress upon him privately the same message I am sharing with our colleagues in this public way. We will have more to say about it later. But this matter has generated far greater anxiety and anger than virtually anything I have seen in a long time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I note the Senator from New Mexico wants to comment on the guest Chaplain and he has to be at a funeral.

We will talk privately. We have not had the opportunity to talk since their caucus, so we can handle our discussion privately and then come back to the floor.

Again, my goal is simply to address this request in a manner where both sides are heard. We have done our very best this week to schedule it in terms of the hearings, and we have talked further about that.

I do ask you to consider—because how much time we spend in hearings or in markups or on the floor does not matter to me as much as having people heard over a period of time—if the markup were delayed, will the Democratic side at least consider finishing this before we go out on our recess, given the fact that this is an emergency request from the President of the United States? We can, whenever it comes to the floor, start early, work late; if it is Monday morning, coming in, or Tuesday, or as soon as you would say, "Well, the markup is OK," so we could finish this before we go out on vacation or recess when we have this emergency request here. Can we finish it next week?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, again, I would respond to the distinguished majority leader in several ways.

First of all, the Ambassador, in speaking to our caucus on Tuesday, noted he does not need this money until January. Now obviously one could make the case that there really is not any rush to do this in September.

I would also say the House has not acted. Until the House acts—and they are not going to act until next week—many of my colleagues wonder what the rush is. If we are denied the right to offer amendments, there are those who could make a point of order that many of the amendments we will be offering involve legislating on appropriations because of the germaneness questions. And if that becomes an issue, then I doubt very much that there will be any way we can finish next week.

As I think I heard the distinguished assistant Democratic leader note, this bill will come back, and we will have to have a second debate when the House bill comes to the Senate if points of

order are raised on the amendments, denying us the opportunity to have this debate in the first place.

So I guess my answer to the distinguished majority leader would be threefold: No. 1, will we have an opportunity to offer the amendments without points of order being raised against them? No. 2, when will the markup actually occur? And if it does occur on Monday, I fear there could be some procedural delays involved in bringing the bill up. No. 3, we need to have a clear understanding of just when this legislation needs to be passed to accommodate the schedule Ambassador Bremer noted to our caucus. If we do not need to finish this until January, that is another matter. So some clarification with regard to the urgency of this issue also needs to be provided.

I certainly will work with the majority leader as we follow through with these questions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, let me turn to the Senator from New Mexico. I know he has a comment on the guest Chaplain, as well as other comments.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, could I make a unanimous consent request prior to the Senator from New Mexico beginning?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time used by the Senator from New Mexico not be counted against the morning business time of the Republicans, and that the full 30 minutes be granted to each side due to this late start.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first of all, might I say to my friends on the other side, I came with the intention of speaking about the guest Chaplain, who is from New Mexico. But I want to note we have an important event, a funeral for a 27-year-old son of one of our staffers from the Energy Committee at 10:15, so I will not be able to come back during that Republican time. So I would ask if I can—

Mr. REID. That was my request. You have it right now.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if I could just give my speech on the guest Chaplain and also my other comments now.

Mr. REID. That is what I asked in my unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator is recognized.

COMMENDING THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first, might I say, as I note your presence in the chair—and you are also the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, about which we are talking this morning—I compliment you. I have not seen

more difficult hearings than you have endured in getting started on this process. I think you have been eminently fair. I have great confidence that what you choose to do, and how you choose to handle this, will be fair to everybody. And I say that to you in all honesty.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am proud to introduce Rev. Sheila Gustafson from First Presbyterian Church of Santa Fe, NM. She has devoted her life to the ministry of God and within her work has touched many lives.

She began her service as the first female pastor ever to serve at First Presbyterian Church, and she is devoted to their mission and has served it faithfully for the past 8 years.

Reverend Gustafson demonstrates a great leadership style that endears her not only to the members of her congregation but to the community of Santa Fe. She has taken the lead within the New Mexico Coalition of Churches to create a faith-based organization that fights hate crimes and recently has dedicated her time to the revitalization and modernization of First Presbyterian Church. This project will allow the church to become a mission-oriented building that will provide direct assistance to the community. First Presbyterian Church will be able to provide meeting space for social and faith-based organizations.

I thank Reverend Gustafson for coming to offer our invocation this morning. That is not an easy chore clear from New Mexico, as I know when I take that trip every couple of weeks. It is an honor to have her here today.

PROGRESS IN IRAQ

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise to comment on where we are with reference to the war. I was very pleased to read in the New York Times yesterday that a poll had been taken in Iraq. In fact, the New York Times reports so little good news about the theater of the war, I figured it had to be a poll or it wouldn't state anything good.

The poll said two-thirds of the Iraqi people believed they were better off and that they would be better off in 5 years, having gotten rid of Saddam, rather than with him present. If you listen to all the news, you wonder whether the people of Iraq even care about our efforts to help or whether there are very many who are pleased to be part of this transition toward freedom.

In addition, that same article said something rather phenomenal about the distinguished Ambassador who runs the American effort. The poll said—and the New York Times used two words—“remarkably positive”—to characterize the 47 percent of the Iraqis who said he was doing a very good job. That was said almost with in-

credulity that it could be true, but it is, because we are doing a good job.

We have been there 4½ months—not years. For us to already have achieved what has been done is borderline miraculous: Schools opened; hospitals opened; a council formed; a head of government there ready to move step by step toward democratization, with great leadership of the 25-member governing body, 17 of them Ph.D.s in the subjects of the ministries they run. The agriculture ministry is run by an agronomist of real class, the water problems handled by a hydrologist of high quality. These are the kinds of people working with us to put that country together.

One of the reasons I think we should move ahead rapidly—and I don't know what rapidly means on this legislation. Does it mean Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday? I don't know—but we had better send a signal as soon as we can that we are there to get this job done.

I had the privilege of asking questions yesterday of the two distinguished generals, the chief of staff of the military, General Myers, and the general in charge of the entire operation, General Abizaid, who speaks Arabic brilliantly. My questions to them were: Will we win this war, this conflict? Will we prevail, and will it end up positive? Instantly, each answered: Yes.

Can we win?

Yes.

Will we win?

Yes.

Do our men want to win?

Yes.

Are our men happy, pleased? Do they know what they are doing?

Absolutely.

When I was finished with my time with the Secretary of Defense and the two outstanding generals, I was convinced that all we needed to be sure that democratization sets in and takes its footing there is the will to do it. We got into this with the full concurrence of the Congress. Those who continually speak of this as being President Bush's war are stating the facts wrong. It is our war. We voted for it by huge numbers, and we haven't brought a resolution to the floor negating that, to my knowledge.

For those who now think it is not ours, but that it is the President's alone, maybe they ought to bring a resolution here denying that we are involved and that it is just his, and see what the Senate would say. I believe no one will do it, and if they did it, it would overwhelmingly fail, because we want to win and we know it, but the critics are involved in a great game of politics.

Truly, it is time we get politics out of the scene and do what is needed. If there are Senators who know how to do it better, they ought to propose it. This is a very open body. If they have a better plan, suggest it. If they think we ought to spend the money differently, amend it. But we ought to do it. Every-

body involved in this on the ground in Iraq thinks we are on the right path—the men there, the women there, the generals there, the privates. The men whose boots are on the ground think we are doing right. The only people who don't are countries such as France. We will never convince France about this. There is no use trying. They have already forgotten about America and America's involvement in helping them, and they are on some new path of their own.

I remember as a Senator when people such as Helmut Kohl, the former Chancellor of Germany, would give a speech that would make you cry about how much Germany owed America. I heard one. I cried as he told of what brothers we were and why and what great people we were to win a war and demand nothing from them. Here we are engaged in a war against terror that will help all of Europe, and we have France and other countries, for some reasons of their own, out there acting as if America were some foreign power that they don't even know, that has some mission that is adverse to the world, when they know better. They know our mission, they know our attitude, and they know what kind of country we are.

Having said that, I hope, if we can't move this emergency supplemental request on Monday, that we move rapidly, whenever that is, to let the Senate speak. Do we want to abandon this process before it ever has a chance to succeed, or do we want to give it a real chance to prevail? I believe in the end the latter will prevail. It will take some time and some talking, but in the end we will conclude that 4½ months is not long enough to determine the destiny of that country where we had such a fantastic military victory that the world will recognize forever as one of the single most significant military achievements in history with minimal civilian damage and expeditious and maximum annihilation of the real opponent.

We cannot quit after 4 months. We cannot say we will support the men and women of the military but we won't support the effort to provide the minimal service that will bring the Iraqi people into a state where they will want to move forward, democratize, and become free.

To me, it is a simple proposition—and maybe it should not be—that is, do we want to give up or do we want to win? Do we want to abandon this effort after 4½ months and challenge every single move by somebody as distinguished as Ambassador Bremer and his team? I believe the answers are pretty simple. The American people, even with all the negatives thrown at them about what's happening in Iraq, still believe we did right going in, and they still believe we are right in being there now. All that is left is that we do what is right.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business not to exceed 60 minutes, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee, and the remaining 30 minutes under the control of the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, or her designee.

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ROTATION POLICY

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I will address the rotation policy in Iraq of our U.S. military forces, and specifically the National Guard and the Reserves. I will also address the planning of that rotation policy.

Over the weekend, I met with enumerable groups in Florida about their loved ones who are serving overseas. As members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, we addressed this issue with Deputy Secretary of Defense Wolfowitz and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Myers, in our committee meeting 2 weeks ago on the plan of rotation and the inequities that are coming out as a result of the lack of planning and how that is being implemented.

Now, I am going to give some specific examples. I might say that this large stack contains all e-mails—and you know how small the type is on e-mails—from family members in my State about the inequity of the situation. These are e-mails that I have received directly from soldiers, primarily members of the Florida National Guard and the Reserves.

As I tried to address what I perceive to be the inequity in this so-called plan as being implemented, as I tried to address it in committee, as I have in private meetings with the brass, and now as I try to discuss these inequities with the Senate, I, first, will say that had the executive branch of Government listened to the bipartisan voices in the Senate Armed Services Committee—and in particular the Senate Foreign Relations Committee where the chairman of that committee, Dick Lugar of Indiana, a Republican, and one of his ranking members, Senator CHUCK HAGEL of Nebraska, a Republican, and another of his high-ranking members, Senator LINCOLN CHAFEE of Rhode Island, a Republican, along with a chorus of voices on the committee, including mine—had they listened about the need for a plan after the military campaign in the postwar occupation of Iraq, then I don't think we would be going through the strains and stresses on this rotation policy. Combatant Com-

mander General Abizaid, who is supplied with Army troops through the Army Chief of Staff, of which they are having to stretch out these deployments of the National Guard and Reserves in Iraq, had they listened—had the executive branch of Government listened that there had to be a plan in place, as we had for Germany and Japan—we had a plan being worked on for 3 years prior to the end of World War II for Germany and Japan—had the plan been in place, we would see that we should not have an American face as occupiers in a Muslim country. Instead, it should be the world community participating in trying to stabilize Iraq politically and economically.

Had a plan been in place, the preparation would have been there to bring in the Iraqi civilians to run the Government so that there is an Iraqi face on the running of the Government. But that plan is not in place and we are seeing the results of the near chaos from time to time and, indeed, the sabotage that is occurring, the deaths that are occurring, and so forth.

But that is an issue for another day. It is a table setter for what I want to talk about—the inequity of the rotation policy and the plan that is specifically being conducted in the rotation of the troops in Iraq.

First, Florida's National Guard is one of the most professional in the Nation. It is well organized, it is well trained, and it is well led. They have proven their dedication to duty in this war, and they have committed to do whatever this Nation asks, and they have done it very well.

A couple of days ago, General Schoomaker, the Chief of Staff of the Army, told me that the soldiers of the Florida National Guard are as good as they come. They are also tired and fatigued.

I raised this rotation policy with the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs in that committee meeting a couple weeks ago. I have discussed this rotation policy with the Army Chief of Staff. I will discuss this policy with the Secretary of Defense tomorrow.

Florida National Guard soldiers were among the first Guard units alerted in December. They were brought into the armory the day after Christmas to start preparing all of their equipment, and they were mobilized right after New Year's Day. They were also among the first to enter the theater of operations, beginning in February and flowing quickly through March and early April.

Florida's National Guard soldiers participated throughout the major combat phase of this operation and throughout the breadth and depth of the theater—a theater that we know had no safe rear area, in the traditional sense.

Company C, Charlie Company, 2nd Battalion, 124th Infantry of the Florida Guard—let me tell you what they did before the war. The war started on

March 19. Charlie Company dug by hand through the berm that marks the Jordanian-Iraqi border, and then they attacked into Iraq in support of the 5th Special Forces Group. They were in Iraq before the war started on March 19. Since then, Charlie Company has been passed around the theater, from command to command, about 10 times, from the 5th Special Forces Group, to Special Operations Headquarters, to the 5th Corps Headquarters, to the 3rd Infantry Division, to the 2nd Armored Cavalry Regiment, and to the 1st Armored Division.

Charlie Company is still there and they have suffered two fatalities—one gunned down at the University of Baghdad the night I was coming into Baghdad in early July, another in a vehicle accident, and a third wounded in the neck. Other companies of the three battalions of the 124th Infantry, of the Florida Guard, have been passed among the headquarters all over the theater no less than 40 times since arriving in the area of operations.

This is not a complaint. This is a statement of fact. Florida is justifiably proud of its contribution to the war on terror. Florida has the third highest number of Guard and Reserve soldiers mobilized and deployed globally in the war on terror, with 6,190 Florida Guard soldiers. Two States are a little higher, California and Texas, and it is only by a few hundred soldiers in each of those States.

Florida has also deployed the second highest number of Guard soldiers to the Iraqi theater. Right now, in the Iraqi area of operations, there are 2,482. We are second highest to Alabama, and Alabama has 38 soldiers more. These two States, Alabama and Florida, by far have the most soldiers deployed to the Iraqi theater.

No State has provided more infantry from the Guard than Florida—1,392 infantry soldiers, followed by Indiana's infantry at 1,286. These two States by far are contributing more to the Iraqi theater from Guard units than are infantry troops.

Naturally, since they were deployed the day after Christmas, they are tired, and I believe they should be replaced by fresh troops as soon as possible.

There is a new policy, and the new policy of the Defense Department is a "12-month Boots on the Ground in Iraq" rotation policy, and it may not be equitably implemented because Florida's Guard entered the theater in company-size elements spread out over a period of 2½ months. So it doesn't sound like it is equitable for this new policy of boots-on-the-ground for the clock to start ticking only when the last unit arrives in theater, what they call over at the Pentagon "closed in command."

I understand that other National Guard units are already beginning the process of coming home, and I am happy for them, and I am happy they are coming back to their loved ones. But I cannot seem to get a clear answer from the Department of Defense

and the Army about who is coming home early and why.

National Guard units that have spent the entire major combat phase outside of Iraq appear to be on the way home. I will give an example.

I had several from the highest echelons of the Department of the Army tell me that another State's National Guard is rotating back—that State's Guard has, in fact, never been in Iraq. In fact, if that information is correct that the other State's Guard is returning in October, then they will have served there 11 months. I am happy for them, but I am questioning the equity of a case where because of a "closed in command" policy, the last unit arriving in the theater starting the clock ticking for 12 months "boots on the ground," that, in effect, is going to extend some of the Florida National Guard a year and a half since they were mobilized and when they went to that headquarters to start packing their gear on December 26.

Then I was told last night by another general in the Pentagon that, no, that particular State was not going home until next January or February. The Department of Defense cannot get the information correct. I have been told three different things about those units. I have been told four different things about the Florida units. So I have had to dig it out for myself by talking to our own Guard members through e-mail and talking with them directly by telephone.

The rotation policy for our Guard and Reserve forces should be simple: Return them to their civilian lives as soon as is militarily practical. This requires detailed and timely planning which does not appear to have been adequate or to have been based on realistic assumptions for operations after the major combat phase. Of course, the major combat phase was brilliant. General Franks will go down in military history as one of the great military leaders of the United States.

Now we are in the phase of the occupation, and our soldiers of the Florida National Guard are proud to soldier on in Iraq, Afghanistan, Kuwait, and Bosnia, as well as at home securing Air Force bases in Florida. But we are on the threshold of a serious problem for our Guard and Reserve servicemembers. Their sacrifices began the moment they were mobilized and left their civilian lives behind. They leave their families, they leave their employers, their livelihoods. Their families' well-being is at risk throughout the deployment regardless of their location or tactical conditions. Guard families in Florida and across the Nation have endured the separation, uncertainty, financial hardship, and fear that goes along with any deployment into harm's way, and that is what they signed up for. They are willing to accept it.

When I talked with these family members, as I did in Orlando last Thursday, in Tampa on Friday, and in

Miami on Monday, they were almost apologetic to me. They said: For me to say anything sounds like I don't want to be patriotic. I am most patriotic, they tell me, and we are so proud of our Guard who are serving. They are pointing out, if others are coming back in less than a year, why are our Florida Guard and Reserves going to be mobilized for up to a year and a half? That is an excellent question.

Let me give some of these family stories. In central Florida in Daytona Beach at the Halifax Medical Center, Kaitlyn Rose Long was born on February 25. Her father was not there. He did not expect to be there because he is a soldier deployed since January. At the time of her birth, he was 7,600 miles away in Qatar.

Kaitlyn's mother thought her husband was coming home soon, particularly because he had suffered a collapsed lung while working guard duty in Balad, an Iraqi city about 50 miles north of Baghdad. He was sent to a hospital in Germany where doctors initially told him he was going to have to go home. They changed their minds, and he is expected back in Balad next week. To family members that is heartbreaking, but they will accept that. What they will not accept is the inequity of treating some one way and others another way.

The husband of another 25-year-old mother of three from Brandon is a specialist in Charlie Company of the 2nd Battalion. As I said earlier, they have shifted to over a half a dozen units during their deployment. In mid-May, the company was told, because they were fatigued from the fog of war, that they were heading home. Instead, they were sent to Baghdad.

Another lady, Ada Dominguez, came from Miami all the way to the Orlando meeting to tell me of her concern about this inequity.

Florida's military families are tough, they are dedicated, and they are loyal Americans, proud of their service. They are willing to continue to make sacrifices to keep this Nation strong and free. They are an inspiration to me. They are an inspiration to all of us. They know this is very tough and complex, and it is still a very dangerous mission.

One soldier's mother from central Florida said to me: Just tell them when they are going to be coming home. Do not keep jerking them around, getting this information; it stops, then it starts, and then it stops. She said that is when the morale sinks to the lowest.

Members of the Guard and the Reserve are also volunteers. As we so often say, we recruit individuals but we re-enlist families. The rotation challenges the Army struggles with now are going to be the result of too few troops for the missions we ask them to do. We need to look seriously at adding more troops to the Active Force.

There have been a number of us who have been trying to urge the Secretary

of Defense to open that issue, and thus far it has not been addressed. We must, as a Nation, figure out how we are going to deal with this challenge, or we are going to risk losing the numbers we need in the finest Guard and Reserve system in world history.

If the demands on our military continue at their current pace and more than 12-month overseas deployments become routine—as some of the Florida troops are facing, up to a year and a half—then our National Guard and Reserve troops are not going to re-enlist when the time comes. Our military force of the Army, which is roughly a half million plus Active, 400,000 plus Reserves, and 300,000 plus Guard; we can see that the Guard and the Reserves are so integrally important to the military force structure. If we do not have what is perceived to be an equitable rotation policy, then when it comes time for them to re-up, many of them will not. That will be devastating from the standpoint of providing for the force structure this Nation is going to need as we face the multitude of places around the world where we will have to go and battle the terrorists. If those ranks are depleted, then we will not have them when we need them the most.

I commend the Guard and the Reserves. They have been one of the finest military fighting outfits that has ever been produced to supplement the regular Active-Duty Army. We can talk about the Air Guard as well, performing services all over this country, including air defense. It is those Guard units, under the command of the general from Tyndall Air Force Base, that if we ever have another airliner hijacked, he has the command responsibility of ordering the shoot-down of that airliner that is taken over by terrorists. The Air Guard is performing that.

The issue in front of us now is the equity of the Guard and the Reserves in the rotation policy. I hope General Schumacher, the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs will listen to these words and will enact a policy of rotation that will be perceived to be equitable for all the Guard units.

Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. What is the status of the morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a period of morning business.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Is the time equally divided?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Equally divided, 30 minutes controlled by the Democratic leader or his designee, and 30 minutes controlled by the Senator from Texas or her designee.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. The Senator from Florida would ask, does that mean the entire first 30 minutes is set aside for this side of the aisle?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. How many minutes remain?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 4½ minutes remaining controlled by the Democratic leader.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I will make a couple of other comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

THE FEDERAL DEFICIT

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, on a completely different subject, as a Nation, we are recklessly careening down the road toward bankruptcy. In the fiscal year that ends in a week, September 30, we are going to be hemorrhaging in our budget to the tune of \$500 billion. That is a half trillion dollars.

In the new fiscal year that starts October 1, it is estimated we are going to be hemorrhaging to the tune of \$600 billion, well over a half trillion dollars. Just to put it in perspective, in the decade of the 1980s, when we ran up so much of our national debt, the max in any one year in the late 1980s was a deficit of \$280 billion. That means we were spending \$280 billion more than we had coming in in revenue. Therefore, we had to go out and borrow it, and that added to the national debt.

The next fiscal year starts in a few days. We are going to spend more than we have coming in tax revenue to the tune of \$600 billion and we have to borrow it. Now, where do my colleagues think we borrow it from? We borrow it from folks like you and me, when we buy Treasury bills. We borrow it from institutional investors like pension funds. But it will shock people to know that a good bit of the debt that is being acquired, or debt that is being bought—or to put it in the vernacular of the street, the people who we are borrowing from are the Chinese and the Saudis. Does that not portend some uncomfortable things for America to have a good part of its national debt owned by folks who from time to time we have serious policy differences with?

How did we get into this? September 11 clearly was part of the problem. To protect this Nation, the war in Afghanistan and the war in Iraq have caused additional spending, but that is not the only reason for the \$600 billion deficit. It was because in the spring of 2001, by a one-vote margin, on a technical part of the budget bill, this Chamber of the Senate passed an instruction that by a majority vote we could pass a tax bill and that tax bill, once we passed it, diminished the revenues so much that the deficit started to swell. We are on a reckless fiscal course, headed toward bankruptcy. Is it any wonder that earlier we heard the majority leader and the Democratic leader going at it over this question of addressing the President's \$87 billion request? That is going to add all the more to the budget deficit. We are going to pass the \$67 billion that is going to the troops because our troops are going to be provided what they need. But for the remaining

\$20 billion that is for building 1,000 schools in Iraq, what do we tell our constituents at home about building schools here? For that \$20 billion that is to fix water systems and roads and bridges in Iraq, what are we to tell our constituents in America about the water systems and the roads and the bridges?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the Presiding Officer for giving me the remainder of the time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I wish to first associate myself with the comments of my friend and colleague, the Senator from Florida, with regard to concerns he raised about all the stress on the National Guard and Reserve. I have been to a number of deployments of troops of the National Guard and Reserve from Minnesota. Our folks are serving admirably and bravely, and there is great stress. I think it is clearly important to make sure we do the things to alleviate the strain, not just on the folks on the front line but on the families, and creating a bit of certainty would be good thing to do. It is not a partisan thing. It is the right thing to do for the folks who are serving so bravely and for their families. So I thank my distinguished colleague from Florida for raising this concern and wish to let him know there are many of us on both sides of the aisle who share that concern and would like a greater sense of certainty.

What does it mean to have boots on the ground? When are our folks coming home? We do have to give them every bit of support we can when they are there. But certainly for the families, the words of my colleague ring true and I associate myself with them.

I do disagree with my colleague from Florida when it comes to his discussion about the economy and the cause and the impact of debt. By the way, debt is a bad thing. I am not going to spend a lot of time talking about that right now, but I do certainly want to raise the issue. The national debt today is not as great as it was in the 1980s, not if you measure it as a percentage of the overall economy. That is the way we have to do it. If you bought a house in the 1980s and you spent \$30,000 and you put \$15,000 down, \$15,000 in cash, you would be in debt 50 percent. As time went on, inflation went on, and you made a little money and you bought a second house in the 1990s, or today, for \$100,000, and you borrowed only \$30,000, you would be twice as much indebted as you were in the 1980s, but the \$30,000 as a percent of the overall value of the house would be less, only 30 percent.

The reality is that the debt today is less than it was in the 1980s. That is not to say debt is ever a good thing, but I think you have to make the facts very clear.

It is also important to understand the cause of that. Let's never forget

that September 11 had a devastating impact on the economy of this country. Let's not forget that WorldCom and Enron and the corporate scandals that undermined the confidence of investors in corporate America—undermined it—had a devastating impact on the American economy. And let us not forget this economy was rolling into recession, was moving into recession at the time President Bush was elected. All these things had an impact.

The other concern and observation I have to make, as a Senator who has been here at this point only about 9 months, is my distinguished friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle, many of them, have consistently talked about the debt, they have great concerns about the debt, yet the reality has been that every time we have acted on budgets, one of the first things that I and, as a newly elected Member of this body, the Presiding Officer did was we had to resolve the budget for 2003 as soon as we got here. On issue after issue, my friends and colleagues from across the aisle, who loudly proclaim concern about the debt, sought to raise the spending. They sought to increase spending, I believe to the tune of perhaps \$1 trillion of new spending.

So it is hard to hear folks being concerned about the debt when, on issue after issue, they seek to raise spending. We have experienced that as we have gone through the process of approving the 2004 budget. On issue after issue, whatever amount is set in the budget to spend, my colleagues from across the aisle seek to increase that, again to the tune, calculated over 10-year periods, of trillions of dollars. Even for the Government, a trillion dollars is real money.

So, yes, the debt is of concern. The way you deal with the debt is you get the economy moving. That is what the President has done. That is what the tax cuts have stimulated. And then you have the will and resolve to keep a lid on spending.

Again, I urge my friends from across the aisle, every time you vote to increase spending, time and again, take a breath then before you talk about the debt.

I came here this morning to support the President's request for a supplemental appropriation of \$87 billion to support our troops in Iraq and to accelerate the redevelopment of that country to a stable, democratic, and peaceful member of the community of nations. As Senators, we have two responsibilities in this matter. As members of the legislative branch of Government, we must put the administration's proposals to the test to ensure they are prudent, practical, and can achieve the promised results. That is what we do as a legislative body. We also have a responsibility to support our Commander in Chief as he leads us as a nation.

I love the story told about Abraham Lincoln during the time he was leading our Nation in the Civil War. He was

getting, on a regular basis, communications from an elderly woman who said to him that God was talking to her and God was telling her which general to hire and which general to fire and where to attack and where to retreat. He got this series of letters. Finally, President Lincoln wrote back to this lady and said: Ma'am, I want to thank you for your correspondence and thank you for your advice, but isn't it fascinating how the Lord Almighty has given you all the answers but gave me the job.

We have a Commander in Chief. We have the right to question and modify the things he proposes. But it is our responsibility, I submit, to work expeditiously and to approve these urgently needed resources.

I express my strong hope that this bill will not be held hostage to political ambitions or become the vehicle of high-profile second-guessing. Our effort in Iraq has many challenges, but lack of politics is not one of them. This debate falls in a tempting place on the electoral calendar, but I do hope we rise above a talk show mentality.

There was talk this morning: Why do we have to move quickly on the President's request? What is so urgent about it? Does the money need to be spent right away? Kind of a slow walk and no sense of urgency.

I do hope those concerns are not raised so that we simply can extend the possibly to have in the political arena debate for the sake of taking political potshots. That is not what this is about. That is not what this body is about. We need to send a message to our troops in the field that we support them and will provide them the resources they need. We need to send a message to the Iraqi people that we are committed to working with Iraq to ensure that democracy is there. You can't have democracy when the lights are out 8 hours a day. We are seeing in Washington and Virginia how difficult it is to operate when the lights aren't on. Multiply that many times over.

I am concerned about the nature of the debate that comes with our involvement in Iraq. Debate is what this body expects and understands, but there is a tone about the debate that is of great concern because others watch. There is discussion now about whether this is the President's war.

Before you and I entered this body on October 11, 2002, there was a debate about what action we should take regarding Iraq, what authority we should give the President regarding Iraq.

There was a full debate. There was a great dialog. There was great discussion. This body voted. The sense of this body was 77 to 23 to support the President and to give the President the authority to do the things that had to be done to make sure Saddam Hussein complied with the United Nations resolutions. Let us not forget that for a period of 10 years he disregarded United Nations resolutions.

By a vote of 77 to 23—not 51 to 49, not a 50 to 50 tie asking the Vice President

to break that tie—a broad bipartisan coalition, an overwhelming majority of the Senate, said: This is our battle, this is America's battle, and the responsibility we have as elected representatives to speak for the people we represent and give voice to their hopes and concerns was reflected in that debate.

When others now talk about the "President's war," it causes great concern.

I like the words of the "Serenity Prayer." I hope we have the wisdom to address ourselves in the things we can change and not try to change the past.

I say to my colleagues that one of my pleasures as a Senator from the State of Minnesota is to represent the western shore of Lake Superior, the world's largest body of freshwater. If you visit this area during the right time of year, you will see the enormous iron ore boats that transport Minnesota iron ore to the steel plants of the eastern Great Lakes. These gigantic boats are so large that it takes them many hours and many miles to execute a turn into port.

The bigger something is, the longer it takes to turn it around. Such is our challenge in Iraq. We are attempting to turn a large society from a generation of tyranny and totalitarianism to democracy and free enterprise.

For over 25 years, the people of Iraq suffered under the brutality of Saddam Hussein. For over 25 years, the people of Iraq didn't even have a budget. Its infrastructure was eaten away as resources were simply given to Saddam for his friends and for his palaces, and the country suffered.

I find it ironic that some critics of our policy who said we could never defeat Saddam Hussein are now loudly complaining that it takes too long. In our instant-everything, drive-through, microwave society, we perhaps have lost sight of the fact that some things take time. The bigger the thing, the more time it takes.

To those who lament our supposed slow progress in Iraq, we are exceeding any realistic expectations of success. Rome was not built in a day and Iraq won't be, either. The lasting social structures in Iraq need to rest on firm foundations and progress. And those foundations are being made.

To those who say we need to turn Iraq over to the Iraqis, we want to turn it over to the Iraqis. We want the Iraqis to be in charge. We want the Iraqis to be guarding the hospitals and the oil wells. We want the Iraqis to be responsible for the future of Iraq. But in order to have that, you have to have a foundation. Iraq has to develop a constitution. It needs to be affirmed. When it is affirmed, it then needs to have free and fair elections. That is how to develop the foundation.

As we are developing that foundation, we are making progress in developing Iraqi security forces and police units which can begin to take the load off the American and coalition military units.

We are helping the Iraqi oil industry and its power generation come back to some semblance of functionality. The Central Iraqi Bank has taken bold steps to create a secure currency. Some of the most dramatic steps that any government has to set for itself is to be open to trade, to be open to entrepreneurship, and to be open to opportunity. These are bold moves in any part of the world but certainly in Iraq.

The Governing Council has just taken steps to open the country to foreign investment.

You heard earlier today my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Energy Committee, Senator DOMENICI, talking about the Ministers of Iraq and the number of Ph.D.s—one of the most educated governments anywhere in the world—and the caliber of folks we are bringing to the table.

The Poles have already assumed command of a multinational division in Iraq with NATO support. We have captured or killed over 40 of the 55 most-wanted Iraqis, including one more over the weekend, Saddam's Minister of Defense.

I mentioned the Governing Council being formed. I am told there is even a city council in Baghdad. I must say as a former mayor that when I heard there was a city council in Baghdad, my first thought was, Haven't the Iraqis suffered enough? But a city council is there and operating.

Thousands of Iraqi policemen and soldiers are being hired and trained to help provide security for their nation. Every hospital and clinic in Baghdad is operating, as are most of the others around the country. Every hospital and clinic in Baghdad is operating. The clinics and hospitals in Iraq have 7,500 tons of medicine distributed by the coalition since May, an increase of over 700 percent over the level at the end of the war.

For the first time in its history, all of Baghdad has garbage collection service. No longer is garbage collection a privilege reserved for neighbors favored by the Government.

Again, I reflect back to my days as a mayor and the importance of basic services being provided to all of the citizenry and not just for the rich neighborhoods. We are doing that in Iraq.

Iraqi workers are producing over 1 million barrels of oil per day, the proceeds of which will benefit the Iraqi people rather than Saddam Hussein's corrupt regime. Ninety-two thousand Iraqis receive social security and welfare benefits at levels four times higher than they received under Saddam. One point three million Iraqi civil servants are drawing salaries under a new salary scale. Many of them, such as teachers, are being paid four times what they were paid under Saddam.

The test of our efforts is that the Iraqi people are voting with their feet. They are staying put. There has been no humanitarian crisis. There has been

no flood of refugees as had been predicted. The \$87 billion in this bill will bolster all of these critical efforts.

We all need to put the daily events so effusively reported in Iraq in perspective. We see this, by the way, even in our own Nation. A lot of good is being done but somehow that doesn't always qualify as news.

I believe the President's leadership is beginning to pay dividends, even at the United Nations. It is a slow boat to turn as well, but I believe we will soon see progress towards broad international cooperation for the rebuilding of Iraq. Even the French say they will not now veto a resolution.

The President met with the head of Germany yesterday and had a good conversation.

Let there be no mistake. We are in a state of war against terrorism. Our decisions and the tone of our debate must recognize that fact. Forces that seek to destroy us are measuring our will and our resolve at each turn. Their view is that we are weak and easily distracted and divided. We must prove to them the truth—that we are not. We do that by what our military does on the ground every day. We do that by how we as leaders conduct this debate in this body.

Again, I recognize the importance of debate and challenging ideas and propositions. But there is a tone about debate and I worry that we are crossing the line. I worry that when we talk about this being the President's war, again disregarding the fact that this body, in a broad bipartisan way, raised its hand and understood the dangers of Saddam, understood the evil of Saddam and the evil impact he had on the Iraqi people, the impact that it was having on the region, the impact it was having on Israel, and the impact it was having on terrorism; understood that we had in Saddam and Iraq a nation which took care of and catered to the persons who masterminded the terrorist acts in the airports in Rome and Vienna; a nation that coddled, took care of and exalted the terrorists responsible for the execution of an American in a wheelchair, Leon Klinghoffer on the Achilles Lauro in Athens—everybody understood what we were dealing with.

We rose together in unison. Let us not now forget. Let us not now pull apart. Let us not now send the signal that we are weak and in disarray. It is important to have a sense of strength and purpose. Let us have the debate but let us make decisions.

In World War I, the French soldiers came up with the saying that "the difference between a hero and a coward is the hero is brave 2 minutes longer." We cannot afford to lose our nerve at the point of victory or all the sacrifice and the progress to date could be lost.

For those who question this amount of money being spent at times of economic difficulty and high deficits, I understand that concern. It is so easy to say, with anything we do, if we put dollars into something, why aren't we

taking care of the needs of kids? Why aren't we taking care of the needs of schools? Why aren't we taking care of seniors? The arguments can certainly be made, and they touch a sympathetic chord, a sympathetic note.

The reality is we have to understand again and again that you cannot have economic security, you cannot have peace of mind, you cannot have the opportunity for your kids to go to good schools, and folks to live in peace in their neighborhoods and go about their daily lives if we live in fear. The world changed after September 11. We have to reflect on the impact of September 11, not just psychologically but economically.

What happens when we allow terrorism to visit our shores? The folks in Washington, DC, saw this very graphically during the terrible period when the sniper was on the loose in Washington, and people would not go out of their homes. They were afraid to go to a gas station, afraid to shop, afraid to go to a restaurant. I have not seen the final bills, but I am sure the economic impact was enormous. When people live in fear, they cannot prosper economically or emotionally.

America has a responsibility at this point in history—for the sake of our kids, for the sake of our seniors, for the sake of our parents—to do those things necessary to live in peace, to confront and deal with terrorism. We learned on September 11 we cannot contain terrorism. We have to aggressively reach out to make sure we do all we can to make sure terrorism does not visit our shores.

It is not a matter of saying, if we did not put this money here we would put it there. The reality is, of the \$87 billion, \$67 billion goes directly to the military. It is also to rebuild the infrastructure of Iraq so that the military ethics can take hold. We cannot have such short memories.

Ambassador Bremer visited with many Senators this last week and gave a little historical lesson. He said: Look at what we did after World War I. We did not step in. We did not have the sense of heart and purpose to come together and say we were going to deal with the destruction left in the wake. We gave rise to Nazism, to fascism. What happened is, ultimately, millions of lives were lost.

I am of the Jewish faith. In our faith we say: We shall never forget; we shall never forget the Holocaust. The seeds of that were laid in the actions after World War I that were not taken to deal with the plight, deal with the economic plight, deal with the disarray, deal with the disintegration.

After World War II, we took a very different path. After World War II, we enacted a Marshall plan, and we came together, with the United States taking the lead; the international community then joining in building up and restoring the economy, doing things that restored hope, doing things that restored water and electricity. The result

is Europe has been safer. We have been safer until the rise of terrorism.

Let us not forget those models. Let us not forget that history. Success will build world confidence and investment far beyond this investment in Iraq. Failure would cost far more.

All of these practical arguments notwithstanding, I close with a simple argument for the passage of this supplemental appropriation: It is the right thing to do. Our troops need our support. The people of Iraq, present and future, need our help. The world that hopes for far more freedom and less terror needs what only the United States can provide. We can reach out and set an example to the international community to join with us.

This bill is the right thing to do. It is the right for the people of Iraq who are free from the torture chambers so they may never come back again. It is the right thing to do for the young women of Iraq who are raped and assaulted by Quday and Usay Hussein. It is the right thing to do for the memory of thousands murdered and buried in mass graves, and for their justice; for the millions of Iraqi people who will choose their own path, live their own lives, and decide their own faith when we set the foundation, set the table for restoration of democracy, firm and lasting in Iraq.

It is the right thing to do for the millions of neighbors of Iraq who will not fear the unbearable fanaticism of a dictator more concerned about power than the moral obligation of leadership. It is the right thing to do for our democratic ally in Israel who no longer will face the threat of Scud missiles from Iraq. It is the right thing to do for the courage of our American soldiers who have performed their duty and lived up to their oath to defend and protect the national interests of their Nation.

It is the right thing to do for the memory of American soldiers who have given their lives so that others may live in freedom. It is the right thing to do for the millions of Americans and the 3,000 who died on September 11 that American determination, resolve, and will are not things of the past but are ironclad promises for the future.

It is the right thing to do for the message it sends to those who support terrorism, that they will have no refuge; for the message it sends to those who kill, who terrorize, who destroy the hopes, dreams, and happiness of men and women and children that this is a new day, a better world. Their days are numbered. No more can we accept the crying faces, parents holding their dying children, parents burying their dead children. To those who seek to destroy, those who choose to unravel the fabric of society and civilization, this bill is the right thing to do because it makes it clear their time will come; our resolve is strong. We will support our fighting men and women and give them what they need to do the job.

We will work with the Iraqi people to rebuild and create a foundation where

democracy and hope will take place. Good will triumph over evil. Democracy will triumph over tyranny. Security will triumph over terrorism. Peace will come to Iraq. And all of us in America will be safer as a result.

SCHOOL VOUCHERS

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, in the time remaining, I raise one other issue, the issue of opportunity scholarships, of expanded choice for students, the issue of the debate we are having over the opportunity for the children of the District of Columbia to take advantage of a "voucher" program. We do not like to use that word. In my State, it is a pretty divisive word.

The Mayor of Washington, Anthony Williams, says this is the right thing to do. As a former mayor, I will stand with Mayor Williams. This is a very divisive issue in my city of St. Paul. When I ran, I said I would not push vouchers for the people of Minnesota. We had our debate. We have gone a different path, expanding charter schools. St. Paul, my city, had the first charter school in the Nation. As mayor, we started 20 more charter schools, providing tax incentives and tax credits so parents could get money back and use money they need to support their kids' education, to give their kids more choice. That makes sense.

But more needs to be done. I recognize that. This is a divisive issue. When the Mayor of the District of Columbia is saying we need to do this for our kids, why not do it? It is not taking any money from my kids in Minnesota. It is not taking any money from any kids in any of the other States. We have a local, elected official saying we need to do this; our kids are failing and we need to give them more hope and opportunity. Why not do it? What are we afraid of?

When I was mayor of St. Paul, the Governor offered, I believe, \$13 million to any community that would simply do a pilot project offering opportunity scholarships to the poorest of the poor and only the kids who were not succeeding.

So you were not going to take the cream of the crop. You were not going to cherry-pick. You were going to take those who were not making it. You have to do something. In fact, the offer was that out of this \$13 million, he would give \$10 million to the school district to do whatever they wanted. Only \$3 million would be for this pilot project. And not a single elected official, other than myself, would stand up and do it.

What are we afraid of? If all you keep doing is what you have been doing, all you are going to get is more of the same. Our children need more hope and opportunity. I hope we have the courage to give it a shot and a chance. The downside is minimal. The opportunity is great. Let's seize the opportunity. Let's do this for the kids. Let's do the right thing. Let's make change. Let's give hope.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2658, which the clerk will state by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2658) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, having met, have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, and the Senate agree to the same, signed by all of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

The Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of September 24, 2003.)

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am pleased to present to the Senate, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. INOUE, who is currently chairing the Indian Affairs Committee, the Defense appropriations conference report for fiscal year 2004.

This conference report was approved by the House of Representatives by a vote of 407 to 15. It has overwhelming bipartisan support. The agreement provides for a total of \$368.7 billion for the Department for fiscal year 2004. Throughout our conversations with the House over the past months, Senator INOUE and I have sought to strike a balanced agreement that we believe addresses key requirements for readiness, quality of life, and reconstitution of our defense force.

As we take up this conference report on the floor today, there are hundreds of thousands of men and women in uniform deployed and serving our country at home and abroad. They are performing superbly, and we are extremely proud of what they are accomplishing. This agreement is a dem-

onstration of our support, the Congress's support, for our men and women in uniform.

It provides a 4.1 percent average pay raise for all military personnel. It funds an increase in basic allowance for housing to reduce average out-of-pocket expenses from 7.5 percent to 3.5 percent for our military people. It provides an additional \$128 million for the continuation of increased rates for imminent-danger pay and family-separation allowances.

This agreement honors the commitment we have made to our Armed Forces—one we will maintain. It helps ensure they will continue to have good leadership, first-rate training, modernized equipment, and quality infrastructure. The agreement provides \$115.9 billion for operation and maintenance, \$74.7 billion for procurement, and \$65.2 billion for research and development.

Defense is a very expensive concept for our country. That is so not only because we have a volunteer service but because we are modernizing our force for the future. This agreement is the result of a bicameral, bipartisan approach. I urge the Senate to adopt this conference report.

Let me once again thank my co-chairman, Senator INOUE, for his support and invaluable counsel on this bill. I would also like to note the dedicated work of his chief of staff Charlie Houy, Betsy Schmid, and Nicole DiResta.

I thank my hard-working staff led by Sid Ashworth and including Tom Hawkins, Kraig Siracuse, Bob Henke, Lesley Kalan, Jennifer Chartrand, Menda Fife, Brian Wilson, Mazie Mattson, Nicole Royal, and Alycia Farrell. They have helped put together this conference report and worked with us through the year to bring us where we are today with the largest defense budget in history and the best bill we have ever presented to the Senate.

I yield to my good friend from Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, before I proceed, I wish to commend my chairman, Mr. STEVENS, for bringing this conference report to the Senate. In doing so, I commend him for his leadership. I realize Members of the Senate may not be aware of this, but because of the leadership skills and because of the hard work of the staff, the conference committee concluded its work on this important measure in 2 hours. In 2 hours, we concluded a bill that was filled with controversy and issues. At the end, the vote was unanimous.

The conferees recommend \$368.7 billion in mandatory and discretionary appropriations for the coming year. It is a huge sum, but it is a sum that is absolutely necessary.

This is nearly half a billion less than recommended by the Senate and \$3.6 billion less than requested by the President. We have tried our best to trim what some would call "fat."

The reduction to the President's request is not an indication that we believe Defense is overfunded. Instead, it is because we realize that there are so many other underfunded areas of the budget that we had to reduce defense to accommodate these needs. This was a tough conference. Our chairman did an exceptional job—I emphasize "exceptional"—representing the Senate position. This is especially true given the reduced allocation.

This agreement provides the funds necessary for the military. It fully funds the pay and allowances for our troops and thereby ensures that we have taken care of the crown jewel of our Defense capability—the men and women who put on the uniform.

In the interest of time, I will not present all of the details of this massive bill. However, I would like to address two important subjects that the managers of the House and Senate spent many hours discussing.

First, the conferees agreed to include an amended version of House language that would close down the Navy Station at Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico.

As we looked into this matter we found that the Navy no longer needed or wanted the base and it could save \$300 million annually by closing it. As such, we agreed to close the base. However, the conference agreement ensures that the base will be closed in accordance with existing base closure laws. We did not agree to a new procedure which would have given the Navy all the benefits of the closure and the local population none of the safeguards included in the BRAC legislation.

Second, the Senate bill include language terminating the controversial Terrorism Information Awareness program, TIA. The conferees have agreed to terminate the program and close the Office of Information Awareness in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, DARPA.

Language has been included that precludes any successor version of this program to be reinstated or developed by any Federal agency. However, I must inform my colleagues that in our review, we learned that there are some classified elements that are related to this program. These have all the safeguards of programs under the jurisdiction of the National Foreign Intelligence Program to protect civil liberties of U.S. citizens. These are very important to the ongoing war on terrorism overseas. The conferees have agreed to allow this effort to continue.

In addition, there were some worthwhile programs in the Office of Information Awareness unrelated to the TIA program. The Statement of the managers lists these programs and funds their continuation. This is a good compromise. It kills TIA and on-line betting, and other questionable DARPA programs, but ensures that beneficial parts of information awareness can continue. Finally, I want to express my strong support for this measure.

My colleagues should know this was a fully bipartisan accord. There are no parts of this bill that I oppose. While it is a compromise, it is a very good bill.

The chairman and his staff, led by Sid Ashworth, have done great work. I thank all the staff who worked so hard on this: Mazie Matson, Nicole Royal, Jennifer Chartrand, Kraig Siracuse, Tom Hawkins, Bob Henke, Lesley Kalan, Menda Fife and Brian Wilson of the majority, and Nicole Diresta, Betsy Schmid and Charlie Houy of the minority staff.

This is a good bill, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, today we are considering the conference report to accompany H.R. 2658, the Department of Defense appropriations bill by FY 2004.

I commend the distinguished chairman and the ranking member on their successfully reporting and confereencing this bill.

The pending bill provides \$368.7 billion in total budget authority and \$389.2 billion in total outlays for fiscal year 2004. The Senate bill is \$3.5 billion in BA and \$4.6 billion outlays below the President's budget request. These funds were shifted to other non-defense spending bills consistent with an agreement with the administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

H.R. 2658, DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 2004: SPENDING COMPARISONS: CONFERENCE REPORT
(Fiscal Year 2004, in \$ millions)

| | General purpose | Mandatory | Total |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|----------|
| Conference Report: | | | |
| Budget Authority | 368,183 | 528 | 368,711 |
| Outlays | 388,642 | 528 | 389,170 |
| Senate 302(b) allocation: | | | |
| Budget Authority | 368,572 | 528 | 369,100 |
| Outlays | 389,306 | 528 | 389,834 |
| 2003 level: | | | |
| Budget Authority | 426,621 | 393 | 427,014 |
| Outlays | 393,835 | 393 | 394,228 |
| President's request: | | | |
| Budget Authority | 371,699 | 528 | 372,227 |
| Outlays | 393,222 | 528 | 393,750 |
| House-passed bill: | | | |
| Budget Authority | 368,662 | 528 | 369,190 |
| Outlays | 388,836 | 528 | 389,364 |
| Senate-passed bill: | | | |
| Budget Authority | 368,637 | 528 | 369,165 |
| Outlays | 389,371 | 528 | 389,899 |
| CONFERENCE REPORT COMPARED TO— | | | |
| Senate 302(b) allocation: | | | |
| Budget Authority | (389) | | (389) |
| Outlays | (664) | | (664) |
| 2003 level: | | | |
| Budget Authority | (58,438) | 135 | (58,303) |
| Outlays | (5,193) | 135 | (5,058) |
| President's request: | | | |
| Budget Authority | (3,516) | | (3,516) |
| Outlays | (4,580) | | (4,580) |
| House-passed bill: | | | |
| Budget Authority | (479) | | (479) |

H.R. 2658, DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 2004: SPENDING COMPARISONS: CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued
(Fiscal Year 2004, in \$ millions)

| | General purpose | Mandatory | Total |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------|
| Outlays | (194) | | (194) |
| Senate-passed bill: | | | |
| Budget Authority | (454) | | (454) |
| Outlays | (729) | | (729) |

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.
Prepared by SBC Majority Staff, 9/24/2003.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, it is interesting to note that Senator NICKLES says this bill complies completely with the requirements of the Budget Committee.

I yield the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we only have notification of one person who wishes to speak. If that is the case, I believe we will have a vote on this conference report sometime around noon. It is my hope that we will have it before lunch if possible. So I put the Senate on notice that we will be voting around noon.

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

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I rise to address the conference report for fiscal year 2004, the Department of Defense appropriations bill. As has become a standard practice for appropriations matters, this legislation is loaded with porkbarrel spending catered to the parochial needs of the Members and special interests and not to the interests of the men and women in the military.

I feel it is important that I come to the floor of the Senate to draw attention to this legislation, especially at a time when American troops are stretched across the globe, including major commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan. I notice in this morning's paper it is very likely that more National Guardsmen and Reserve Forces will have to be called up. We should be devoting critical defense dollars to urgent defense priorities. Apparently, that philosophy is not shared by all.

In this year's version of the legislation, there is over \$6.5 billion in Member add-ons. I must say I congratulate the committee because last year it was \$8.1 billion. So we have experienced a \$1.6 billion reduction. I want to point out that these add-ons were not in the President's budget, not on the unfunded priority list, and not on the Pentagon's long-range defense budget.

Nowhere—nowhere—was there a priority for any of these items that I will be talking about and listing. One of the remarkable things about it is our disabled veterans are now trying to receive what we call concurrent receipt—

in other words, to be treated, when they are disabled, the same way that nonmilitary members of the Federal Government are treated. As it is now, they are prohibited against receiving both retirement and disability pay, as are other men and women who work for our Federal Government. Full concurrent receipt would cost the Government \$3.5 billion annually, which is approximately half the total pork that is in this bill.

So I am announcing to my colleagues today I was trying to work out some way of ameliorating the cost of this concurrent receipt. When we spend money like this—when we will spend \$5.9 billion more by leasing Boeing tankers rather than buying them, it seems to me that taking care of the men and women who have served with honor and distinction in the military deserve full concurrent receipt.

Once again, we are considering the Defense appropriations conference report prior to the consideration of the Defense authorization conference report. I remind my colleagues again of the role of the Appropriations Committee. The responsibility of the authorizers and the appropriators are expected to be distinct. The role of the Senate Armed Services Committee is to establish policy and funding levels and oversee the Department of Defense and its programs. The role of the Appropriations Committee is to allocate funding based on policies provided by authorization bills. The appropriators' function and role today, however, is expanded dramatically, and they now engage in significant policy decision-making and micromanagement, usurping the role of the authorizing committees.

I recognize the failure of authorizing committees to pass authorizing legislation contributes to this broken system and that often, as is probably the case now, appropriators have no choice but to fund unauthorized programs and take it upon themselves to make policy determinations. That is why, as chairman of the Commerce Committee, I have tried to reauthorize every program and bureaucracy that falls under the responsibilities of the Commerce Committee. I think I have done this with some success. But we still find, for example, in the Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill—which has not been considered yet on the floor—significant policy changes, laws written—it is rather remarkable. Entire departments of Government are dissolved without debate—by the way, with the strong objections of the executive branch.

So one of the reasons the authorization bills are held up is because Members know that authorization measures don't really have to pass, and we know that the appropriations vehicles are always available to carry legislative riders. I have testified before the Rules Committee on the need for change, and I think at some point in time we will be faced with a choice: We either do

away with the Appropriations Committee or with the authorizing committees.

The authorizing committees, to some degree, have become rather engaging and sometimes interesting debating groups when the real changes and policy decisions are made by the appropriators.

I also want to point out, last week I saw one of the most remarkable things I have ever seen in all the years I have been here. The energy and water appropriations bill was voted on and passed last Tuesday night. We voted. It was a recorded vote. Everybody went home. The next morning—and I mention this because the Senator from Nevada is on the floor—the next morning the Senator from Nevada stood and asked unanimous consent that \$65 million be added for water projects for the Corps of Engineers.

I understand there was some technical reason for it and there was some technical change that was made, but I have to tell you, Mr. President, I have never, in all the years I have been here, seen a bill passed and voted on and the next day, many hours after the bill was passed, a Member come to the floor and ask unanimous consent that millions of dollars be added to an appropriations bill. If that is the way we are going to do business around here, then, I say to my friends, there is no fiscal discipline.

On September 17, the Comptroller General of the United States David Walker delivered a speech at the National Press Club. According to the head of the General Accounting Office, "We must begin to come to grips with the daunting fiscal realities that threaten our Nation's, children's and grandchildren's future."

In his speech, Mr. Walker cited CBO estimates at that time—they have since gone up \$401 billion and \$480 billion for the unified budget deficits for the fiscal years 2003 and 2004 respectively. If we take out the Social Security surpluses, these numbers jump to \$562 billion and \$644 billion respectively. More importantly, the costs of the \$87 billion war supplemental are not even factored into these numbers.

In addition to this money, there are a number of financial liabilities the Federal Government has to pay out but are not counted against the budget, such as Medicare trust funds and health care benefit costs provided to the Department of Veterans Affairs. This leads Mr. Walker to state:

We are starting off in a financial hole we don't really have a very good picture of how deep it is.

His suggestion:

It is time to admit that we are in a fiscal hole and "stop digging."

I would like us to take seriously the advice of the top Government watchdog and quit digging. It seems to me if everybody in this country is watching reality television these days, I say to my good friends watching the Senate proceedings on C-SPAN, you are not watching reality television here. What

you are watching is unreal. You are watching Members who don't care about the budget deficit we are running. In the face of huge deficits, we can still find enough money to blow on some of the items I will describe today.

Mr. President, I am tired of fighting these bills. I don't enjoy arousing the animosity of my friends on both sides of the aisle. I don't pretend to judge these projects. Many of them are worthwhile. Many of them are worthy causes. The hundreds of millions of dollars that are spent out of the Defense appropriations bill for breast cancer research is a worthy cause. My question remains, What in the world is it doing in a Defense appropriations bill when we have men and women who are still on food stamps and living in quarters that were built in World War II?

I am dismayed by the lack of attention we focus on these bills. Aside from scouring the bills to see if their projects are included, not much time is devoted to considering the conference report.

This legislation passed the House of Representatives without a copy of the bill text or explanatory report being available to all who want to look at it. In fact, a member of my staff called the House committee while they were voting on final passage of this conference report to inquire if the committee had the report available. The House appropriations staffer said they had a copy but were only allowing one staff member at a time to look at it. Staff was not allowed to make copies or remove the bill from the appropriator's office.

It took the House of Representatives 7 minutes to pass a bill that appropriates \$368 billion for projects that appear on the Defense appropriations add-on list of items requested by Senators and were not included in the President's budget request. They did not appear on the Joint Chiefs unfunded priority list and were not authorized in the Defense authorization bill.

This criteria has been useful in identifying programs of questionable merit and determining the relative priority of projects that are requested by Members, often at the expense of the readiness of our Armed Forces.

The fact remains that in the years I have created these lists, no offsets have been provided for any project. The Joint Chiefs provided a list of critical requirements above what was provided for in the President's budget request. That list totaled nearly \$18 billion for the year 2004. We should provide additional funding for defense for items and programs which the Joint Chiefs need, not for programs that are important because of the State they come from or because of the seniority of the Member of Congress.

My point is, we cannot do business as usual. There is an ever-growing proportion of our Federal budget that is in these appropriations. While the cost of each program or project may not seem

like a good deal of money, collectively, earmarks, such as the ones in this legislation, significantly burden American taxpayers.

Let me point out some of the more egregious examples in this legislation:

\$135 million for advanced procurement of the LPD-17;

\$8.1 million for the 21st century truck. Mr. President, \$8.1 million for the 21st century truck, not requested by the Department of Defense, not on any list the Joint Chiefs of Staff might feel is important, but the 21st century truck finds its way into the Defense appropriations bill each year;

\$4.3 million for the Army's smart truck. One would think after all these years on the pork list if this truck was so smart, it would find a way to fund itself by now;

\$1.0 million for the Young Patriots Program. It is a wonderful name. It is a program by the National Flag Foundation to expand the Young Patriots Program to include a video which promotes the significance of national patriotic holidays. I love our patriotic holidays, but \$1 million to watch a video on national patriotic holidays?

One of my favorites that has come up—it is interesting, once they are in, they continue year after year—\$1.0 million for Shakespeare in American Military Communities. Shakespeare in American Military Communities has found its way in again. I guess it all is a matter of priorities.

\$1.8 million for the canola fuel cell initiative. I think canola is cooking oil. I am not sure. But \$1.8 million for the canola fuel cell initiative not requested by the President or the Department of Defense;

\$1 million for Lewis and Clark bicentennial activities. If this was in the Interior appropriations bill, I would support celebrating the Lewis and Clark bicentennial activities. I think it was a monumental series of events in American history, but we are taking it out of defense.

\$7.5 million for the Joint Advertising Market Research and Studies Programs. I can hardly wait to see the commercials that come from this money.

\$3 million for U.S.-made bayonets. Nobody else has made bayonets. Once again, Buy America provisions have found their way into the bill.

\$6.5 million for the procurement of lightweight armor for CH-46. The conferees mention use of Kevlar, a DuPont product, making this another Buy America provision.

I congratulate again the Senator from Alaska for a large number of appropriations that are earmarked for the State of Alaska ranging from \$8 million and up to \$26 million for railroad track alignment at Air Force-managed ranges to \$8.9 million for hybrid electric vehicle testing only at the cold region testing facility. \$9 million for the Fort Wainwright Utilidor. I apologize I keep displaying my ignorance on some of these items. I do not

know what a utilidor is. Kentucky, they did OK. Then there is \$1.2 million for the Fort Knox University of Mount- ed Warfare Campus Area Network Infrastructure. One of my favorites that was in the bill last year, a half million dollars for a hangar at Griffis Air Force Base in New York. The only problem with that is that Griffis Air Force Base has been closed for many years. It no longer belongs to the military or the Federal Government.

Of course, language preventing that has been in for several years, language which clearly falls under the purview of the authorizing committee, preventing the disestablishment of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve stationed in Mississippi. That is clearly a policy decision and has nothing to do with appropriations.

Then there is \$45.7 million for the Maui Space Surveillance System; \$23 million for the Hawaii Federal health care network, \$2.5 for the Alaska Federal health care network. If I were from Alaska, I would be a little upset at that disparity: \$23 million for the Hawaii Federal health care network, and only \$2.5 million for the Alaska Federal health care network.

Our old friend, the brown tree snake, is back, another \$1 million for the brown tree snake, the best funded snakes in the United States and certainly in the world; \$1.4 million for the minimally invasive surgery program for Ohio; \$4.5 million, Pacific Island health care network; \$3 million for complementary and alternative medicine.

Again, I want to point out there are a number of excellent programs. The legislation provides a pay raise to our soldiers, sailors, and airmen, as well as a targeted raise for midcareer officers and selected noncommissioned officers. The legislation also provides \$128 million for the continuation of increased rates for imminent danger pay and family separation allowances. Of course, my question is: Why is that not permanent?

I have a serious concern that extended deployments will lead to retention problems if we do not work to ensure that we take care of our soldiers and sailors. By providing our servicemembers with adequate benefits, we help ensure that our military will not face retention problems.

In this morning's Washington Post there is a quote from an unnamed National Guardsman who said that with these recent strains, the Guard in particular, and Reserves, are going to have significant difficulties. National Guard and Reserve servicemembers are performing many vital tasks. Direct involvement in military operations to liberate Iraq in the air, on the ground, and on the sea, guarding nuclear powerplants, our borders and airports in the United States; providing support to the war on terrorism through guarding, interrogating and extending medical services to al-Qaida detainees; rebuild-

ing schools in hurricane-stricken Honduras; fighting fires in our Western States; overseeing civil affairs in Bosnia; and augmenting aircraft carriers short on Active Duty sailors with critical-skilled enlisted ratings during at-sea exercises, as well as during periods of deployment.

I look forward to the day when I do not have to criticize the unrequested spending in appropriations bills. Yesterday, the House and Senate passed the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act. I was encouraged to see that there was not a great deal of unnecessary spending in that legislation. We still have a number of appropriations bills and conference reports left to consider in this session. I can only hope that the members of the Appropriations Committee will follow the lead of the Homeland Security appropriators in the future. I think we are entering a very serious fiscal crisis in the United States, including the fact that the Social Security situation is going to be compounded by the retirement of the baby boomers, the Medicare trust fund is going to be in a very serious situation, and we are rapidly approaching the kind of deficits that were only equaled in the early Reagan years and may even exceed them.

I know of no economist who does not believe that sooner or later the deficit will increase interest rates and cause inflation. There are a broad range of economists who have many different views on many different aspects of economics. I know of none who believe that over time burgeoning deficits are bad for America and the people who reside in our country.

Not too long ago, someone said the difference between California and Washington is that in California they cannot print their own money. I think there is a certain truth to that. What bothers me is that we are not making strong efforts to reduce unnecessary spending at this very difficult time.

I thank the Senator from Alaska, our distinguished chairman, as we enter a very difficult time, for trying to get approval of the request of the President of the United States. I commend him for his heroic effort on behalf of the much needed and very critical amounts of money, both in terms of defense and in reconstruction funding.

I just came from a hearing in the Armed Services Committee where Ambassador Bremer stated unequivocally, as did General Abizaid, that this money, both for the military and reconstruction, is not only vital but very time sensitive. Both Ambassador Bremer and General Abizaid said the war is on for the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people. We need to restore the infrastructure. We need to provide for their security. Otherwise, we will face, in the words of Ambassador Bremer, "the most severe crisis."

I thank the Senator from Alaska, our distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for the heroic effort he is making to get that urgent request from the President of the United

States to take care of our men and women in the military and pursue to success the very vital mission and challenges we face in Iraq.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I do thank the Senator from Arizona for his comments about the supplemental. This bill before us now is what we call the peace budget for defense. It does not contain any of the monies for Iraq or for Afghanistan. That money is in the separate supplemental emergency appropriations bill on which we are working. That was handled in that manner because of the request that we have a clear delineation of the monies to be spent for Iraq and Afghanistan.

I will comment on two things, but first I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending conference report occur at 12:10 today, and that Senators be so notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object. There has been a problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I was just notified by staff that we received a call and we could have the vote at 1:15.

Mr. STEVENS. I did not hear the Senator. If there is an objection to the time agreement, I will continue with my comments.

The Senator from Arizona did mention the money in this bill for the Alaska railroad. The Alaska railroad goes through two military reservations, and this money is to straighten out that railroad as it goes through those two military reservations. We have done this for a period of years now. We are straightening it out so it does not provide a hazard to the people who live on base. It moves the sound as far as we can from the military operations. It is much more safe as it is straightened out and does not have a circuitous route through those two military bases.

In addition, for the Senator's information, a utilidor is a facility that we put into the ground in Alaska to carry our utilities. In effect, it is an underground tunnel so that the utilities can all be maintained underground during the wintertime. It contains water, sewer, electric, all cables, and they are capable of maintenance through the winter.

As a matter of fact, I would welcome the District of Columbia to follow our path and put the utilities underground because every time there is a storm, all the electric lines, power lines, and cable lines come down because they are not buried. We do not just bury them under the ground. We bury a long, continuous container that is capable of being walked through so we can maintain all of the utilities on our military bases. They, at times, need modernization. The money in this bill is for modernization.

I know my friend wants to comment. I have been asked—we do expect a vote. We will try to get a vote on the pending bill. We are having a communications problem. I yield to my friend.

Mr. REID. I say to the distinguished chairman of the committee, we want to have a vote on this most important bill as early as possible. It appears now we are not going to be able to do that until a later time today because we have a number of people who are going to the White House at 2:20. President Bush always meets on time.

Mr. STEVENS. If the Senator will yield, I am informed if I make a request for a vote on this conference report at 1:15, that will be acceptable. Is that not correct?

Mr. REID. We would agree to that.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the conference report occur at 1:20, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, that would be fine if the Senator would modify his request—that we stay on this until 1:15?

Mr. STEVENS. That is my understanding. We will stay on this bill until 1:15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend from Arizona, for whom I have the greatest admiration and respect—he and I came to Washington together in 1982 as new Members of Congress. Of course, at that time I was aware of his gallant deeds for our country as a member of the U.S. Navy.

However, the Senator has tried to indicate that there was something wrong with how the energy and water appropriations bill was handled, especially the raising of the 302(b) allocations. That is done all the time. We worked very hard with the chairman of the Budget Committee, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the chairman of the subcommittee, this Senator, the chairman of the full committee, and the ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee to come up with some way to take care of the weather-related problems that had occurred, dealing with the Corps of Engineers.

What we did was, we had an amendment ready to offer, to have an emergency appropriation, in effect, for the \$125 million that was caused by weather-related activities. I have no doubt that that would have been agreed to. However, after meeting with the Senators about whom I spoke, they were able to find money in other appropriations bills that was not used. Rather than have the emergency designation, we simply raised the 302(b) allocation. The \$65 million was just that.

So anyone who would in any way infer that there was anything wrong with that simply is wrong. The chairman of the full committee is in the Chamber, and he would acknowledge that, as would the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator NICKLES, as would Senator CONRAD.

Mr. President, could we have order in the Chamber, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order.

Mr. REID. One reason I asked you to bring the Senate to order was there were two conversations going on. They were both interesting. It was hard for me to listen to both of those and also try to get my thoughts together. I don't know which of the two was the more interesting but they were both pretty good.

I say to my friend from Arizona, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona said the country was in a hole and we should stop digging. I respectfully agree with him. But the hole isn't anything the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee created. We are struggling to take care of the defense needs of this country. You know the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee handles the defense nuclear programs of this country, in addition to many other programs—university programs and other things that go on.

The situation is simply that the hole the Senator talks about was created by the fact that we are spending far more money than we are taking in. It is no secret, when President Bush took office, there was a surplus of about \$7 trillion over 10 years. That is gone. This year's deficit will be around \$700 billion, when you take out the Social Security Program and don't have that mask the deficit. So the hole is there, and I acknowledge that. The Senator is right. I am simply saying don't pick on the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee; we had nothing to do with the hole. The hole was dug by others, not by us.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

Mr. GRAHAM of Florida. Mr. President, today I commend the Senate for addressing and correcting an unfortunate hardship placed on Native American veterans.

For the past decade, VA's Native American Housing Loan Program has provided direct loans to eligible Native American veterans who wish to purchase, construct, or improve a home on

trust lands—lands held by the federal government for the benefit of Native Americans. A problem arose this year due to a provision included in the fiscal year 2003 Omnibus Appropriations bill, which set a spending cap for the program at \$5 million. That figure was deemed reasonable by the administration and appropriators because it was taken from previous years' spending amounts.

However, due to historically low interest rates over the past year, VA and borrowers have worked together to refinance many loans, loans that were counted toward the \$5 million cap. The combined costs of refinanced loans and new loans led VA to exceed the newly-implemented cap. Consequently, last June, VA was forced to cease providing further funds for the year. This left many Native American veterans in despair as their housing projects sat awaiting completion. With the cessation of the program, veterans have been unable to complete construction on homes that were already in progress, refinance existing loans, or pay contractors.

The Native American Housing Loan Program originally began as a 5-year pilot project in 1993. Congress, recognizing its value, has re-authorized it twice and extended it through 2005. A recent GAO report noted a primary motivating force behind the bill was the fact that the home ownership rate among Native Americans is one of the lowest in the United States, finding that "while over 67 percent of Americans own their homes, fewer than 33 percent of Native Americans own homes."

In the report accompanying a reauthorization of the program in 1998, the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs stated that direct loans to these Native American veterans are necessary since—even with traditional VA guarantees—commercial lenders will not make mortgage loans to finance the purchase or construction of housing on Native American lands. They decline to do so because Federal law would prohibit a lender, in the event of default, from taking possession of native trust lands. Recent estimates indicate there are approximately 190,000 Native American military veterans. Many expert demographers recognize that, historically, Native Americans have the highest record of service per capita when compared to other ethnic groups. Congress realized that they should be allowed to receive the benefits they have earned through their service—such as VA home loans—no matter where they choose to live in the United States.

The Native American Housing Loan Program alleviates some of the problems faced by Native American veterans in a couple of ways. First, the bill lowers barriers for these heroic veterans by encouraging them to participate in the privileges and benefits of home ownership in America. Secondly, the program provides economic incentives to develop thriving and

long-lasting Native American communities. According to VA's Annual Report to Congress for fiscal year 2002, VA closed 62 loans during 2002 for a total of 289 loans made under the program from its inception through September 30, 2002.

Mr. President, as ranking member on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I applaud the Congress for working to alleviate this problem in a timely manner. I am proud to support a provision in the Department of Defense appropriations bill that will eliminate the spending cap completely. The legislation ensures that stalled housing projects can be continued without stifling future home ownership opportunities for Native American veterans. I am glad that we have been able to work in a bipartisan manner and I know the Native American veteran community is thankful of our efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote "yea."

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 364 Leg.]

YEAS—95

| | | |
|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Akaka | DeWine | Lugar |
| Alexander | Dodd | McCain |
| Allard | Dole | McConnell |
| Allen | Domenici | Mikulski |
| Baucus | Dorgan | Miller |
| Bayh | Durbin | Murkowski |
| Bennett | Ensign | Murray |
| Biden | Enzi | Nelson (FL) |
| Bingaman | Feingold | Nelson (NE) |
| Bond | Feinstein | Nickles |
| Boxer | Fitzgerald | Pryor |
| Breaux | Frist | Reed |
| Brownback | Graham (SC) | Reid |
| Bunning | Grassley | Roberts |
| Burns | Hagel | Rockefeller |
| Byrd | Harkin | Santorum |
| Campbell | Hatch | Sarbanes |
| Cantwell | Hollings | Schumer |
| Carper | Hutchison | Sessions |
| Chafee | Inhofe | Shelby |
| Chambliss | Inouye | Smith |
| Clinton | Jeffords | Snowe |
| Cochran | Johnson | Specter |
| Coleman | Kennedy | Stabenow |
| Collins | Kohl | Stevens |
| Conrad | Kyl | Sununu |
| Cornyn | Landrieu | Talent |
| Corzine | Lautenberg | Thomas |
| Craig | Leahy | Voinovich |
| Crapo | Levin | Warner |
| Daschle | Lincoln | Wyden |
| Dayton | Lott | |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|-------------|-------|-----------|
| Edwards | Gregg | Lieberman |
| Graham (FL) | Kerry | |

The conference report was agreed to. Mr. REID. Mr. President, 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. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2765) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

Pending:

DeWine/Landrieu amendment No. 1783 in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, in just a moment my colleague and friend from California will be offering an amendment. Before she does that, I again thank her for her contribution to this bill.

When this bill was being marked up in the Appropriations Committee, she came to Senator STEVENS, the chairman, Senator GREGG, myself, and the other members of the committee and said she believed the bill could be improved—specifically, the section having to do with the scholarships for the children in the District of Columbia.

She made some suggestions. Quite frankly, as I told her on the phone later, I was just sorry I had not come up with those ideas because, frankly, she significantly improved the bill. So I wish to publicly again thank her for the suggestions she made. We incorporated those suggestions, those ideas, into the bill in the committee.

She said: We want to make sure this bill is constitutional. She had some ideas in regard to that. We incorporated them into the bill. She also said: "Let's make sure the mayor—who has been such a strong advocate for the scholarship program, the mayor of the District of Columbia—let's make sure he is intricately involved in this program, the designing of the program, the running of the program; let's make sure he is tied into this program, and that we can, in fact, do that." We made those changes as well.

Third, she said: "Let's make sure there is accountability so we can measure the results." We made some changes to accomplish that as well.

The amendment she will offer and describe in a moment builds on the changes that we have already made but

goes further and breaks new ground and perfects the bill even further. I am anxious to hear her description of the amendment. I have taken a look at it. It is an excellent amendment.

I yield the floor and anxiously await her amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 1787 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1783

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank the manager of the bill, my colleague from Ohio. I appreciate his sentiments.

Once in a while, by something we do, we can make a tangible and immediate difference in the lives of others. This is one such instance. In this case, what I hope to do is send an amendment to the desk, have Senator DEWINE's second degree, and then I would like to speak to the underpinnings of this scholarship program, which some people call a voucher program, and my rationale as to why I think this Mayor's request to try a pilot small voucher program in the District of Columbia should be granted.

I begin by sending the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] proposes an amendment numbered 1787 to amendment No. 1783.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the DC Student Opportunity Scholarship Program regarding student assessments)

On page 31, strike line 13 and all that follows through page 32, line 2, and insert the following:

(c) STUDENT ASSESSMENTS.—The Secretary may not approve an application from an eligible entity for a grant under this title unless the eligible entity's application—

(1) ensures that the eligible entity will—

(A) assess the academic achievement of all participating eligible students;

(B) use the same assessments every school year that are used for school year 2003–2004 by the District of Columbia Public Schools to assess the achievement of District of Columbia public school students under section 1111(b)(3)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(3)(A)), to assess participating eligible students in the same grades as such public school students;

(C) provide assessment results and other relevant information to the Secretary or to the entity conducting the evaluation under section 9 so that the Secretary or the entity, respectively, can conduct an evaluation that shall include, but not be limited to, a comparison of the academic achievement of participating eligible students in the assessments described in this subsection to the achievement of—

(i) students in the same grades in the District of Columbia public schools; and

(ii) the eligible students in the same grades in District of Columbia public schools who

sought to participate in the scholarship program but were not selected; and

(D) disclose any personally identifiable information only to the parents of the student to whom the information relates; and

(2) describes how the eligible entity will ensure that the parents of each student who applies for a scholarship under this title (regardless of whether the student receives the scholarship), and the parents of each student participating in the scholarship program under this title, agree that the student will participate in the assessments used by the District of Columbia Public Schools to assess the achievement of District of Columbia public school students under section 1111(b)(3)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(3)(A)), for the period for which the student applied for or received the scholarship, respectively.

(d) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—The Secretary and Mayor of the District of Columbia shall jointly select an independent entity to evaluate annually the performance of students who received scholarships under the 5-year pilot program under this title, and shall make the evaluations public. The first evaluation shall be completed and made available not later than 9 months after the entity is selected pursuant to the preceding sentence.

(e) TEACHER QUALITY.—Each teacher who instructs participating eligible students under the scholarship program shall possess a college degree.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I have been in public office for 30 years. I have always supported schools. I supported every charter amendment, and every bond issue to be helpful to schools. I have supported every vote to increase dollars to schools. I voted to support charter schools, magnet schools, alternative schools. I have campaigned for increasing Title I moneys that go to schools that teach poor children to try to correct the formula so the money goes where the child goes.

As a Mayor for 9 years, 3 of those years I bailed out the school district with \$3 million a year so that teacher salary increases could be paid during those years. I have traveled to many cities to see what innovative public education programs have been put into play. I have never before supported a voucher program. I do so now with a great commitment to see if this program can succeed. I do so now because those of us who believe strongly in public education—and that is 100 Members of the Senate—have perhaps been too concerned with the structure of education, the rhetoric of education, and not concerned enough about what actually works on the streets and in the neighborhoods and communities of America.

This was brought to my attention 3 years ago when the Mayor of Oakland, Jerry Brown, called me and said: My schools have deep troubles. There are so many failing youngsters. I want to try something new. I would like to try a military school, all voluntary, aimed to be geared for excellence, college preparatory. I want to have the poorest of the poor admitted to this school.

I thought about it for a while.

He said: I have been turned down by the local board of education. But that is not going to stop me.

He went to the State and got a special charter from the State. He came back here and convinced Jerry Lewis in the House, me in the Senate, to put some money in a bill to allow him to begin.

I spoke to Jerry Brown this morning. I said: Jerry, I want to give the Senate a brief progress report. How is it going in your military school?

He said: We have our startup problems, but we are doing pretty well. We have 350 youngsters. Some drop out. We have discipline. We have uniforms. We have the National Guard participating. These youngsters, 3 years later, are testing to the equivalent of the second best middle school in Oakland.

So it was a new model. It was refused by the educational establishment. But it is working for some youngsters.

When I went to public school in San Francisco, there were 350 students in the school. The class sizes were under 20. There were no other languages other than English spoken. That is certainly not the case for the most part in public education today. It has changed dramatically. Schools have student populations in the hundreds. Classes are way up in numbers. Language has run up to 40 different languages in a school. The economic and social disparity of this great diverse society makes teaching in the elementary school grades much more difficult.

I have come to believe that if I can make a difference to work for new models in education, I am going to do it. Education is primarily a local institution. Policy is set by local leaders. The Federal Government provides maybe 7 percent of educational dollars and most of those through Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I strongly believe that Mayors should have an input. This Mayor has asked for dollars not to be taken from public schools but new dollars: new dollars to be put in public schools, \$13 million; new dollars to be put in chartered schools, \$13 million; and new dollars to try a scholarship program to try something different.

What he has seen in the District of Columbia is too much failure. Despite the fact that each youngster receives \$10,852 a year—the third highest in the United States,—despite the fact that of the amount of money that comes into education, test scores are dismal.

Of fourth graders in the District of Columbia schools, only 10 percent read proficiently. Of eighth graders, only 12 percent read proficiently.

Think about what that means. If you are in the eighth grade and you can't read, what good is high school? You can't read to learn. Reading is a predicate to learning, just as discipline is a predicate to learning. So these youngsters become doomed.

This is not my assessment. This was a national assessment that was done in March of 2000. Of eighth graders, 77 percent are below the grade level in math. Twelve percent are proficient in reading.

I am supporting this because the Mayor wants it. I am supporting it because it is not a precedent. It is a pilot. It is 5 years. The voucher is adequate. It is \$7,500. There are 9,049 students in the District of Columbia in failing schools.

This would cover 2,000 of those youngsters; 2,000 of those youngsters would have an opportunity to have some choice in where they go to school. Would they go to a religious school or a secular school? That is up to the parent; it depends on the cost. Some families would be able to put in some additional funds, if the private school tuition is above \$7,500.

But I know for a fact there are plenty of schools where the tuition is below the \$7,500. As I said in the committee, I helped a youngster go to one of these parochial schools in the District. The tuition is \$3,800 a year. I have watched her blossom. I have watched the discipline work for her. I have watched the small classes work for her. I have watched the additional time the teacher spends with her work. I see her reading way above grade now. I see her proud of her uniform that she wears, so there is no competition for clothes. It is just one model.

The key thing that comes through to me, as somebody who listens to average people perhaps more than I do the policy wonks when it comes to education, is different models work for different children. We all know with our own children, what works for one child doesn't necessarily work for another. Therefore, what public education needs to do is stop worrying about structures and bureaucracies and bigness and worry about what is not working for these children. What do we do to provide a different environment? Do we divide up our campuses in a number of smaller schools? Do we build schools in office buildings—small schools, maybe with a hundred youngsters—so children can be closer to their families? What do we do? What new models do we look at?

All this Mayor is saying is these are failing schools. Why should the poor child not have the same access as the wealthy child does? That is all he is asking for. He is saying let's try it for 5 years, and then let's compare progress and let's see if this model can work for these District youngsters.

Interestingly enough, I am looking at the list of failing schools, and I see four are elementary, four are middle/junior high; and then it jumps to eight for senior high. What is the lesson in that one statistic? The lesson in that one statistic is if you have four elementary schools failing, you are going to add to that in high school; you are going to have more high schools failing and more difficulty in high school.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this chart be printed in the RECORD.

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

NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN FAILING SCHOOLS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ENROLLMENT FOR SELECTED SCHOOLS AS OF SY 02-03

| Schools | Enrollment |
|---|------------|
| Elementary | |
| Bruce-Monroe ES | 370 |
| Stanton | 622 |
| Wilkinson | 508 |
| Fletcher-Johnson EC | 528 |
| Middle/Junior High | |
| Evans MS | 259 |
| Sousa MS | 420 |
| Johnson JHS | 646 |
| R.H. Terrell JHS | 294 |
| Senior High | |
| Anacostia SHS | 693 |
| Ballou SHS | 964 |
| Coolidge SHS | 843 |
| Eastern SHS | 968 |
| Roosevelt SHS | 821 |
| M.M. Washington CSHS | 329 |
| Woodson SHS | 788 |
| Total kids low performing schools | 9049 |

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, the Mayor has asked for a 5-year pilot. He said it would be for the less affluent. They are defined by families of 4 at 185 percent of poverty. This is a family of 4 that earns \$34,000 a year, or below, and these children would be given priority by lottery to have an opportunity to go to another school. It is like a golden key. It gives them an opportunity to try something else. It is voluntary. Nobody is forced to do it. Why is everybody so threatened by it? No one is forced to do it. If a family wants to try it, this provides them with that opportunity.

Again, these are schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. That is the language from the bill. And priority is given to students and families who lack financial resources to take advantage of educational opportunities. That is the language in the bill. So for \$7,500 a child, 2,000 youngsters will have an opportunity to try this, to see if it makes a difference.

It might offer some smaller classes, or uniforms; it might offer more attention; it might offer an easier learning environment; it may offer better discipline. Certainly, there will be some curriculum changes. There will certainly be more emphasis on reading, writing, and arithmetic—the basics, if you will.

Now we have in the Appropriations Committee, thanks to the accommodation of Senator DEWINE and Senator JUDD GREGG, made several changes in the original bill. It was brought to my attention to take a look at the Zelman Supreme Court case. Senator VOINOVICH mentioned that to us. I believe he was Governor of Ohio when Cleveland put forward this program, and it went up to the Supreme Court in a case called *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris*. So we took that case and this bill and we tried to bring them together so that we added religion to the general non-discrimination clause, which also covers race, color, national origin, and sex, and extend the nondiscrimination clause to both schools and the entity operating the voucher program. We added language clarifying that the bill does not override title VII to ensure that we don't change title VII's provi-

sions permitting religious discrimination under certain circumstances.

We deleted certain other language which we thought might impact the establishment clause. We increased the role of the Mayor to make the Mayor responsible for the details and functioning and accountability of this program, and to ensure the proper use of public funds by the schools participating in this voucher program.

The amendment I have sent to the desk is an additional strengthening of the testing and evaluation components of the bill to try to ensure that scholarship students are taught by quality teachers. Essentially what this bill says is every voucher child must be taught by a teacher that at least has a college education. Additionally, we have changed the testing requirements. I have had a conversation with Cardinal McCarrick. Since about one-third of the private schools in the Districts are Catholic schools, I talked to the Cardinal about the advisability of having the same tests given to a student on a voucher in a parochial, or secular school, as would be given to a student in the public school. He agreed that would be a very significant thing to do.

I would like to read into the RECORD a portion of the letter from Cardinal McCarrick.

... I want to assure you that we are not only open to being accountable for any public funds which the families of our students receive, but anxious to be able to prove the value of our education. This would mean being willing to administer the same set of examinations that are given in the public school system.

I was happy to be able to tell you that in the District of Columbia 47% of our students are non-Catholic—

Forty-seven percent of the students in the DC Catholic schools are non-Catholic—

and in the heavily impacted inner city areas it goes up to 67% or higher. My great predecessor, Cardinal Hickey, used to say that we don't educate them because they are Catholic, but because we are Catholic and we accept this as a responsibility for being good neighbors and committed to serving the community.

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

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

ARCHDIOCESE OF WASHINGTON,
Washington, DC, September 8, 2003.

Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: It was good to be able to speak to you on the phone on Friday. I promised to send you this letter to clarify the situation of our Catholic schools in the District of Columbia. First of all, I want to assure you that we are not only open to being accountable for any public funds which the families of our students receive, but anxious to be able to prove the value of our education. This would mean being willing to administer the same set of examinations that are given in the public school system.

I was happy to be able to tell you that in the District of Columbia 47% of our students

are non-Catholic and in the heavily impacted inner city areas it goes up to 67% or higher. My great predecessor, Cardinal Hickey, used to say that we don't educate them because they are Catholic, but because we are Catholic and we accept this as a responsibility for being good neighbors and committed to serving the community.

I am so grateful to you for your concern for the parents of these children. So many of our parents work three jobs and more to be able to afford the education in our schools. The help that this legislation would make available would be such a blessing for them.

If there is any further information that you might find useful, please do not hesitate to have your staff contact me.

With every good wish and deepest gratitude, I am

Sincerely,

THEODORE CARDINAL MCCARRICK,
Archbishop of Washington.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. We have a provision in this bill that a scholarship recipient would essentially be tested against a control group with the same test given in the public school setting as in the private school setting.

The first component of my amendment requires that the managing entity that will run the voucher program give voucher students—not every student in private school—the same assessments they took in public schools. It also requires that the Secretary of Education, in conjunction with the Mayor, appoint an independent evaluator to study all aspects of the voucher program, with a strong focus on the academic progress of the students in the program.

The independent evaluator, which could be a think tank, could be an independent entity, will be required to evaluate the test scores of voucher students over the 5-year period, as well as the scores of a randomly selected group of comparable students who applied for vouchers but did not get them.

The test scores of the control group for which no voucher is available will be studied and measured against the scores of the voucher students.

The evaluator will be required to report back to the Congress every year on the progress, for the duration of the 5-year pilot. This amendment also requires that the test scores of both recipients and the student control group, as I said, would be studied, obviously, against one another.

I think we have a very practical, very doable trial proposal. I know on this side of the aisle there are a lot of objections to it, and I must say I am deeply puzzled by them because I do not understand what the fear is. Traditionally, the argument against vouchers always has been it takes money away from the public school. This does not. It adds money to the public school. Another argument always has been, how do we really know the students will do better? We have the testing and evaluation component in place.

Finally, the program is restricted to those most in need. These will be the poorest families in DC who will participate. They will all be families of four, earning under \$34,000 a year. So for 5

years, a child who is not making it, whose parent may be at wit's end, will have an opportunity to say, aha, I might be able to get one of those vouchers. Let's see if John, Sam, Gloria, or Betty can make it in another setting. In other words, let's try another model for our child.

Affluent people do this all the time. Affluent people have that opportunity. If their child does not do well in one setting, they can place their child in another setting. Why shouldn't the poor person have that same opportunity? This is the weight of our argument. This is the candor of our argument. I hope this is the caring point of our argument, because if this passes, 2,000 children will be able to take that pilot and 5 years from now we will know a lot more than we know today.

I have gotten a lot of flak because I am supporting it. And guess what. I do not care. I have finally reached the stage in my career, I do not care. I am going to do what I sincerely believe is right. I have spent the time. I have gone to the schools, I have seen what works, I have seen what does not work. Believe it or not, I have always been sort of a political figure for the streets as opposed to the policy wonks. I know different things work on the streets that often do not work on the bookshelves. So we will see. It is kind of interesting.

I have a member of my own staff who I do not think was very much in favor of me trying this, but at one point she came up to me and said: I must tell you something. I grew up in Anacostia. My parents could afford to send me to a Catholic school, and I went to that school. I saw so many of my peers get into such trouble and it conditioned the whole remainder of their life. Now today, she is a distinguished attorney with a solid career and a solid job.

My concern in education has always been K-6. It has always been teaching the basic fundamentals to kids so they could go on and learn, because if they do not have the basic fundamentals, it is so humiliating.

As mayor, I used to go out to Bayview Hunter's Point every Monday. I spent the afternoon with children. I talked to children. It took me 6 months to get them to look me in the eye, to be able to pronounce their names, to be able to talk directly to another human being. It took the time, the energy, and the effort. Through no fault of their own, in many cases our public institutions are so overburdened, with so many different issues, that it is difficult to provide everything for every child. Obviously, some children need more than they are getting.

I hope there will be others on my side of the aisle who will give this program a chance. I believe it will meet the test of constitutionality. I believe it is a bona fide pilot. I intend to stay with it and see what happens and see that the evaluation and the testing is adequate and carried out correctly and see what we learn for the future for our children.

Once again, I thank Senator DEWINE for his courtesy in working with me. He really has been terrific and I appreciate it very much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from California for a wonderful speech, but, more important than that, for her commitment to the children of the District of Columbia. Her position on this issue is so typical of her career and what I have seen her do during the time I have been in the Senate, during the time I have served with her. That is, she does not necessarily take the conventional position. She studies issues. She goes out and looks at the issue. She goes out and sees what the issues are and tries to understand them. As she says, she listens to the street. She listens to the people. She finds out what is going on, and that clearly is what she has done in this particular case.

Again, as I have said on this floor before, I applaud her. I applaud her for her contribution to this bill. This is a better bill than it would have been but for the Senator from California. I thank her for her contribution.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. May I say one more thing? Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DEWINE. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. First of all, again, I thank the Senator. It has been a great pleasure for me to work with him. I really appreciate it.

I have just been alerted that the Mayor is here. I understand the Mayor of the District of Columbia can come on the floor of the Senate. I believe very strongly, because mayors run their cities, they are responsible. Yet, in education, it is very often so frustrating because they do not have control. This is the Mayor who wants to leave a legacy of an improved education system for the District.

Those of us who read the Washington Post this morning, and the Mayor's comments addressed, I guess, to the editorial board of the Washington Post, understand the frustration. I have always been one who had a great appreciation for Dick Daley, of Chicago, who went to the State legislature and said: Give me control of appointment of the school board. And they did. He appointed some of his people to the school board and turned around the Chicago public schools. I think in a way that has set a real pattern for public education in America. I had the privilege of visiting those schools and spending a day in Chicago.

I ask consent that the Mayor be allowed to come on the floor of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Mayor of the District of Columbia is authorized to be on the floor of the Senate under the rules.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Just to continue on for a moment, I think what's going to happen in America is that more mayors of big cities will get more control over the schools, whether it is by appointing the school board or whether it is by having a separate entity involved in it. In the case of Chicago, I remember the Mayor appointed his chief of staff as head of the school board and his budget person, Paul G. Vallas, as superintendent of public instruction. So they had a working team to really turn the public school system around.

I would like to welcome the Mayor of the District of Columbia to the floor of the Senate.

Welcome, Mr. Mayor. Thank you very much.

I want everybody to know this is your request and your program. I don't know how many votes on our side of the aisle we will have for it, but I think it is a very important program to try. I think it is very important. I think because of the testing we have built into it, the same tests, the evaluation component, the fact is that your feet are going to be to the fire because this is your program and it is going to succeed or fail based on your energy, your staying power, your drive, your motivation. And I know it is there.

To the Presiding Officer, and to the manager of the bill, I have made my arguments. I am happy to answer any questions there may be, but I am hopeful this amendment will be agreed to and we will have an opportunity to try this pilot program.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Ohio giving me the opportunity to speak at a time while the Senator from California is still in the Chamber and the Mayor of the District of Columbia is still here.

I greatly respect the leadership shown by the Mayor of the District of Columbia and by the Senator from California, who are willing to take a fresh look at children who need help. This leadership is based upon their own experiences and common sense, and wisdom to try something different.

I listened very carefully to the Senator from California. I was thinking the Senate is a good place for someone with a lot of experiences on the street and in the Mayor's office, in political campaigns, and in legislative bodies. She is someone who has enough experience to come to her own conclusions.

This is a terribly important decision. It would not even be before us if the Mayor and other local officials in the District of Columbia had not asked for it because too many of the changes that have been suggested in education are often suggested in the tone of: This is good for you. But, it rarely ever happens unless somebody says: I want this for my child, or my school district.

I remember in Milwaukee 15 years ago, there was a strange confluence of circumstances that led Milwaukee to

try to give the poorest families in the city more choices of school for their children. It only happened because Polly Williams, who was the State representative and was the leader of Jesse Jackson's campaign in Wisconsin, and the Democratic mayor of Milwaukee, and the Republican Governor, Governor—now Secretary—Thompson, all happened to come to the same conclusion. They all thought outside the box. They all did things that were different.

But the person that really made the most difference, with great respect to the mayor and with great respect to the Governor at that time, was Polly Williams, who represented parents who said: I want this for my child.

What we are hearing today in the Senate, and what the Senator from California has so beautifully stated, and the Mayor has brought to our attention, is that we have several thousand families in the District of Columbia who are saying to us: We want this for our child. We see the results. We see the figures the Senator from California cited: In eighth grade only a few children are reading at the eighth grade level, so few children are able to do math, this lack of academic success is almost a guarantee of a lack of success in life.

I was glad I had the assignment of being the Presiding Officer at the time when the Senator from California made her speech. I wanted to add to that in a couple of ways.

I think she beautifully distinguished between this proposal and a broad voucher program. We have argued those up and down the street for years. But here is what the Senator from California reminded us is different about this proposal:

No. 1, the Mayor wants it. If we were in a State, if we were in the State of California, or Tennessee, or Ohio, the money we are talking about would really be the State's money; in effect, it would be money the State was spending the way the State wanted to spend it. We just happen to be in the District of Columbia where the money is collected a little differently. This is money that local people really ought to be able to decide how to spend, and they want to spend it this way. That is one big difference.

The Senator from California said this is a pilot program. One might argue that there is not such a thing in Federal Government; that every program lasts forever. But it doesn't have to last forever. This is a chance to try to give 2,000 poor children from failing schools one option to see if they can succeed in their educational life.

We don't have many pilot programs with this idea. We have one in Milwaukee where it worked well, I thought. I have been to those schools. We learned a lot. We have some programs in Ohio, which the Presiding Officer helped to implement.

In the Nation's Capital, it might be good to have a look and see whether this idea works or not. The Senator

from California suggested in her amendment some provisions which will help make sure that it gets a fair test—requiring scholarship students to take tests similar to other students in the District, requiring the Secretary of Education and the Mayor to select an independent entity for evaluation, and to say that the teachers of these children who are on scholarships should be as well qualified as possible. Those are very sensible additions.

The Mayor wants it. It is a pilot program. And it helps 2,000 of the poorest children in failing schools by giving them \$7,500 a year of new money. This comes from no other educational program. If it is not spent for this, it goes right back into the Federal budgets. It is new money to give them that choice.

Pilot programs and studies sometimes help us learn things. For example, Vanderbilt University did a very interesting report that was published in September of 2001.

The Senator from California and the Mayor of the District of Columbia might be interested in this, too. They took a group of schools, all of which have the characteristics of potential failing schools. In this group of schools, 35 percent of the students changed school every year, and 50 percent of the students qualified for free or reduced-price lunches.

The parents of the children in those schools had a modest education themselves. It is a recipe for failure when compared to most of our schools. Yet in these schools—instead of having only 1 of 10 or 1 of 20 8th graders who score proficient in math or reading, these schools are first in the country and second in the country among African-American students, according to the National Assessment for Educational Progress in Math and Reading.

What schools are these? These are the schools on the military bases across the country. All of us can speculate as to why that is true. There might be more discipline in a military school or military environment. Another one might be that the school reports to the commanding officer of the base.

The Senator from California has just increased the accountability of the schools in these scholarship programs by saying the Mayor is directly responsible. The Mayor of the District of Columbia is going to be paying attention to these schools and these scholarship kids.

There is another thing we might learn from this study of the military. There is one other provision which I found very interesting. At the military post schools where the military children who live on the base go to school, parents must go to the parent-teacher conference. They don't have a choice. They can be court-marshaled if they don't go. They are ordered to go. I guess that might be the single most important thing.

If this education has all of these aspects—and everyone is an expert. Everybody has 1,000 ideas. There are two

things we know for absolute sure. The thing that makes the most difference in a child's education is the parent and the second thing is the teacher. Everything else all added up into a lump counts for relatively little compared to those first two.

It might be that if there are 2,000 families who go to the trouble of helping their kids move from a failing school into another school that these parents will have increased parental involvement. This might be what makes the difference in terms of their child's success. But we don't know that unless we try to find out, which we can do over the next 5 years if we support the Senator's amendment and then we support the bill that is reported.

There are a couple of other things I would like to say. The Senator from California said that she has lived long enough to do what she thought was right and that she was puzzled by the opposition to this program. I have to admit that I am puzzled, too. On my side of the aisle, I am not always in lockstep with all of the Republican ideas that come along because I have lived long enough to make up my own mind about things.

But on the idea of saying that poor children shouldn't have the same choices of schools that middle-income and rich kids have, I have never really understood the opposition. It has always puzzled me.

Let me give an example of why. This is not some idea from the Moon. The idea of giving families choices in educational institutions has been the single most successful social program we have ever had in our country's history. Most people would say that the GI bill after World War II has been our most successful social program. What happened after World War II?

At a time when only 5 or 10 percent of Americans were going to college, the Government said to the veterans: When you come home, to pay you back, we are going to give you a scholarship to go wherever you want to go to school. They said: You may go to Berkeley. You may take this money to Fisk University. You might go to Hastings in California. You can go to Vanderbilt, you can go to the University of Tennessee, you can go to Ohio State, or to Notre Dame, or Kenyon. You can go to Yeshiva. You can go to a Brigham Young University. Wherever you want to go you can go to an accredited university.

A great many of the veterans returning from World War II used their GI bills to go to high schools. Many of them went to Catholic high schools. At that time, we began to allow Government scholarships to follow students to the educational institutions of their choice.

At that time, about 20 percent of our higher educational institutions were public. About 80 percent of the students went to private schools.

It sounds strange today because now we have big public universities. In Ohio you had all of those wonderful institu-

tions—Miami, Kenyon, Oberlin—all the colleges in Ohio. And Ohio State wasn't all that big at the end of World War II. A lot of the colleges that are universities today were just small teachers colleges.

What has been the effect of allowing Federal dollars to follow students to the educational institution of their choice since World War II? What happened is that it has created more opportunities for Americans more than any other program we have ever passed. It has created not just some of the best universities in the world but almost all of the best universities in the world. It continues today in the form of the Federal Pell grant and the Guaranteed Student Loan Program. One-half or more of students who go to colleges or universities in California or in Ohio or in Tennessee go to college with a Federal grant or with a loan following them to the college or university of their choice.

When I was president of the University of Tennessee, it never occurred to me to come to the Senate and say: Senator DEWINE, I hope you will pass a law that keeps Federal dollars from following a Tennessee student to Vanderbilt or to Fisk or to Maryville College or Carson-Newman College or Howard University or Brigham Young or Yeshiva because they are private, public, or parochial. It never occurred to me. I wanted the students to have all of those choices. It helped them and it helped our university.

If we have the tradition of choice in America, and if we have 60 years of funding educational institutions by allowing the money to follow the student to the school of their choice, it has always puzzled me as to why we exempt grade schools and high schools. We even allow Federal scholarships to let money follow preschoolers to Head Start or the child care program of their choice. Many States allow juniors and seniors in high school to let money follow them to the college of their choice.

We have gotten in this rut, and it is not clear how we got there but some people are determined to keep it forever. The ones paying the price are the poor kids of America.

We just finished what has turned out to be a very unpopular set of tests in Tennessee and America, the leave no child behind test. In our State, some of the superintendents and teachers were up in arms. They said: We are not a failing school.

I said: I would not get too proud or too embarrassed about the scores in Tennessee or California because all the leave no child behind tests are demonstrating is what we already know, which is that in most of our schools in America, even some of our finest schools, there are some children who are not learning to read. They are not learning to compute. Almost all of those children are disadvantaged.

We can ignore that and adopt a new slogan that says leave no more than 35 percent of our children behind and go

right on to decide to try some other things.

As the Senator from California said, one thing we could try is to allow the District of Columbia to spend its money helping 2,000 of those children who are poor and in failing schools, help them go to a school of their parents' choice and see whether that helps.

Some people say the school choice plan is a think-tank plan, maybe a conservative plan, maybe even a Republican plan. It is none of that. Let me give an example. One of the most distinguished educators in America is a man named Ted Sizer, at Harvard University, a graduate student during the Lyndon Johnson days. He was a "power to the people," Johnson liberal Democrat. As his graduate degree thesis in the late 1960s, Ted Sizer published a proposal called "The Poor Kids Bill of Rights." The idea was that part of the war on poverty, under the LBJ programs, the Federal Government should give \$5,000, in 1969 dollars, to every poor kid—he defined poor as middle income or below; which meant half the kids—give \$5,000 to half the children in America and let it follow them to the school of their choice.

That proposal came out of the 1960s from Ted Sizer, out of Harvard, out of Lyndon Johnson's philosophy. It is as true to that philosophy as it is to Milton Friedman's philosophy.

I like better what the Senator from California said. She was not so interested in a philosophy. She was interested in parents and kids on the street. That is who we should be listening to. If the Mayor and the chairman of the city school board say: We have tried everything. We are spending \$11,000 per kid; we are putting more money into charter schools; we are improving our schools, but we have all these children who are not learning to read, could we not try to give them a chance to go to some of the same schools that they could go to if their parents had some money? That is all they are saying.

I am very glad to have been here today to hear the Senator from California address the Senate. I am glad she is here to make a difference. I am glad the District of Columbia Mayor is here to make a difference too.

Everyone, after being here for a while, looks to the end of their careers and wonders what it will look like when looking back. My guess is when the Senator from California and the Mayor of the District of Columbia look back—these decisions, which are courageous in a political sense, are decisions they will take great pride in years to come.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise to support the inclusion of the District of Columbia School Choice Program contained within the fiscal year 2004 District of Columbia appropriations bill. I urge my colleagues to defeat any attempt to weaken or remove the program.

I also rise to support the amendment of Senator FEINSTEIN which strengthens that provision in the appropriations bill.

First of all, I applaud the efforts of my friend, the senior Senator from Ohio, Mr. DEWINE, for his efforts to expand school choice for the parents and schools of the District. I also applaud the leadership of Senator GREGG moving this issue forward. I also applaud Senator FEINSTEIN for her courageous support of this program and her very thoughtful amendment to the amendment to the appropriations bill.

My father, a first generation American, used to say that America enjoys more of the world's bounty than any other nation because of the free enterprise system and our educational system. This is true today as it was years ago. It we expect to remain competitive in the world marketplace and maintain our standard of living, this country needs to rededicate itself to the free enterprise and most importantly our educational system.

Some in Congress believe rededicating ourselves to this Nation's educational system means simply throwing more money at the issue, closing our eyes, hoping it will solve itself.

If spending alone ensured a quality education, the District would be one of the best school systems in the Nation. For the school year that ended June 2001, the District spent an average of \$10,852 per student. That is the third highest in the Nation. However, the 2002 national assessment of educational progress showed fourth grade students in the District held the lowest scores for writing and tied with Los Angeles for the lowest score in reading. That means 27 percent of fourth graders in the District scored below the basic level in writing, and 69 percent tested below the basic level in reading.

What a dismal message on the state of education for the families who live in the shining city on the hill, the Nation's Capital. What a terrible record to send throughout the country and the world.

We, in Congress, are obligated to do more to help the children in our Nation's Capital. I have often said that the greatest thing one could do for their fellow human being is to help them fully develop their God-given talents so they can take care of themselves, their families, and make a contribution to society. We need to empower families and children with more than just additional funding.

When I was first elected Governor of Ohio in 1990, I pledged to the people that I would draw a line in the sand for this generation of children in Ohio by making their health education my administration's top priority. As I look back, I am proud of that record in Ohio. When I left the Governor's mansion in 1998 for the Senate, Ohio led the Nation in State funding for Head Start. Every eligible child whose parents wanted them in a Head Start Program, early education had a place for them.

Many of these Head Start facilities were sponsored by religious organizations and located on the premises of religious organizations.

We were among the Nation's leaders in providing health care for uninsured children. Ohio increased funding for children and family programs by 47 percent while holding State spending to its lowest rate in 30 years. These actions and accomplishments were rooted in the belief that future generations of Ohioans would be served by a government that strived to empower families.

As the Presiding Officer knows, education begins with a family. A parent must be a child's first teacher. It was in this context that Ohio became one of the first States to undertake the challenges of implementing school choice. My colleagues in the Senate know how tumultuous a battle that program faced. It went on for years and finally ended up in the Supreme Court.

At the beginning of the Cleveland scholarship program, we provided 2,000 scholarships to children in grades kindergarten through third grade that would follow them through the eighth grade. Depending on the family's income level, the State paid between 75 and 90 percent of the cost of education. The scholarship amount did not exceed \$2,250, which provided a significant portion of the tuition at one of the participating nonpublic schools in Cleveland. The State also provided an equal number of \$500 tutoring grants to those students who did not receive scholarships but whose parents felt they needed additional help for their children.

The response to our program was overwhelming. The State received nearly 7,000 applications from Cleveland parents. More than half of the applicants were from households dependent on welfare, and half were from minorities. It was evident from the sheer number of applicants that parents were demanding options that the Cleveland Scholarship Program provided.

Today, the program has expanded. Effective July 1, 2003, students who had previously received a scholarship are now eligible to receive a scholarship for grade 9 in the 2003-2004 school year. And beginning in the 2004-2005 school year, a student who received a scholarship in the 9th grade will be eligible to receive a scholarship in the 10th grade. We are moving them along. Additionally, the scholarship amount has increased. The capped tuition for the 2003-2004 school year is now \$3,000.

From its humble beginnings in 1996, with 2,000 students, and total scholarships of \$2.9 million, the program has more than doubled its enrollment. Today it covers some 5,200 students. Additionally, total scholarship amounts have increased to almost \$10 million.

Since 1998, Indiana University's Center for Evaluation has been conducting longitudinal studies regarding the Cleveland Scholarship Program. So we have been watching it. We put the money out so we could watch how this thing has progressed.

In its most recent study, the center found that students who have participated in the Cleveland Scholarship Program since kindergarten have achieved significantly higher levels than public school students in reading and language skills.

I would also like to call my colleagues' attention to the results of an evaluation of the Cleveland voucher program that was conducted 2 years after it began by Paul Peterson of Harvard University.

In his study, Dr. Peterson found that parents of voucher recipients were consistently more satisfied with many aspects of their child's education than were parents of students in the Cleveland Public Schools. From the quality of academic programs to school discipline, teachers' skills, class size, and so forth, parents whose children were participants in the Cleveland Scholarship Program showed greater satisfaction and enthusiasm than did parents in the Cleveland Public School System.

The Cleveland Scholarship Program is merely one component of a renewal in our education system that needs to occur. I do not stand before the Senate and claim it is a cure-all for all troubled school districts. I think it is very important. Those of us who are supporting Senator DEWINE's and Senator FEINSTEIN's amendment are not claiming this is going to be the cure-all for troubled school districts. What we are saying is that it is another option on the education smorgasbord. And as the Presiding Officer so eloquently stated, why not look at some other programs that are out there? A business that is not doing very well starts to look at itself saying: What are other things we could be doing? Let's do some research and development. Let's look at some new ideas. Let's try something else.

I must tell you, as chairman of the Governmental Affairs subcommittee with jurisdiction over the District of Columbia, I support this as one of many options. We need to expand our vision. Instead of putting on our blinders, let's look at some other programs. The legislation offers the positive step toward empowering parents in the District by increasing their involvement in their child's education and offering them more choices.

Families in the District of Columbia have limited opportunity for choice in their children's education, and families have wholeheartedly embraced school choice. In 1996, the first charter schools opened in the District. The 39 charter schools operating in the District of Columbia only educate 1 in 7 children in the District. That is 15 percent of the students. Hundreds—hundreds—are on waiting lists.

Additionally, the Washington Scholarship Fund, a private, nonprofit organization, that provides scholarships for economically disadvantaged families, received over 7,500 applications for 1,000 available scholarships. It is clear that the parents of children in the District of Columbia want more options.

When I came to the Senate, I said I would not mandate a scholarship program on any jurisdiction; they had to want it. It is clear to me that the District of Columbia wants this. And it is just as clear that the District is within the responsibility of the Congress. They are our responsibility. We are not mandating every school district in America. We are increasing options for families in the District of Columbia.

Some would contend this is going to be running throughout the United States of America. We are concentrating our attention on our responsibility: the city on the hill, the Nation's Capital—our responsibility. And we are saying we want to give the parents of those children more options.

The most important thing is that this proposal for fiscal year 2004 has been drafted in consultation with and has the approval of Mayor Anthony Williams—I have talked to him about it; he is passionate about it—Council Member Kevin Chavous, chair of the Council's Committee of Education, Libraries, and Recreation; and Ms. Peggy Cooper Cafritz, president of the DC Board of Education. They are for this. They want this for their children. They are asking us for it.

The bill also contains \$13 million for charter schools and \$13 million for public schools to assist them with requirements under No Child Left Behind for teacher recruitment, training, and similar programs. Combined, the funds for these three programs represent the largest Federal contribution to the District of Columbia in the history of this country.

Unfortunately, the debate is not focused on the \$39 million in new funds for the District. Oh, no. It is on the \$13 million being considered for the scholarships. The proposed scholarship program would be authorized for 5 years, giving Congress the opportunity to monitor and evaluate the progress of schools and students—5 years. Let's watch it, just as we did in Cleveland with the longitudinal studies. Let's see how it works out. It would be overseen by the District of Columbia and the U.S. Secretary of Education.

Finally, it is a scholarship program that will help the neediest families in the District, the ones about whom the Presiding Officer so eloquently spoke. Eligible students are children attending low-performing public schools and whose household incomes do not exceed 200 percent of the poverty level. We are talking about a relatively small number of students. I think it is something like 2,000 students who would be eligible for the program.

I would like to stress to my colleagues that this is all new Federal money for students in the District of Columbia. Let me repeat: This is all new money. These scholarships are one piece of a larger proposal to address the educational needs in Washington, DC.

Certainly there is a role for Congress to play. We in Congress have increas-

ingly recognized the need for the Federal Government to serve as the State for the District, a necessity considering the unique relationship between the District of Columbia and the Federal Government.

For example, just 4 years ago, I was the chief sponsor in the Senate of the DC Tuition Assistance Grant Program, which was enacted in 1999. This program provides grants for students graduating from DC high schools to attend public universities and colleges nationwide at in-State tuition rates. In other words, we put the students in the District in the same position as if they lived in the State of Tennessee or the State of Ohio. There is a subsidy by the State so they could go on and get higher education.

It also provides smaller grants for students to attend private institutions in the DC metropolitan area and private historically black colleges and universities nationwide. So we have expanded it beyond just public. We now have private and historically black colleges included. This program has been enormously successful.

There is one final point I would like to discuss. Critics of scholarships argue that scholarships are ways for private schools, especially religious schools, to get rich quick. Incredible, just incredible. It is not true. As my colleagues may know, tuition for a student does not cover the full cost of educating a child. The difference currently is made up by private donations.

Many schools in the District run by the Archdiocese of Washington are struggling financially and would not be able to support a large influx of students. The Archdiocese estimates needing an additional \$5 million in the first year alone, should the Archdiocese fill all open seats in their schools with students on scholarships. It basically means, if they opened their doors and took advantage of the scholarship program, for them to do that, they would have to go out and find \$5 million someplace in order to educate these children.

It is the same thing in the city of Cleveland, with our nonpublic schools. We have hundreds of low-income kids who are not Catholic who are attending Catholic schools. My mother was a volunteer librarian at one of them where 70 percent of the kids were non-Catholic. There was not any proselytizing going on.

The reason they opened their doors is they believed in the two great commandments—love of God and love of fellow man. They believed the best way they could witness their faith is by reaching out and making a difference in the lives of these children, developing their God-given talents so they can take care of themselves and their families and make a contribution to society.

I will never forget one of those students was a player on the Ohio State football team. He was a big center. He went to the school where my mom was

a librarian. I went out there to one of their practices. He almost picked me up, and he looked at me and said: Are you Mrs. Voinovich's son?

I said: Yes, I am.

And he talked about the wonderful experience he had at St. Aloysius and the difference it made in his life so he could go on to high school and get a scholarship to play football.

This is what we are talking about. Why anyone would deny a student in the District the opportunity that students have had in the city of Cleveland and other places throughout the United States is simply beyond me. It is not the end of the world, if this is adopted. That is ridiculous. This is a small experiment to give people an option in their children's education.

Over the years it was argued that the Cleveland scholarship program was unconstitutional. I argued it was constitutional. I am not going to make that argument because the Presiding Officer made it in his presentation just before me, in terms of kids having money. The money goes to them, and then they can go wherever they want to go. That is in the American tradition. That is how thousands of Americans got their college education through the GI bill. The Supreme Court, on June 27, 2002, upheld the Cleveland scholarship program. When they did that, I labeled it a victory for hope. We have seen wonderful successes in Cleveland of children excelling in school, when the doors of opportunity were opened and parents could choose to offer what they believed is the best education. I believe all families deserve those options. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation for the families in our Nation's capital.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, as a member of the DC Appropriations Subcommittee, I thank Senator DEWINE and Senator LANDRIEU and their staffs for their hard work on this important legislation.

This is never an easy bill. I have been ranking member of this subcommittee in years gone by. It appears every Senator or Congressman, whoever in their weakest moment or wildest dreams wanted to be a mayor or a member of a city council, decides they can play the role when it comes to the DC appropriations bill. Thank goodness for Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON who has stood fast year after weary year, beating off every assault on home rule with some success and a few setbacks. But this bill is a tough one. It is always a tough one.

Members of Congress will do on this bill what they wouldn't dare do in their own districts or State. They will force on the District of Columbia things they would never even consider doing at home. They think it is easy. This is an area of America which, sadly, does not have a vote in Congress nor in the Senate. Frankly, they don't have to answer to the voters of the State. So

when it comes to experimenting and doing what you would never suggest at home, it is usually the DC appropriations bill that becomes that laboratory, that political playground.

Senators DEWINE and LANDRIEU, with very few exceptions, have done their level best to make certain this year's appropriations bill did not deteriorate into that particular situation. I want to take a few minutes to underscore that there is much in this District of Columbia spending bill that merits our collective endorsement.

As has been outlined, this bill provides \$545 million in Federal funds, the bulk of which will fund the District of Columbia Courts, Defender Services, and the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency, CSOSA, for the District of Columbia.

Since the enactment of the District of Columbia Revitalization Act of 1997, these three entities are funded entirely by Federal appropriations. The Revitalization Act made substantial changes in the financial relationship between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia and in management of the DC government.

Under revitalization, the Federal Government's cash contributions to the District budget were substantially reduced. In exchange, financial responsibility for several governmental functions was transferred from the District's budget to the Federal Government.

This year additional resources are being provided to the DC courts to integrate the 18 different computer systems that track offender and litigant information. In addition, the bill provides an increase of \$6.8 million over the President's budget request which will allow CSOSA to enhance its supervision of high-risk sex offenders, offenders with mental health problems, and domestic violence offenders.

In addition, the bill continues level funding for the DC resident tuition program, a very successful initiative Congress established in 1999 which permits DC high school graduates to attend out of State schools at in-State tuition rates.

Among other items, the bill also provides Federal funding for hospital bioterrorism preparedness; for security costs related to the presence of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia; for support of the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative; and for the Children's National Medical Center.

It is important to recognize and emphasize that about 93 percent of the funds contained in this bill—fully \$7.43 billion, \$6.33 billion in operating expenses plus \$1.1 billion in capital outlay funds—are not Federal funds, but locally-generated revenue which must be approved by Congress before the mayor can execute his budget and begin spending these local funds.

The District of Columbia does not enjoy autonomy over the local portion of its budget but must await a congressional imprimatur. Senator SUSAN COL-

LINS has introduced bipartisan legislation designed to change that, which I hope we will have an opportunity to consider during this session of Congress.

Senator DEWINE and Senator LANDRIEU have collaborated on producing a thoughtful product. We owe them a debt of gratitude for tenaciously juggling municipal needs, amid Federal funding constraints.

I have been in their shoes as either chairman or ranking member of the District of Columbia Subcommittee and was honored to serve. I quickly learned from that experience that while the DC spending bill is technically the smallest of the 13 appropriations bills we consider each year, it usually is among the more contentious ones.

The issue before us is the issue of school vouchers. It is not just another debate about another DC appropriations measure. If this is adopted, it will be the first time in the history of the United States that the Federal Government will pay for private school vouchers in grades K through 12.

This issue was brought up a few years ago when President Bush suggested sweeping reform of public education and some of his allies said: Let's put in school vouchers for private schools at the same time.

In the Senate we took a vote on that issue. If I am not mistaken, the vote was 41 in favor of school vouchers, 58 opposed. I raise that vote because it will be of interest to see what happens now when this issue goes beyond a national program and is confined to the District of Columbia. I suspect many of those who said "we don't want school vouchers in our State" are going to say "but we will allow them to have school vouchers in the District of Columbia." That is unfortunate. It reflects an attitude toward the District of Columbia which is not complimentary. Mayor Williams is here on the floor with Delegate NORTON. I respect him very much. We agree on much more than we disagree, though we disagree on this particular issue. He was treated with a Faustian bargain. Here was the bargain the Republicans offered to him. They said: If we give you \$13 million for your public schools that you had not anticipated and \$13 million for your charter schools that you had not anticipated, will you sit still for and embrace and endorse and help us pass the first federally funded voucher program for private schools in America?

The District of Columbia struggles with a lot of spending problems. There are a lot of reasons for it I will not go into. I know he must have looked at this long and hard and thought: This is something I will have to agree to. To get \$26 million for public schools and charter schools, I am going to support the Republican voucher program.

That, unfortunately, was the decision he made. I say "unfortunately" because my respect for him has not diminished, but I am concerned that the

decision he made for the District of Columbia is a departure from where the District of Columbia has been year after year when this appropriations bill has come up. For year after year the District of Columbia has said to Congress, respect home rule. Let us make our own decisions. Now this year they have done 180 degrees. The Mayor has said: When it comes to our schools, which is the responsibility of DC local government, we are going to allow the Federal Government—in this case the Congress—to create a school scholarship program, vouchers for private schools.

DC could have done this on their own. They could have done it over the years. They didn't. There was a reason they didn't. It isn't that they didn't consider the possibility of vouchers for private schools. They considered it and voted on it and overwhelmingly voted against it. The residents of the District of Columbia, in referendum, overwhelmingly opposed vouchers for private education, overwhelmingly opposed diverting public money from public schools into private schools. That is what the people think about the concept.

It isn't confined to that concept. The Mayor's own city council opposes this, and the elected members of the school board also oppose it. But the Mayor and the president of the school board support it. They have entered into this bargain with the Republicans to go forward with a voucher program, the first federally funded diversion of public funds from public schools to private schools in the history of the United States.

It is momentous. What is particularly noteworthy is that this measure comes to us not after committee hearings, deliberation, a markup process with amendments, but comes to us, frankly, in a package in this appropriations bill which we are now changing with some drama on the floor of the Senate even as I speak.

Senator FEINSTEIN of California came forward with an amendment. She had made it clear in the Senate Appropriations Committee that she supported the voucher plan for the District of Columbia. Many of us pointed out in that hearing some deficiencies in this plan. Understand, we were given this voucher program in the Appropriations Committee where we don't usually entertain anything of that complexity—not that it isn't done, but it is done rarely—and we were given it on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. As we considered what was proposed to us, a lot of questions were raised.

Let me cite an example of one amendment I offered in the Appropriations Committee to give an idea about the mindset that is pushing this forward. I offered an amendment which said: You cannot give vouchers to a private school—public money to a private school—unless the teachers in the private school receiving the voucher money have a college degree and the

school physically complies with the life, health, and safety code of the District of Columbia.

That seems fairly reasonable for my colleagues who have voted for No Child Left Behind. Remember the President's program? The President not only required college degrees for teachers, but imposed even higher standards of excellence over the years. So to require a college degree at the private schools where we are sending public tax dollars is not a huge leap or a radical idea. It is consistent with what the overwhelming majority of the Senate said would be the minimum standard for public schools in America. To say that any private school that is supported with public taxpayer dollars has to be safe for the children—fire escapes, and alarms, the appropriate exit doors, and the like—it seems to me is just common sense. I am sorry to report to my colleagues that amendment was defeated.

Senator FEINSTEIN and the Republicans who support this DC voucher bill opposed my amendment which would have required a college degree of teachers at the private schools and would have required that those schools comply with the life, health, and safety code of the District of Columbia. I might add something. Per capita, the District of Columbia has the largest number of charter schools, which are exceptions to the traditional public school system, of any place in the United States. And even in the DC charter schools there is a requirement that teachers at these charter schools have a college degree.

When I offered the amendment in committee, you should have heard the debate. I actually heard my colleagues say: Senator DURBIN, you don't understand. These private schools are going to be experimental. We are going to try innovative approaches.

One Senator said that would rule out home schooling. Home schooling? Is that what DC vouchers are about? It strikes me as odd that we would want to engage in an experiment in private schools with standards far lower than what we are demanding of our public schools. I have to add, too, that Senator FEINSTEIN's effort to correct that problem, I don't believe, has been successful.

Let me give an example. In this amendment Senator FEINSTEIN offers, which is presently before us, there is a section on teacher quality. In describing it, she stated that all teachers in the schools receiving voucher funds must have a college degree. That is not what the amendment says. What it says is that only those teachers who teach the students on vouchers need a college degree. So this means, frankly, a school could put all of the students on vouchers in one classroom with a teacher with an associate's degree, which is a college degree. So I don't believe it was very carefully drawn. It doesn't meet the minimum standards we expect of schools in America.

Let me tell you what else is deficient in the Feinstein amendment. The amendment falls short of the requirements that we all voted and imposed on public schools in America, where we said it is not enough to have a college degree. We said in public schools we are going to require not only a bachelor's degree, but certification of ability to teach, and particularly "subject area mastery." What does that mean? If you want to stand in front of a high school class and teach chemistry, you must demonstrate that you have taken the appropriate amount of training in college to teach chemistry. Our understanding is that all of the statistics show that when the teacher in front of the classroom has not studied the subject, is merely reading a chapter ahead to stay ahead of the children, the students don't learn much. So we have said for public schools across America, this is our minimum standard—a college degree, bachelor's degree, certification, and evidence of mastery of the subject.

It means in some of my schools in Illinois that they are saying we know you have taught biology for many years and you are good at it, but you don't have the requisite number of college degree hours to meet President Bush's requirements of No Child Left Behind. You have to take biology classes in college to meet President Bush's minimum requirements for public schools.

Turn the page to this debate. In this debate, we hear from Senator FEINSTEIN and supporters of the DC voucher program that we are not going to hold the teachers in the private schools receiving Federal tax dollars to the same standards as teachers in the public schools in the District of Columbia. Something is wrong with this picture. Either we were mistaken in imposing the standard on public education, or they are lax and deficient in not requiring the same standards of teachers in private schools in the District of Columbia where these children are going to go to school.

Some of them have said this is just an experiment, and we are just going to see what happens. I can recall when my own kids were growing up and the school year started. After a few weeks, you get to meet the teacher. Before that, you may have said to your son or daughter, how are things going? They might say: Oh, I really like this teacher, or I am not getting along with the teacher. And you thought to yourself, I am going to work with my son or daughter and talk to the teacher and try to make things right. But there is a real possibility that students in some schools, public and private, can be thrust into a situation where they not only have a bad year, they have two straight bad years—bad years with teachers who are not up to the academic levels that we should require. The experiment may fail for those students. They may be in classrooms where the teachers are not ready to

teach and where, frankly, the teachers don't have the background to even consider teaching.

What happens to that student after one bad year in this experiment? Can they catch up? It is possible but more difficult. Now give them a second bad year.

This is an experiment with the lives of students. To think that a child can have a bad experience in the fourth grade and fifth grade and then catch up in the sixth grade may be wishful thinking. Some students are struggling with challenges that I never had and that my kids, thank goodness, never faced. To put them in this experimental atmosphere where teachers are not required to have the same basic minimum qualifications as teachers in public schools is a disservice to those children and their families.

We hear about experiments taking place in other places, such as Cleveland and Milwaukee. We read about one in the Washington Post the other day, where a convicted rapist, a fellow, started Alex's Academics of Excellence. He received \$2.8 million from the State of Wisconsin. It turned out that the students were not getting the kind of education they deserved there. They said it was very difficult for anybody to say no to someone who opened a school and said they were going to abide by all of the requirements of the law. That experiment failed, but it didn't just fail for those who wrote the law, it failed for those kids and their families.

Why would we say, if there is going to be a DC voucher program, that the teachers in private schools wouldn't at least meet the standards we require of teachers in public schools? Sadly, the Feinstein amendment doesn't do that. That may have been her intent, but I am afraid she didn't quite reach it in terms of satisfying that need.

There is another point that concerns me, too, and that is testing. If this is to be legitimate and honest, you would have to take the students who are in private schools and test them with exactly the same tests students in public schools take. Then you could at least compare progress. These students may be somewhat self-selected because they decided to go to a private school. At the end of the day, you ought to be able to compare test scores, in fairness, to not only the private schools but to the public schools.

Listen to what the Feinstein amendment says. It says: Student assessments are not a requirement imposed on the school; rather, it is placed on the fund recipient—a very unusual allocation of responsibility—the fund recipient that administers the voucher payout. I don't understand why the schools don't have this requirement.

The amendment goes on to say that the tests for voucher students must be the "same as" school year 2003–2004. In a way that seems to answer my challenge that the same tests be administered in the private schools as in the

public schools. But read it more closely. If these are the same tests as required in school years 2003 and 2004, consider that this is proposed as a 5-year program. So what this means is that all of the students in all grades would have to be tested as required by No Child Left Behind for public schools. Why? Because the requirements for testing in No Child Left Behind take effect and change each year.

So what Senator FEINSTEIN set up as a standard is a testing for this year only, instead of just saying pointblank the students in these schools will be tested with the same frequency and the same tests as No Child Left Behind, she has instead said only one year's testing standards, 2003–2004.

For example, by 2007, there will be a science assessment required under No Child Left Behind. So public schools across America will be taking tests indicating competency in science. Under the Feinstein amendment, they do not have to worry about that. They are only held to the standard of 2003–2004.

There is no duty in this law, as we read it, to report the findings of those tests publicly, even to the parents, only to the Secretary of Education. Why not? Where I live, the State of Illinois—the State of Ohio and other States—school test scores are reported publicly so the parents know, taxpayers know, whether the schools are performing. The Feinstein amendment does not require this.

Now here is another thing I find curious. The Feinstein amendment requires the comparison made for those students tested must include testing not just students still in public schools and students who are now in private schools being funded with public funds, under vouchers, but also a third class, those students who applied for vouchers and were rejected. So we have a third category of students who are going to be a control group for testing.

I do not quite understand this, but I do think the concept is at least challengeable, because there is no doubt in my mind that the private schools are not going to rush to accept students who are going to be problem students and challenging students. So there will be the rejected students having been controlled out into a cherry-picked group being tested separately.

It is possible these students are likely to test worse. The private schools did not want to take them in because they are going to be held accountable for some 2003–2004 tests. Why the Senator has decided to include this, I do not know.

So when we look at this bill overall and consider the elements in it, I am afraid Senator FEINSTEIN's attempt to correct the problems does not quite solve the problem. We still have some major deficiencies in this bill.

What bothers me, too, I read in the paper this morning that the Mayor has said he wants new authority over education in the public schools of the District of Columbia. At the risk of step-

ping on the toes of some of my friends, I think the Mayor is on the right path. The reason I say it is this: Many of the people who are supporting voucher programs have given up on public education, for a variety of reasons. For some political reasons, they believe the teachers' unions support Democrats and they are going to go after public education and they are going to fight the teachers' unions. Others have said, just look at the results. Some of the public schools are not very good. Therefore, there should be an alternative.

If one takes an honest approach to this, the first obligation of elected officials in this country is to the system of education which built America and the system of education which serves more than 90 percent of America's school children, and that is the public school system.

I say to the Mayor of Washington, who has joined us today, and all those who are following the debate, do not give up on public education. Things are happening that are positive in the District of Columbia. Frankly, I think they have been ignored and played down and there has been a disservice by some of the rhetoric we have heard about DC public schools.

There are good things happening: Charter schools and transformational schools, big changes that are moving in the right direction. I ask the Mayor, before he gives up on the public school system and says we have to have vouchers, that there is no other way but to take public tax funds and send them to private schools, before he gives up on public education, come to Chicago. Come and look at what has happened there. In our Chicago public school system, we have 95 percent minority students and 85 percent students under the poverty level. Yet in a rather brief period of time we have seen dramatic increases in test scores because the mayor of the city of Chicago assumed a personal responsibility for the public school system, brought in some of the most talented people he could find, challenged the parents, the teachers, the principals, and the students to do a better job and got the results to show for it.

My colleagues do not have to give up on public education. They do not have to say there is no alternative but to let kids escape public education and go to private schools. There is a lot more that can be done. It takes some hard-nosed, tough-minded leadership, but I think the Mayor may be on the right path in what he said this morning. He is willing to accept more of this responsibility personally and maybe that is what is necessary.

The Chicago experience tells me it has been a good experience. When the mayor had the power and the responsibility, good things happened. Come with me to the city of Chicago and take a drive through many tough parts of that great part of town. Homes will be found where people in the lower and

middle income are struggling to keep it together and then, like a mirage or an oasis, one will see the public school where over the last several years the Chicago public school system has dedicated dramatic amounts of money to renovate these schools and bring them back to a source of pride in the community.

No graffiti will be seen on the walls of the school. Flowers will be seen planted outside and the people in this neighborhood point to that public school with pride, because the mayor was proud of those schools and because the people in the neighborhood are, too.

If that mayor or any mayor had said these public schools are a failure, we are walking away from them, then frankly it would have created a negative environment. We need a positive environment for education. Moving to this voucher plan, without adequate hearing, without the consideration of the options that are available to us, frankly is a move in the wrong direction.

I also say to my colleagues that as I read through this bill, they must, I hope, acknowledge the fact there are several things that could happen they do not anticipate. For example, there is no prohibition in this bill that the 1,000 to 2,000 vouchers that are created, whatever number they turn out to be, will all be given to children who are already in private schools. There is no prohibition against that. Though they start with a premise and a goal of moving kids from lower performing public schools to higher performing private schools, in fact the testing is not there for comparison.

Second, there is no requirement that the family of the student receiving the voucher actually bring the student from a public school to a private school. This could end up diverting a substantial amount of money to students, and their families, already enrolled in private schools. Like it or not, the bill is inartfully drawn, and having been so poorly drawn, that could be the outcome. So they will not be proving much of a case there, will they, if students are already in the private schools?

I can go on for some time about the experiments with vouchers in private schools. I want to close, because I see Senator KENNEDY is in the Chamber and I imagine he would like to make a comment on this bill. If he does, he is certainly welcome to.

I will close my comments on the Feinstein amendment by urging my colleagues to oppose it. Senator FEINSTEIN has identified the problem. She has not identified solutions, not good solutions, not solutions that are worthy of the first-ever program in the history of the United States to divert funds from public schools to private schools under a voucher program.

From my point of view, private schools in many communities add a lot to education. I am not an enemy of private education. I am a product of

Catholic education. My wife and I both attended Catholic schools, as did our children. But we understood our responsibility. Our responsibility was first to pay our public property taxes, to support public education, and then if we chose, for religious reasons or whatever reasons, to send our children to a Catholic school, we accepted the financial responsibility of paying tuition. It was a sacrifice for many families. I think they add a lot.

I think we should take care here. We are creating a new system in the District of Columbia, and there are few protections and safeguards, if any, to stop the possibility that at some point after we have passed this bill that some group will decide to open up a private school and draw in hundreds of thousands of dollars of public taxpayer funds and the teachers in those schools may not have college degrees, only associate degrees, the testing in those schools may not match what is going on in the public schools, and the schools will be allowed to discriminate against students for such things as disabilities where they will not allow any children in who have any kind of learning disability or any physical or mental disability, which would be allowed, incidentally, under this proposal.

Is that what we want to see happen? Is that what should be the first test case of this experiment in the voucher program? I think not. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I urge them to think long and hard that if they voted against vouchers for their States, why is it now we are making an exception because the case in point involves the District of Columbia?

These students and their families deserve the same respect as the students and families in all of our States, and I urge my colleagues to keep that in mind as we consider this important legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, my friend and colleague from Illinois has once again demonstrated why he is known as certainly one of the best, if not the best, debater in the Senate. He does an absolutely excellent job. I always enjoy debating with him. I thank him for his contribution to this debate. I know we will have the opportunity to continue to debate in the days ahead.

My colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, will, in a moment, talk about her amendment and will respond to Senator DURBIN's comments about her amendment. But I would like to make a couple of comments first about Senator DURBIN's comments.

My colleague from Illinois talked about where this plan came from. I talked earlier about the fact that it is a three-pronged program. That is what I like about it. I happen to like the fact that a third of the money goes to the public schools, a third of the money goes to the charter schools, and a third of the money goes to this new voucher program.

Somehow, my colleague seems to know—I don't know how, but he seems to know how this program started. Somehow he seems to know in his wisdom that this program was some sort of bargain deal. The House Republicans came to the Mayor and said: Mayor, here's the deal.

It is a funny thing. The Mayor, under the rules of the Senate, cannot come down here and speak. But if someone would happen to ask the Mayor, not on the floor—you can't do that; that is against the rules, but if someone someday would happen to ask the Mayor what the truth is, what the Mayor would say is that is not true, and this was the Mayor's idea; that the Mayor and his people said they wanted. This is the program we want. We want a balanced program because what we want is a choice for the children and the families of the District of Columbia. We want a balanced program.

Yes, we want more assistance for the public schools—and the Mayor has a consistent record of trying to get more money for the public schools of the District of Columbia, and he is not bashful about that. He should not be bashful about it. And he is proud about it. Yes, he wants more money to create more charter schools. Everyone who will vote on this bill needs to understand when the issue comes, when Senator DURBIN tries to strike the money, what you will be striking is \$13 million which will create more charter schools, four or five more charter schools in the District of Columbia. Everyone needs to understand that.

The Mayor is proud of the fact that the District of Columbia has created more charter schools. I must say my colleague, Senator LANDRIEU, has been integrally involved in creating those charter schools. It is something she cares passionately about.

Mr. DURBIN. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. DEWINE. If I may finish the thought and then I will yield.

The Mayor also said: I want more money for my public schools. I want to continue to improve them. I want more money for the charter schools. We are proud of what we are doing in that area. And third, I want to create the voucher program.

So let's clear that up. If anyone has any doubt about it, ask the Mayor. Go to the source. What the Mayor will say is: It was my idea. I am the one who had the idea. My people put the program together. We requested it. This is what we want.

I will be more than happy to yield, not the floor, but for the purpose of conversation with my colleague.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank my colleague from Ohio.

I would like to ask through the Chair, I certainly will be ready to yield whenever he would like to ask me a question because I think this is an important part of the debate, but I ask my colleague if he is aware of two things. First, the amendment I am

going to offer will take the \$13 million out of the school voucher program and divide it equally among the public and charter schools. The money goes back into public and charter schools, so they will end up with about \$20 million each, instead of \$13 million.

Mr. DEWINE. In response, I have not seen the amendment of my colleague.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank him for acknowledging that.

Second, I ask my friend and colleague from Ohio if he is aware the Executive Office of the President released a Statement of Administration Policy on September 24. In reference to this particular program it said as follows:

The administration is pleased the committee bill puts \$13 million for the President's School Choice Incentive Fund Initiative. . . .

It doesn't refer to Mayor Williams' School Choice Incentive Fund Initiative.

Mr. DEWINE. In respond to my colleague, we all like to take credit for many things. I am sure the President is taking credit for this. I am sure I will probably take credit for it, too, if it passes. There will be many fathers and mothers of this program.

All I know is what the Mayor will tell us. The Mayor will say this is a program he put together.

What I would emphasize to my colleague is that this is a program that the Mayor says is a balanced program.

I will quote from a letter the Mayor has sent to me. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

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

Washington, DC, September 11, 2003

Hon. MIKE DEWINE,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations,
Subcommittee on the District of Columbia,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEWINE: Thank you for your leadership on the District of Columbia's FY 2004 Appropriations bill. By any measure, it is a great bill for the city. In particular, I am grateful for your support for the District of Columbia School Improvement Initiative, which will help us advance the important school reform efforts underway. Certainly, the private school scholarship element has generated significant debate, and I hope that I have made the case to your colleagues that its passage is consonant with home rule and will strengthen our public education system.

I, along with the Chair of the District Council's Education Committee, Kevin Chavous, and the School Board President, Peggy Cooper Cafritz, believe that we must continue to do everything possible to strengthen our nation's public schools. This is why, in addition to a private school scholarship program, we have insisted on strong federal financial support for both the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) and the public charter schools.

Since becoming Mayor, I have overseen an increase in the public education budget by more than 50 percent. This demonstrates my commitment to public schools as tremendously important institutions in our city. This increase has allowed our charter school movement to expand to 40 schools and has permitted us to launch the Transformation Schools Initiative in 15 DC public schools,

which we hope will revitalize our lowest-performing schools. After consulting with education officials, however, I have concluded that these aggressive reforms, while promising, will take years to reach most of our children. So, as these foundations expand and improve, I think it is prudent to look to the assets provided by our private schools, at least for a limited period of time.

The proposed scholarship initiative will not drain resources from our public school system. I have agreed to hold the public schools harmless from any loss of local funding arising from students' enrollments in private schools through the federally funded scholarship program. Moreover, because Title I funding is based largely on census data, we do not anticipate that DC will lose significant federal funding as a result of this program. Thus, under the scholarship initiative, our public schools will receive the same amount of funds as they otherwise would have, in order to educate fewer students.

Since our city began to debate the issue of expanded school choice, there has been speculation that this initiative will have an impact far beyond the borders of Washington, DC. Some say that what we do in the District will affect national education policy and the likelihood of pilot programs in other cities. For me, however, the issue of vouchers is more localized.

This initiative was designed by District leadership for District residents and is not being imposed on the District from outside, as some would have you believe. As mayor, I am trying to make the best choices for the residents of this city, and without a state government to which, under normal circumstances, I would make this request. In this regard, I believe it is appropriate for the federal government to act on behalf of the nation's capital when the local mayor and school board president seek assistance.

You have been a strong supporter of the District of Columbia and of our aspirations for self-government. Our city continues to improve in many ways. I hope we can count on affirmative action from the Senate in support of the School Choice Improvement Initiative and the entire FY 2004 District of Columbia Appropriations bill.

Again, I thank you for the extraordinary leadership and commitment you have shown toward the District. I look forward to continuing to work closely with you in taking the necessary actions to support the District of Columbia.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY A. WILLIAMS,

Mayor.

Mr. DEWINE. This is a letter dated September 11, 2003, to me as chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, a two-page letter from Mayor Williams to me.

I would like to quote a part of this letter to my colleagues. This is the third paragraph:

Since becoming Mayor, I have overseen an increase in the public education budget by more than 50 percent. This demonstrates my commitment to public schools as tremendously important institutions in our city. This increase has allowed our charter school movement to expand to 40 schools and has permitted us to launch the Transformation Schools Initiative in 15 DC public schools, which we hope will revitalize our lowest-performing schools. After consulting with education officials, however, I have concluded that these aggressive reforms, while promising, will take years to reach most of our children. So, as these foundations expand and improve, I think it is prudent to look to the assets provided by our private schools, at least for a limited period of time.

What the Mayor clearly is saying is that as we improve our public schools, as we have the charter schools, we need another alternative for some of our students.

Let me quote again, if I could, from the letter:

The proposed scholarship initiative will not drain resources from our public school system. I have agreed to hold the public schools harmless from any loss of local funding arising from students' enrollments in private schools through the federally funded scholarship program. Moreover, because Title I funding is based largely on census data, we do not anticipate that DC will lose significant federal funding as a result of this program. Thus, under the scholarship initiative, our public schools will receive the same amount of funds as they otherwise would have, in order to educate fewer students.

Let me quote another part of the letter:

This initiative was designed by District leadership for District residents and is not being imposed on the District from outside, as some would have you believe. As mayor, I am trying to make the best choices for the residents of this city. . . . In this regard, I believe it is appropriate for the federal government to act on behalf of the nation's capital when the local mayor and school board president seek assistance.

At this point, before I yield to my colleague, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. CARPER. Will the Senator make the request again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has requested the yeas and nays.

Mr. DURBIN. Parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will withhold.

The question is on the call for the yeas and nays. Is there a sufficient second?

At the moment there is not a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I very much disagree with the position of the Senator from Illinois. I understand this is something that is new. I understand it is something being tried. I understand it turns counter to a lot of what has been done in the educational establishment today. But that doesn't mean it shouldn't be tried.

I wish to correct one point. I asked the Mayor if he believed he got a Faustian bargain. He said no, he didn't. He said: As a matter of fact, I proposed the three-pronged asset portion of this. In other words, one-third of the money would be new money to the schools, one-third of the money would be new money to charter schools, and one-third of the money would be new money to try this special scholarship program for poor children.

I would like the RECORD to reflect the rationale for the language in my amendment on the testing. In order to guarantee a valid and statistically reliable evaluation, we are told it is vital that we have the scholarship student and those students who applied for the scholarship but didn't get it take the

same test for all 5 years. If the District should switch tests at some point in the 5-year duration of the program, we need to continue giving the test to start with, which today in the District is the Stanford 9 test. That is a norm-referenced test which is given all over the country, and it would preserve the evaluation. The use of the same exact test for all 5 years is critical to be able to compare apples to apples. If the District changes tests during these 5 years, you have a false comparison; you have apples to oranges. That is the reason the language is as it is.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. May I finish?

Any parent applying for this scholarship must agree that their child will take the Stanford 9 test for all 5 years regardless of whether they receive a scholarship or not.

Let me tell you what this is all about. I recognize the Senator doesn't like it. That is fine. He doesn't have to vote for it. But what this is all about is that 76 percent of DC fourth graders performed below basic in math, and only 10 percent read proficiently. Only 12 percent of eighth graders read proficiently.

That is what this is all about—to see if, by learning some of the basics, these children have a better start in education in a different model, in a different setting, with a different structure than currently exists in public education. It may work. It may not work. But these are all poor children. They are all in failing schools. Why not give them a chance?

I suppose you could fault it by saying, well, everyone who instructs one of these children in these schools should have more than a college degree. Sure. I would like to do it. I don't know that we can condition the requirement in every private secular school or every private parochial school that may accept one of these children.

I took high school classes from nuns who didn't have college degrees. And guess what. I got into Stanford based on what I learned in high school. So I came to realize that these absolute requirements may be right if we are going into this on a permanent basis, but we are not; we are going into it on a temporary basis. This pilot gives us an opportunity to see whether these children progress better in different settings. What is the difference if those different settings happen to be private parochial, or they happen to be private secular school settings?

I cannot tell you how many parents write to me and ask: Can you help me get my child into a private school? Please help me. These are parents who have funds. What about the parents who do not have funds? They don't have a chance at this. All this does is give them that opportunity.

If you do not like it, don't vote for it. That is easy. But some of us want to see what works and what doesn't work.

They said the same thing to Oakland Mayor Jerry Brown about his idea to start a military school in Oakland. A public military school? Horrors. The school board voted it down. Fortunately, the Mayor of Oakland is a persistent personality. He went to the State and got a special charter to open a military school so that youngsters from the deeply troubled socioeconomic areas in the city of Oakland would have a shot of going to college. Now they have 350 kids who are 3 years into the program, and they are testing as the second best middle school in Oakland. That is discipline. It is amazing. Different models work for different youngsters.

That is why I am supporting this approach.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. You might not find the "i" dotted or the "t" crossed exactly the way you would like to have the "i" dotted or the "t" crossed.

This isn't a program that is national. It is not a program that is going to exist for 50 years. It is a program that is going to be tried for 5 years. Either poor children will do better or they won't. And the test is going to be—

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I don't know whether I want to yield to the Senator or not.

Mr. DURBIN. Just say no. No is also an answer.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I beg your pardon?

Mr. DURBIN. No is an answer, if you don't want to answer.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I am thinking about it.

Mr. DURBIN. It is your prerogative.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Yes. I yield.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank my friend and colleague from California.

I have no doubt that she offered this amendment—I say through the Chair—to address some of the concerns raised in the committee.

I ask my friend from California to turn to page 2 of her amendment and consider paragraph B on page 2. I will read it. It says:

Use the same assessment every school year used for school year 2003-2004 by the District of Columbia public schools to assess the achievement of DC public school students.

I will ask the question, and then I will sit down.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Fair enough.

Mr. DURBIN. Currently, the DC Public School System, like many public school systems, is in transition under the No Child Left Behind Act and the 2005 requirement that students be tested every year. Currently, their public school students are only tested every other year.

By establishing as a standard for the next 5 years for the District of Columbia voucher program using the 2003-2004 assessments, the Senator is saying they will only be tested every other year, while students in public schools by the year 2005 have to be tested every year.

If the Senator had said here that you will comply with the No Child Left Behind Act testing requirement, it would have been easy. But instead, you picked one particular year, and I don't think you reach the standard which you have described to our colleagues.

Is that true or not?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. What you have just stated and what I have been told is that in order to have a fair test evaluation and compare apples to apples, the same test has to be used, which in the District is the Stanford 9, for the 5-year period. So that is the test now being given. If the District changes—I think it is called a criterion-based test—and I gather the District is considering changing them, this control group would still have to take the Stanford 9 to see if they have progressed.

Now I am told if somebody says, I am happy to change it, I am told you cannot get a fair test if we change it.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator will yield the floor, I would like to ask this question.

Does the Senator understand that by the year 2005 under No Child Left Behind, every public school in America, including the District of Columbia, will have to test every grade every year; but in the current school year, schools are moving toward that goal. In the District of Columbia they are only testing every other year.

It is not a question of changing the test. I am asking the Senator from California, does she understand if we stick to the 2003-2004 standard, she will only be testing every other grade while every public school in the District of Columbia and across the Nation will be moving to every grade, every year by 2005? Her bill, her standards, will not be following that same assessment.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. As I understand it, the Stanford 9 is a nationally norm-referenced test. It can certainly be given every year, and I believe the Mayor will agree to that.

If your question is, Are you saying the students will be tested every other year instead of every year, what I am saying is we can use it every year. If you are saying we want the test to change in the middle of the test period, I am being told that will mess up any fair evaluation.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. I am not suggesting changing the test. The same test should be administered in a private school as administered in a public school.

I am suggesting to the Senator, as she has written this amendment, the 2003-2004 testing in the D.C. public schools, her standard for 5 years only tests every other grade. By 2005 every grade will be tested. It is not the substantive test that is the issue. It is a question of whether every grade will be tested every year.

The reason I raise this, and I hope the Senator agrees, should have been

worked out in the education committee after hearings and markup in the amendment process. We are doing it on the fly, on the floor, creating the first private school voucher program in America and discussing as we go.

That is my concern.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I appreciate the Senator's concern.

If the Senator from Ohio agrees, I am very happy to have my amendment modified to provide that the voucher recipients and the students in the control group be given the same test that all District public schools students are given.

With respect to this being done in the education committee, I probably agree, except it would probably get bogged down one way. The reason it is in the appropriations bill is because the Mayor has come to us and asked us for the additional money. The additional money is what brought this on. Once the additional money was in the bill, then the terms of the money came to bear and the bill had to be written.

It is not easy. There are powerful forces against it. People do not want to try it. I do. I hope a majority want to try it. We have tried to do the best we can.

Even more importantly, what has been developed here is a relationship between the city and Members of this Senate with this Mayor. I happen to respect this Mayor. I am a taxpaying citizen of this District. I have been so for 10 years. I used to go down the street where there was a pothole so big somebody plugged it up with a mattress. I am very pleased to say, Mr. Mayor, that pothole is gone now. The District is in much better shape. People are coming back to the District. He wants this.

The question was also raised, it is easy to do it here. I am not in my own jurisdiction. I tried to point out, the mayor of Oakland came to me in my own jurisdiction to do something that was a new model; I agreed to it. I am going to look at new models and try to support them where I can, also support teachers, also support Title I, and also support public education.

AMENDMENT NO. 1787 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1783, AS MODIFIED

I ask the Member from Ohio if he would be in agreement that we submit a modification and ask our amendment be modified to reflect that the test be given annually?

Mr. DEWINE. I would certainly have no objection to that. It at best is ambiguous. It is always good to clarify.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, may I direct a question to the Senator from Ohio?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from California has the right to modify her amendment. However, to do so, she would have to send it to the desk.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I modify the amendment on page 2, line 3, strike "that are used for school year 2003-2004."

I send that modification to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to make that modification to her amendment. However, she needs to send a modification to the desk.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment will be so modified.

The amendment (No. 1787), as modified, is as follows:

On page 31, strike line 13 and all that follows through page 32, line 2, and insert the following:

(c) STUDENT ASSESSMENTS.—The Secretary may not approve an application from an eligible entity for a grant under this title unless the eligible entity's application—

(1) ensures that the eligible entity will—

(A) assess the academic achievement of all participating eligible students;

(B) use the same assessments every school year that are used by the District of Columbia Public Schools to assess the achievement of District of Columbia public school students under section 1111(b)(3)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(3)(A)), to assess participating eligible students in the same grades as such public school students;

(C) provide assessment results and other relevant information to the Secretary or to the entity conducting the evaluation under section 9 so that the Secretary or the entity, respectively, can conduct an evaluation that shall include, but not be limited to, a comparison of the academic achievement of participating eligible students in the assessments described in this subsection to the achievement of—

(i) students in the same grades in the District of Columbia public schools; and

(ii) the eligible students in the same grades in District of Columbia public schools who sought to participate in the scholarship program but were not selected; and

(D) disclose any personally identifiable information only to the parents of the student to whom the information relates; and

(2) describes how the eligible entity will ensure that the parents of each student who applies for a scholarship under this title (regardless of whether the student receives the scholarship), and the parents of each student participating in the scholarship program under this title, agree that the student will participate in the assessments used by the District of Columbia Public Schools to assess the achievement of District of Columbia public school students under section 1111(b)(3)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(3)(A)), for the period for which the student applied for or received the scholarship, respectively.

(d) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—The Secretary and Mayor of the District of Columbia shall jointly select an independent entity to evaluate annually the performance of students who received scholarships under the 5-year pilot program under this title, and shall make the evaluations public. The first evaluation shall be completed and made available not later than 9 months after the entity is selected pursuant to the preceding sentence.

(e) TEACHER QUALITY.—Each teacher who instructs participating eligible students under the scholarship program shall possess a college degree

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I yield the floor.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. REID are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The Senator from Arizona.

DO-NOT-CALL REGISTRY

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of H.R. 3161, the FTC's ratification of authority for the Do Not Call Registry, under the following conditions: 45 minutes under the control of the chairman of the Commerce Committee or his designee, and 45 minutes under the control of the ranking member or his designee; of the time under the control of the ranking member, the following Senators be recognized to speak for up to 5 minutes each: Senators HOLLINGS, DORGAN, CONRAD, KOHL, PRYOR, SCHUMER, and FEINSTEIN, with the remaining time under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee; further, that no amendments be in order to the bill; and that upon the use or yielding back of time, the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to a vote on passage of the bill, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I only ask that the ranking member, Senator HOLLINGS, be given up to 10 minutes out of the 45 minutes under his control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modified request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I think everyone should be advised that if all the time is used, we will vote at about 5:35 on final passage of this most important legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I will be glad for the time to be 10 minutes for Senator HOLLINGS, but I remind my friend from Nevada, Senator HOLLINGS will be controlling the time. So he will be granting himself as much time as he may use because the unanimous consent request is that the time will be under the control of the ranking member or his designee.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Arizona, Senator HOLLINGS is the ranking member, and the unanimous consent request does say that. However, he is going to speak and then turn the time over to the ranking member of the subcommittee, Senator DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mr. MCCAIN. Good. But I have always proceeded under the assumption that Senator HOLLINGS can speak whenever he wants to, for however long he wants to. I have found that it has improved our relationship.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3161) to ratify the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to establish a do-not-call registry.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, does the Senator from South Carolina care to speak at this time?

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, marketers assault Americans' privacy every day. Businesses track everything we buy and everything we do. It seems the marketers know more about our lives than we do ourselves. It is intrusive, and Americans want the tools to fight back.

But those of us who work to protect Americans' privacy are thwarted every step of the way. The marketers oppose antispam legislation. The marketers oppose decency limits on advertising to children. And the marketers oppose legislation that would allow Americans to "opt-out" of the sharing of their personal information, including financial records.

The one success we have had is the Do Not Call list. The public's vociferous reaction to the court decision yesterday shows the country's desire to win refuge from the marketing onslaught. The public wants the Do Not Call registry. And the public wants the registry to become active next week. We will make sure that happens.

But we have several Johnny-Come-Latelys to our cause. When I was chairman of the Commerce Committee last Congress, we worked with the FTC to create the Do Not Call Registry. But we didn't get much help from the other side. Instead we were unfairly criticized by interest groups for jeopardizing their funding.

We fought to win \$18 million for the registry in the omnibus appropriations bill last year. But the House wanted language that would prohibit using that funding absent explicit Congressional authorization. The House language could have stopped the registry. Again, it was an uphill battle, and we had few allies. But we eventually got the bad language removed, giving the FTC the funds to implement the Do Not Call Registry.

Once the FTC opened the list to registration, the response from the American public was overwhelming. By yesterday, Americans had registered more than 50 million phone numbers. South Carolinians have registered 685,393 phone numbers—486,533 through the FTC Web site, 198,855 via phone, and 5 through hearing-impaired devices. The marketers argued that Americans did not want the Do Not Call list, but the American public proved them wrong. Americans want this tool. They want the assault on their privacy to stop. Once news reports showed the Do Not

Call Registry was popular, many converted to the cause. And some of them are leading the charge today. We appreciate their support now as we try to overturn a clearly flawed court decision.

To prepare for compliance on October 1, 2003, nearly 5,000 telemarketers have purchased all or parts of the list. Therefore, telemarketers acting in good faith are ready to comply next week.

A telemarketer that ignores the Do Not Call list is subject to an \$11,000 fine for each call to a phone number on the Do Not Call Registry. The law requires telemarketers to search the registry every 3 months and synchronize their call lists.

Once consumers register a number on the Do Not Call list, telemarketers are prohibited from calling the number for the purpose of selling goods and services. Consumers who receive sales calls after their number has been in the registry for three months can file a complaint on the FTC web site or call 1-888-382-1222.

The Do Not Call list will not hurt charities seeking to raise money for worthy causes. Charities may still hire professional telemarketers to seek donations. But calls during which a charity or telemarketer seeks to sell something are prohibited to phone numbers on the Do Not Call Registry.

This Do Not Call Registry has been a long time in coming. We are going to take the final step today. The court decision yesterday may even have given the Do Not Call Registry more publicity, encouraging even more people to register their phone numbers.

Opponents of Americans' privacy should take notice: Americans want tools and choices, such as the Do Not Call Registry, to protect their precious time with their families. They also want to protect their private medical and financial information and protect their children from indecent advertising. We will keep fighting.

Mr. President, let's thank Chairman Tim Muris of the Federal Trade Commission, who came to the Commerce Committee last year. And we put in S. 2946, the Do Not Call bill, with some \$5 million that was requested. Later on, we found there were well organized holds, whereby we could not even get this bill up for consideration. Yes, we reported it favorably from the Commerce Committee, but we could not get it on the floor to pass it. And it was needed.

Chairman Muris came to me and said he needed \$15 million. I talked with Chairman GREGG earlier this year, and in the omnibus bill, with the Federal Trade Commission appropriations, we increased it to \$18 million. We could see the demand and see the interest and see the need. So we did just that.

It is good that my distinguished chairman, the Senator from Arizona, is on the Senate floor because the opposition was that it was not authorized. I go right to my experience for over 30

some years on the State-Justice-Commerce Committee, where we have had difficulty over the years passing, for example, an FBI authorization bill.

I remember for a period of almost 20 years we had no authorization. We worked with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to make sure their wants were taken care of. But we provided the bill; the same with respect to State Department authorization.

So I would only admonish the distinguished jurist who made this ruling about authorization that, yes, the Senator from Arizona is jointly correct with respect to the rules of the Senate but not with respect to the Constitution.

Once you receive three readings in the House and three readings in the Senate, and it is signed by the President of the United States, we have no doubt that law would take effect and this order of the court would be set aside.

However, the triggering date is the first of October, next week, and so I commend my House colleagues and those on the Senate side, and my chairman, Senator MCCAIN, in taking this up at this particular time so we can go ahead and take the House bill.

There are many interested in separate bills, and what have you. But right to the point, time is of the essence. Fifty million Americans cannot be wrong, they are all interested in stopping the calls.

With that, let me yield, then, to the distinguished chairman, and then to Senator DORGAN, who will control the time on the floor.

I thank the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I thank Senator HOLLINGS for all his efforts on this legislation. I think he was not a Member of the Senate when the Federal Trade Commission was created, but very close to it, and he has been heavily involved with all the issues surrounding the FTC and the good works they do.

I will speak very briefly. I would like to thank Senator ENSIGN and Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator DORGAN, Senator DEWINE, and many other Senators, but particularly those including the distinguished ranking member, Senator HOLLINGS, for all their efforts regarding this legislation and, more importantly, this issue.

Two days ago, a Federal district court in Oklahoma issued an opinion that could stall the FTC's implementation of a National Do Not Call Registry scheduled to go into effect next Wednesday. The court opined that the FTC was not authorized to create a Do Not Call Registry. I must say that opinion came as an amazing surprise to those of us who have been involved in this issue, and served as a rallying cry for tens of millions of Americans households that have signed up for the registry.

I understand the judge received so many calls from irate Americans that the FTC could not get through to the court regarding the Commission's appeal. Clearly, the court's decision was misguided.

The measure before us makes crystal clear that the Commission can and should proceed as planned with the Do Not Call list. Earlier this year, in two separate measures, Congress ratified the FTC's Do Not Call Registry by explicitly providing for the Commission to collect fees to pay for it. Today Congress is once again saying, dispositively and unambiguously, that the FTC has the authority it needs to create a National Do Not Call list.

When the FTC proposed to create this registry, I don't think they or even Members of this body had any idea how strongly it would be embraced by a public tired of having their precious leisure time filled with a seemingly incessant string of telephone solicitations.

I understand the FTC's Web site for registering on the Do Not Call list became the fastest growing Web site in history.

One of my favorite programs is "Seinfeld." In one of the episodes that has become famous in reruns, Jerry Seinfeld answers the phone and it is a telemarketer. He says: I am busy right now. Can I call you back at home?

And of course the telemarketer says: No, you are not allowed to do that. You wouldn't like that. Well, neither do I. And he hung up the phone.

Obviously, the issue of telemarketing involves the free enterprise system. Nothing in this legislation would inhibit their ability from practicing that, but it also balances the right of private citizens not to be disturbed if they choose not to be.

During a peak period, the FTC's Web site received approximately 1,000 hits per second. On the first day alone, 3.4 million consumers visited the Web site. In the first 10 days, 10 million phone numbers had been registered. Within the first month, the number had risen to 28 million—quite a remarkable evolution. To date, over 50 million phone numbers have been registered, including nearly 1.2 million in my State of Arizona.

Congress is often accused of being slow to respond. Thankfully, that charge can't be leveled here. Just a few hours ago the House passed this legislation by a vote of 412 to 8. Whenever you see a number like that, you are always curious who the eight are, but the curious decision of one court should not be allowed to frustrate the clear will of Congress and the even clearer will of tens of millions of Americans.

Obviously, we urge our colleagues to support the measure, give consumers what they want by empowering them to say no to what they clearly do not want.

I thank all of my colleagues who have responded to the predictable but certainly overwhelming response to the

court's decision in the State of Oklahoma. That judge in the district court will become well known to many Americans as well.

I thank all my colleagues for coming and speaking on this issue. I thank them for their support. Although there is not a need for the yeas and nays, some of our colleagues may want to be on record. So we may want to do so depending on the desires of my friend from North Dakota, a man who understands the will of the populace especially where telecommunications issues are concerned.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I compliment my colleagues, Senator MCCAIN and Senator HOLLINGS. This is an important issue, one we believed we had previously resolved only to learn that a court ruled that the Do Not Call list developed by the Federal Trade Commission was "not authorized."

Most of us in Congress and the Senate are surprised by that. Clearly, we authorized that. But if a court needs another authorization, it is something we can certainly do on a Thursday afternoon at 4:15. So this will be done with the support of many colleagues, and I am pleased to say that this is good public policy.

Let me make a couple of comments about the substance. There may be some people who are terribly lonely and whose phone seldom rings except to have an advertiser of a credit card or a long-distance service call during meal time just wanting to visit about their product. There may be some people who welcome those calls, just talk the ear off these telemarketers. I can't say that for sure, but this country is full of very interesting people. As for me and for most of the American people, getting a telephone call in the middle of a meal or getting a telephone call at all hours of the day and night to have someone tell us that we really need a new long-distance service or a preapproved credit card gets a little annoying. Unsolicited phone calls are an intrusion on the phone line that most American people pay every month to have in their home.

I come from a sparsely populated State, a wonderful place. It is 10 times the size of the Massachusetts landmass, with 642,000 people. It is spread out. We understand the importance of communications. We understand the importance of telephones. It took a long while to get telephones to the outer reaches of our country, including rural areas. Now with modern communications, we also understand that we are not alone in our homes.

There are those who are working in large banks of employees who are randomly, with computers, calling telephone numbers from banks of telephone books, getting people on the line. And by the way, because these computers dial multiple numbers at once, when one person answers, per-

haps a second person is answering a nanosecond later, no one will be on the line when they answer. That happens often. People should understand that comes from unsolicited phone calls with computer banks making calls. One person answers; the other doesn't get an answer. That is what is happening. It is enormously annoying.

Do people have an inherent right to make solicitation calls? Yes. But the other question is, Do people who pay for their telephone service each month have a right to put their name on a registry saying: I really don't want these calls; don't have them come into my telephone instrument; I pay for the instrument and I don't want to be annoyed and I don't want to be interrupted by them? Do people have that right? Of course, they do. That is what this issue is about.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs in the Commerce Committee last year, I held hearings on this. At one of the reauthorization hearings for the FTC, we had an entire panel devoted to the discussion of a do not call registry. We had a hearing in which the Federal Trade Commission came up, the Commissioners themselves, and talked to us about this issue. I had a member of the Federal Trade Commission come to Fargo, ND. We held a public hearing there on this subject. This is not a foreign or strange subject to me nor to most of my colleagues. As a result of that, we took action in reauthorizing the Federal Trade Commission to include funding to allow them to put together a Do Not Call Registry.

If you wonder whether the American people care about this, just remember these numbers. They put together a Do Not Call Registry and said to the people: If you think these unsolicited telephone calls are bothersome to you, if it is an intrusion on your family and an interruption to your life and annoying to you and you want to stop them, call and put your telephone number and your name on this registry.

Guess what. In virtually a nanosecond, 50 million Americans have said: Count me out. I don't want to be a part of this unsolicited phone call mess going on. Put my name on the list and get rid of these phone calls. In the State of North Dakota, 131,000 people said: We don't want these calls. We don't want the interruptions. We don't want the annoyance. Stop it.

Now one court has said somehow this is not operative, effective, because it is not authorized. So this afternoon the House will authorize it, the Senate will authorize it, and the bill will go to the President and be signed.

I hope this court will understand that not only was it authorized, but we were pleased this afternoon to authorize it a second time just to reinforce our determination with the American people that we believe they have the power and they ought to have the ability to stop these calls.

Let me make just a couple of additional points. Some say this is an im-

portant industry making these telephone calls, doing marketing. The answer is, sure, it is. It employs people. We are not saying with this legislation that you cannot make unsolicited phone calls. We are saying the American people, however, have a right to decide they don't want to be part of it; I don't want to receive them. This is empowering the American people.

If there are people, as I said, who are lonely, have no one to talk to, who sit around all day with a desire to visit with somebody, if they want to get these phone calls, God bless them. Let them get the phone calls, let them get the credit cards and sign up for multiple long-distance services, and let them visit until they are visited out. I assume there are a few of those people. But in most cases the American people are saying: Put my name on the list. I don't want to be interrupted. I don't want unsolicited phone calls, especially during mealtime.

There is this peculiar quality of this industry to call only when dinner or supper is ready. Lord only knows how that occurs, but it does. So today we have said we are going to authorize this explicitly once again, so that this Do Not Call list will not be interrupted. People whose names are on that list will be assured they will not receive unsolicited calls.

I say to my colleague, Senator ENSIGN, I know he is working on this issue and has introduced legislation, and my colleague, Senator FEINSTEIN, and others—again, we have worked hard on this in the Commerce Committee, going back to last July—July 17, at the reauthorization hearing I chaired. I will not go through all the negotiations that went on with appropriations and the reauthorization, but suffice it to say we believed very strongly the FTC should have taken the action they did. We provided the funding. We implicitly provided authorization for it, and today we are once again reauthorizing that which we have previously done just to satisfy some court in some corner of America, and in order to give comfort to those 50 million Americans and the at least 130,000 North Dakotans who have said: Take my name off this list. The American people have that right. This legislation allows them to keep that right. It is very important.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. President, I thank the cosponsors of our legislation, especially my chief cosponsors, Senator FEINSTEIN from California, Senator DORGAN, Senator MCCAIN, and Senator DEWINE, as well as the 47 original cosponsors. I thank them all for being original cosponsors.

The legislation, however, we are dealing with now is identical legislation sent over by the House because of a procedural matter. I am very excited that this legislation is going to be

passed in just a little over an hour from now, because I think this is very important legislation just for the peace of mind of a lot of the people at home.

People say, "Have you heard about this from your constituents?" A lot of people who don't follow politics are talking about this issue in the last couple of days. They have talked about it for years, but they have heard about it in the news. They are talking about it around the water cooler and they are talking about it wherever there is a coffee shop, wherever they are, because they want to make sure that on October 1, when the Do Not Call list is supposed to be starting to be enforced, that it actually happens.

There are over 50 million Americans, as was said, who have signed up for this service. I am hazarding a guess, but I would say in the coming months there are going to be tens of millions more who will sign up for this because so many people don't want to be bothered. As Senator DORGAN talked about, the people who don't mind being bothered—for them, they don't have to sign up for the Do Not Call list. If they want to continue to receive all those offers at home from telemarketers who are trying to sell a product—if people want to receive those calls at home—I don't, but a lot of people probably want them—it is their right to have that coming into their household. I know in our household we get bothered by this a lot, and you hate being rude to people when they call up on the telephone. Nobody likes to get a call during dinner. You happen to have the phone all the way across the room. You get up and you walk across the room, and all of a sudden you realize it is a telemarketer. You are a little irritated and you don't want to be mean, but at the same time you don't want to be bothered. This Do Not Call list stops that from happening because the penalties in the Do Not Call list legislation are such that these telemarketers are going to stop.

So it is, to me, very exciting that we are actually going to act very quickly after what I believe the judge did was wrong. But that is fine; the Senate and the House have quickly acted on this bill. We are going to make sure there is no question in the court's mind that this bill is authorized.

I will conclude with this, and I will yield 5 minutes to my friend from Montana. It is really summed up in the Jerry Seinfeld episode where a telemarketer calls him and he asks the telemarketer, "Can I have your phone number?" The telemarketer says, "Why?" Jerry says, "Because I want to call you during dinnertime and bother you." Of course, the telemarketer doesn't want to do that. But that is how people feel. They want to call them and bug them to let them know how they feel. That is the way people feel all across America.

It is important that we pass this legislation, and it is great to see the bipartisan support for it.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Nevada. I am wondering if the Senator from California wants to speak, if we are going back and forth here. I don't want to preempt her.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. There is no problem. I merely wanted to thank everybody. We heard about this through my Judiciary counsel, who follows the courts, and we came to the floor and indicated we were going to put this together and we got a number of cosponsors. It was really Senator DORGAN who worked out all of the protocols involved.

I thank the Commerce Committee, Senator MCCAIN, and Senator HOLLINGS, for their work on this issue. I didn't realize the depth of involvement that had existed. I find the court's decision so out of whack with what has happened. So I am very pleased and I thank the Senator from Montana for his courtesy.

I am glad to see that so many of our fellow colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, have joined us in this important and urgent effort, and that we were able to take up this legislation so quickly, in record time. It was only about 24 hours ago that I first raised this issue on the Senate floor.

Our bill is identical in language to the bill introduced in the House of Representatives, and we expect one or both of the bills to pass today.

The bill simply confirms what we all already thought was true, that the Federal Trade Commission has the authority to implement a "Do-Not-Call" Registry.

We in Congress must act quickly, because this registry is due to go into effect in just 1 week on October 1. Literally tens of millions of Americans have registered their phone numbers not to be called by telemarketers.

I have rarely seen an issue where so many millions of Americans have made their strong preferences known.

Are we going to simply tell them that this was all a myth? Or is Congress going to act to honor our earlier commitments and to protect this important right to privacy? These citizens expect us to act—and I believe that the momentum is clearly on our side.

If allowed to stand, the decision made by an Oklahoma district court judge that the National Do-Not-Call Registry would strike a powerful blow against the basic private interests of millions of Americans.

Right now, these people are subjected to unwanted and annoying marketing calls to their homes at all times of the day, including the dinner hour.

According to industry estimates, about 60 million telemarketing calls are made daily. With advances in technology and declining telephone costs, consumers would face the prospect of

an unprecedented barrage of calls. And this is why the registry is so important.

The FTC's registry will give Americans who want to avoid these unsolicited sales pitches a chance to stop annoying intrusions into their home.

As we know, tens of millions of Americans have registered more than 50 million phone numbers for this program. In the end, the Federal Trade Commission expects 60 percent of the Nation's households with approximately 60 million home phone lines to sign on to the registry.

This registry is crucial because it puts consumers in charge of the number of telemarketing calls they receive. Telemarketers who disregard the registry could be fined up to \$11,000 per call.

The Oklahoma district court yesterday ruled that the Do Not Call Registry is "invalid"—that is the word the judge used in his decision—because it was created without congressional authority.

I find this conclusion surprising since Congress passed H.R. 395, the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act on February 13 of this year. The legislation clearly authorizes the Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Communications Commission to collect fees sufficient to implement the registry. And the Appropriations Committee granted \$18 million for the program.

I also note that the FTC's rule came after an exhaustive comment period. The FTC announced its plan to proceed with the registry on December 18, 2002, after receiving 64,000 comments. The overwhelming majority of these comments favored the creation of the registry.

Millions of Americans were promised protection from annoying, unwanted telemarketing calls starting October 1. They are outraged—and so are we—by this setback.

Congress must move now and unanimously adopt and pass legislation which grants the authority to the FTC, clearly and unequivocally—so that no Federal judge can misunderstand it.

Many of us were taken by surprise yesterday, but by putting this legislation to a vote now, we are doing the right thing. On October 1, let's make sure that the millions of Americans who want their privacy protected from these telemarketers are not disappointed.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the Commerce Committee and everybody on the committee. You are probably hearing from the core of that committee today, reacting to the disappointment that we have gotten from the Oklahoma Federal District Court preventing the Federal Trade Commission from going forward and implementing the Do Not Call list.

The Do Not Call legislation turned out to be the most popular and probably the most necessary consumer initiative we have ever passed in the history of this body. From day one, people started to sign up; that was June 26. Up until now—you have heard the figures—over 50 million people have registered, and 138,000 of those are in Montana.

So urgent was the public's need to stop intrusive telemarketers that in the first 14 hours of enrollment on June 16, 650,000 people called up. That gives us some idea of how consumers think of these telemarketers.

The ill-considered decision yesterday by the Federal District Court in Oklahoma would prevent the Do Not Call list from going into effect next Wednesday. The decision is dead wrong and its core assumption is that the FTC acted without statutory authority in creating and administering the Do Not Call list.

Let us make it very clear, Congress clearly granted the FTC the authority to set up the Do Not Call list by passing the Do Not Call Implementation Act in February of this year. The act gave the agency authority to collect fees from telemarketers and to establish and enforce the list. In fact, the Omnibus Appropriations Act in February also authorized the FTC to enforce the Do Not Call list.

Rather than waiting around for an appeals court to overturn this wrong-headed decision, I am certainly glad the Congress has taken action very swiftly. It did not take long. In fact, one of my good friends who does not serve in this body anymore, who served from North Carolina, said this is almost a June bug issue, and it really is. We do not have to put Americans through unwarranted intrusions into their lives by telemarketing, and so we will pass this today.

I tell my good friend from North Dakota, my wife has it all figured out about telemarketers. We both may be home; the call comes in: Is Mr. BURNS there? She says: I will call him—whether I am there or not. She lays the phone down and goes off and leaves it until we hear the little disconnect: "If you are trying to place a call, please hang up and try again." So that is our attitude towards that.

By any estimate, telemarketers attempt almost 105 million calls daily. The implementation of the Do Not Call list would reduce these calls by almost 80 percent, and those are figures that are out now. So if they do not get the message by talking to a telephone that does not have an ear on the other end of it, then we will take care of it this way.

People are rightly sick and tired of this endless interruption into their private lives. So I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I thank my good friend from Nevada for allowing me this time, and Senator DORGAN and the chairman of the full committee for acting this swiftly, because this takes care of it.

Let's make no bones about it, they clearly had the authority. They clearly had the funds to implement it. We gave it to them in appropriations and we gave them the authority this year. The telemarketers did not choose to abide by that law. So I heartily commend my good friends for offering this legislation.

By the way, if I am not on the list, you may put me on the list.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator INOUE as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. DORGAN. I was just recollecting, as the Senator from Montana was speaking, telemarketing is, of course, a legitimate business. It is an important business in many respects. But the point that my colleague, Senator ENSIGN, made is the American people also have their right, and their right is to put their name on a list to say, I do not want unsolicited calls.

They call almost everyone. I received a call some long while ago from a telemarketer. I answered the phone, and the telemarketer said: May I speak to Haley Dorgan please? I could tell immediately it was a telemarketer. I said: You could, but I do not think she is going to buy anything. She is 4 years old.

They get lists and they just blizzard the country with telephone calls to young and old. It is indiscriminate, and that is why this fervor has grown in this country to do something about giving the American people the right to say they do not want these unsolicited calls. That is what this legislation will do.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. KOHL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. KOHL. Yesterday, a Federal judge in Oklahoma voided the Federal Trade Commission's national Do Not Call list that was set to go into effect next week. This action frustrates the wishes of more than 48 million Americans who have signed up for the list.

I am pleased that we will overturn that judge's questionable decision today. Americans have spoken very clearly on this issue and it is our responsibility to respond. Though a judge ruled that the FTC lacked congressional authority to create this national Do Not Call Registry, I strongly disagree and believe that earlier this year Congress explicitly granted the Commission both the authority and the funding to create the registry.

Indeed, absent congressional action, the FTC's Do Not Call initiative would have failed to become a reality this year. I discussed the matter with FTC Chairman Tim Muris at a hearing before the Antitrust Subcommittee last September. He asked me for help in getting congressional authority in

order to raise fees necessary to implement the Do Not Call list. We were able to grant the Commission this authority in the consolidated appropriations resolution which passed in February of this year. We further authorized the FTC's list in the Do Not Call Implementation Act on March 11, 2003.

These actions more than authorized the FTC's rulemaking in my view. That said, this bill will make it crystal clear that Congress endorses, supports, and authorizes the FTC to create a national Do Not Call Registry.

I commend the FTC's hard work to create a national Do Not Call list. Such action was long overdue. The deluge of telemarketing sales calls is the number one consumer complaint in this country. It is a problem that has gotten out of control. The average American receives two to three telemarketing calls per day. Some estimate that the telemarketing industry is able to make 560 calls per second or roughly 24 million calls per day. No wonder people feel like they are under siege in their own home.

Wisconsin recently implemented a similar, statewide Do Not Call list last year. During the first 3-month registration period, more than 2 million residents placed their phone numbers on the list, which is 40 percent of Wisconsin's population. Such a positive response demands further action at the Federal level. That is why we in Congress acted earlier this year to ensure that the FTC's Do Not Call list became a reality. Should we need to do more to overcome a court's objections, we can and shall do it today. Providing consumers the option to stop telemarketing calls is something on which we can all agree.

Given the enormous response of nearly 50 million Americans who have signed up in less than 3 months, the Do Not Call list is clearly needed. Though I am troubled by the court's decision, we can set the record straight and authorize the FTC's action. I urge quick passage of this legislation so that the Do Not Call list can start up as scheduled on October 1, 2003.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, unless the Senator from Nevada has time he wants to consume, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. PRYOR.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their hard work on this issue. It is a very important issue for people all across the country.

Yesterday, I received the news that the Federal court in Oklahoma had decided that we had no authority over the Federal Do Not Call list.

I must tell you that as a United States Senator and as a former attorney general and as a lawyer and just as a citizen, I have all the respect in the world for our Federal courts and our judges and our legal system. I just happen to think they were wrong in this ruling.

At the same time, I am proud to join with my colleagues, both in the Senate and in the House, in efforts to try to

make sure the courts understand that very clearly there is authority for the Federal Trade Commission to establish a National Do Not Call list.

I think it is very clear that the people have spoken on this issue. Back in February of this year, the Congress passed what we thought was the authorization and the funding for Do Not Call. Then, just a few weeks later, President Bush signed it into law.

I know a lot of people have been sharing their stories about telemarketers. I can tell you from firsthand experience, from back in 1998 when I traveled the State of Arkansas extensively, running for attorney general—that is what I did before I was elected to this august body—everywhere I went, it seemed as though every community I went into, every group I talked to, it didn't matter who they were, what they had on their mind, they wanted to talk about telemarketing. They would say: Please, is there anything you can do to have these telemarketers stop calling us?

I said: Yes. We in Arkansas had one of the first—not the very first but one of the first—State do not call systems that we passed in 1999. It had very few exceptions to it. It was something we were proud of. We had to charge \$5 because, where Congress appropriated some dollars for this Federal system, we did not have a State legislative appropriation for our State system. But regardless of that, even though we charged for it, we had thousands upon thousands of Arkansans sign up for our State do not call system.

I tell you, everywhere I go in Arkansas today, people still thank me for the State's do not call system.

One thing we learned during that process was that for most people, telemarketers' calls are an annoyance. People get tired of being bothered during dinnertime, when they are trying to do the homework with the children, when they are trying to put the kids down—whatever the case may be. But for some Americans, a small percentage, telemarketing also has the element of fraud to it.

Many people in this country—mostly seniors but not all, but many people in this country are taken advantage of via the telephone. If you look at the FBI statistics—I haven't seen the most recent round, but I was familiar with them in my 4 years in the attorney general's office—it is a small percentage of fraud, but let me tell you, it is a lot of dollars every single year. It is millions upon millions of dollars that are swindled away from people by use of the telephone.

I want to touch on something that Senator DORGAN said a few moments ago. The telemarketing industry is not evil. They are just doing their job. We understand that. We appreciate that. It is a legitimate industry. It is an industry that has a lot of hard-working people in it. They do a lot of great things. We are not critical of the industry *per se*.

We know there are some bad actors out there. I think a National Do Not

Call program will help clear up those bad actors, just like we have been able to do on a State-by-State basis, when the States pass these kinds of provisions.

But telemarketing is, for many Americans, an annoyance that they just do not want to have. After all, we are talking about the privacy of people's homes. They should be able to have some control over the types of calls they get.

If they get solicitations, if they don't want those, there should be some mechanism where they can shut those off on the front end. That is what the Federal Do Not Call program will do. That is why I think you have seen so many people in the House and in the Senate come to the respective floors today and argue that we should take this step that we are about to take today.

One last point. In the last few weeks, ever since it was announced with toll-free numbers and Web sites that there would be a Federal Do Not Call program, and how to sign up, et cetera, there have been about 50 million phone numbers added to this list. That is an amazing number. Fifty million Americans can't be wrong.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent Senator REID of Nevada be added as an original cosponsor.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Might I just in less than a minute say we have not mentioned on the Senate floor, and we should, that the Federal Communications Commission took action that was complementary and action that coordinates with the Federal Trade Commission because action was needed by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to common carriers in areas under their jurisdiction to also create a do not call list, which is expansive.

So while I, with some of my colleagues, have been critical of the Federal Communications Commission on other issues on the Senate floor in recent weeks, I did want to say that the Federal Communications Commission deserves our plaudits and deserves credit for moving very quickly to fill in a gap with respect to a do not call list. All of our discussion is about the Federal Trade Commission, but, again, I think the Federal Trade Commission has contributed substantially, and I compliment them for that, with the leadership of Michael Powell and all the Commissioners.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ENSIGN. I ask unanimous consent Senator Don Nickles be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I want to spend a couple of minutes talking a little more about this legislation. First of all, this chart that we have in back of us—this graphs the calls and online registering to the Do Not Call center. This started June 27, 2003, which is the far left side of the graph. In blue or purple there is the amount of e-mails that came in, the way the people registered on line.

In the middle is 1-888-382-1222, the telephone number. About 11 million came in there. In the yellow at the bottom which started in July, about 8.5 million people came in. Those were numbers that came in from the States.

There are over 31 million people just since June 27 who have registered online. So we see, for a total of a little over 50 million people, how rapidly people have signed up to say we do not want to receive telemarketing phone calls.

The key is people are saying we don't want to be bothered. Part of freedom, it seems to me, is the freedom from being bothered by people when you are in your own home. Telemarketers contend that, just as if they are sending mail, somebody who is sending mail to somebody's home, they have the right to call somebody in their home.

The American people are saying no; we don't want to receive those phone calls. Mail they can just glance at and throw away. They don't actually have to get on the telephone and speak to somebody. Telemarketers require somebody to pick up the phone. If it is ringing, you have to go because you don't want to miss an important phone call. Maybe your kids are out or something, you don't want to miss an important phone call, and it turns out to be a telemarketer.

Nowadays, because of answering machines, you have a situation where you come home and it says: Hi, this is Fred—or this is Lisa or whoever it is. Please give me a call my number is, and you don't know who it is.

Then you call the number back and you find out it is a telemarketer. So you have just now wasted the time listening to the message, and you have wasted the time making the telephone call.

So we have people stealing valuable time, and time is our most precious commodity. That is why so many people want to sign up for the Do Not Call list.

We want to remind people—and I think this is going to happen a lot—that the telephone number is 1-888-382-1222. That is the number that people will be able to call, and can call today to sign up for when this goes into effect on October 1. They just call up, very simple, add their name, give them their telephone number, add it to the list.

If they want to register on line, it is on the World Wide Web, donotcall.gov. It is all small letters. They go on there, they sign up, put their telephone numbers in, and they are added to the list.

It is simple for people to do. I think the simplicity is why it has been so wildly successful up to this point.

On October 1, when it goes into effect, that is when people will start having some peace of mind at home. At a time where families need more time together, they need more time to talk, I think it is important, especially around dinnertime when there are so many distractions—that is a prime time for telemarketers to call, at dinner time. Families don't have enough time together as it is now. I think to have those distractions around dinner-time is even more disruptive of that important family time.

We need to encourage families to be together. This certainly will result in fewer interruptions around the dinner table. That is why I so strongly support the legislation and why I sponsored this legislation to repeal what the Federal judge did in Oklahoma.

I don't currently see anyone who wishes to speak. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to address the judicial action that would temporarily prevent the National Do Not Call Registry from going into effect.

This privacy-oriented program was recently implemented by the Federal Trade Commission and was supposed to go into effect by October 1. That is just about a week away.

I am proud to join my colleague from Nevada, the ranking member of the Commerce Committee, Senator ENSIGN, in cosponsoring this bill. This bill ratifies the authority of the FTC to establish the National Do Not Call Registry and allows the program to go into effect as drafted by the FTC.

As you may or may not know, Alaska is about a 4-hour time difference from Washington, DC. It seems like just about my dinner hour in Alaska when telemarketers throughout the country get kicked into full gear. I know when my family and I are interrupted at the dinner table by these calls, we feel invaded. I can only imagine that my other friends and neighbors are equally upset. Sometimes we are outraged that our right to privacy is invaded every night when we are sitting down to have dinner with our families. Our lives are busy enough throughout the day with work, school, homework, and just

catching up with one another and preparing for the next day. The last thing in the world we want when we sit down for the quiet time is to be interrupted by the telemarketing company that believes it is their right to disturb us during our few minutes of family time.

Those who seek to stop the implementation of this program assert that they are protected by the right to free speech. I say it is the people who have the right to decide that they do not want to be hounded by telemarketers and those who would interrupt the sanctity of their homes.

The entire purpose of the FTC's National Do Not Call Registry program is to allow Americans to opt out of receiving these annoying phone calls. In my judgment, the court's decision to stop this program tilts the privacy rights out of balance in favor of those telemarketing companies.

In June, the Anchorage Daily News—which is my hometown newspaper—published an editorial supporting the National Do Not Call Registry. They wrote about an Alaskan by the name of Ron Hammett who says he sometimes gets two or three calls a day. Mr. Hammett is a 76-year-old retiree who spent more than 2 hours waiting to get through the registration process once the FTC rule came out. Now he is going to wake up today—or he woke up this morning—to find out that his time and the time of many other Alaskans was wasted.

In just a few short months since the FTC adopted these rules, nearly 50 million people have registered to stop these phone calls.

My State of Alaska has its own do not call program that was created in 1996—it is called the Black Dot Program—which allows telephone subscribers to elect to have a black dot placed next to their name in the Alaska phone books.

A computerized version of the list is made available to the telemarketers, but the problem is they are not required to use it. If they call any telephone customer with a black dot next to his or her name, they are subject to a fine of up to \$5,000, whether the telemarketer uses the list or not.

The problem with Alaska's statute is that there has been only one complaint filed since it was implemented. Most of the telemarketers are located outside the State of Alaska, and the State law doesn't have the teeth that the FTC rule contains to go after these outside groups. Alaskans, quite honestly, are looking forward to the implementation of this FTC rule to give them the peace and the quiet they have sought for so long. We need this FTC rule to protect our citizens and their privacy.

Americans have spoken. They don't like to be disturbed by unwanted and harassing phone calls from people selling products over the phone. Through this legislation we can have that peace and privacy within our own homes.

I am proud to cosponsor this legislation. I hope the body will act quickly

on this measure. I am very pleased to see us moving so rapidly at this point.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator PRYOR be added as a cosponsor to S. 1655.

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

The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I believe I have 5 minutes.

Mr. PRYOR. Yes. I yield 5 minutes of my time to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise in strong support of this legislation. In my time in the Senate, I have never seen legislation move so quickly through the House and Senate for any issue.

Why? There are three reasons. The first is, of course, the need for this legislation. Fifty million people have signed up on a registry and are expecting it to work October 1. We should fulfill those expectations. None of us, me included, because this has happened to my family when we sit down to dinner all the time, hopping up and down like jackrabbits to answer the phone and then hear someone on the phone trying to sell you something. It drives you crazy. No. 1 is the need.

No. 2 is the fact the court decision was so goofy. The bottom line is, if you read the legislative language, if you read the statutes, in my judgment, there is no question we granted authority. I think the judge went out of his way to try to throw out this list. This may be an example of judges making law rather than interpreting law that we have talked about for so long. On this, we all agree that we do not want the judge making law, particularly making law that so goes against the will of this Congress and the American people.

The bottom line is, our intent was clear from the language of the February 13, 2003, statute called the Do Not Call Implementation Act. I cannot understand how a court would conclude Congress would have directed the FTC to implement the registry if it had not assumed that it had authorized the FTC to make the registry, either in previous law or through the implementation act itself.

If this were not enough to demonstrate Congress's intent on this issue, on February 20, 2003, the Omnibus Appropriations Act was signed into law which authorized the FTC to "implement and enforce the do not call provisions of the Telemarketing Sales Act."

That is as clear as the nose on your face. The court's decision is based on an overly technical view that ignores the clear intent of Congress. So the second reason we are moving so quickly is this law was so poorly interpreted by the judge.

The third is this has a consensus behind it. It is needed. There are a lot of laws that are needed but do not have a consensus. It was thrown out by a court in a strange decision. There is almost a universal consensus that this is the right thing to do.

The telemarketing industry feels badly about this. I understand there are many people who work in this industry. They are going to have to find a way to telemarket—which is a good thing when people want telemarketing—they will have to refine their processes. I would not mind refining this list and allowing people to file, if we could technically, to say I only want to get calls about mortgages or I only want to get calls about garden tools, but not to subject everyone to answer the phone, particularly at dinner time and evening time when the family is home alone and relaxing. This has happened in my family. It does not make any sense.

It is a good law. I wish there were more days in Congress that we do important things in a bipartisan way without tarrying. Let's savor it while we can.

I make one additional point. This approach can also work for another problem facing American consumers very similar to the annoying telemarketing call: e-mail spam. As in telemarketing calls, spam traffic is also growing at a geometric rate. It has become more than an annoyance. It is now a real danger to the future of the e-mail part of the Internet. Fifty percent of all e-mail is spam. What was a simple annoyance last year has become a major concern this year and could cripple one of the greatest inventions of the 20th century next year if nothing is done. We should be doing the same thing against spam.

Admittedly, it is easier to cut off a telemarketer than a spammer, but the same basic concept applies and the telemarketing provisions worked. The anti-e-mail spam provisions are the best we have to deal with spam right now.

This morning the Judiciary Committee passed the Criminal Spam Act of 2003. I was proud to cosponsor that along with my colleagues, Senator HATCH and Senator LEAHY. For the first time that will criminalize some of the spammer's favorite tricks. Those that repeatedly use predatory practices to evade filtering software will face stiff punishment, including the potential of jail time, but we should add the registry to those provisions. I did not do that in committee today, but I hope we can do it on the floor when it comes forward.

A spam registry such as the Do Not Call Registry has broad consumer support. It has bipartisan support. Senator GRAHAM of South Carolina and I are the lead sponsors. The registry provides parents with the unique opportunity to register their children's e-mail addresses to prevent unwanted advertisements that go to our children

for pornography and lots of things the kids should not see.

I commend my colleagues for moving so quickly to defend consumers against unwanted telemarketing calls. Fifty million people cannot be wrong. I hope we will do the same and move with the same speed and urgency when we deal with e-mail spam and create an anti-e-mail spam registry as well.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, we all know that fraud can be very much a problem when it comes to telemarketing, but we also know a Do Not Call registry is a very positive consumer tool against fraud. By that I mean if you signed up for the National Do Not Call plan and you still get a call, you know something is up. That ought to be your first tip that something may be amiss with this call. This is another reason I thank my friend from New York for his very wise comments.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the Senator yielding to me. We are in the position of being able to yield back all of our time except 6 minutes for the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that following the next vote on passage of the Do Not Call legislation, the Senate immediately proceed to executive session and two consecutive votes on the following nominations on today's Executive Calendar: Calendar Nos. 359 and 360.

I further ask unanimous consent that there be 4 minutes equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to the second and third vote; further, that following the votes, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I yield back all time on our side.

Mr. REID. As soon as Senator DODD arrives, we will use the remainder of our time. We have been told he is on his way—from where, we do not know. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield the remaining time on our side to Senator DODD from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Connecticut has 6 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am confident my colleague from North Dakota will probably want to use 5 minutes of that 6 minutes. He probably has not exhausted every thought on the subject matter. I will be happy to yield back some of my time to him.

I wish to add my voice and thanks to the managers of this proposal and to commend the other body for their efforts in acting as quickly as they have on the subject matter. I am familiar enough with it because I introduced legislation about 2 years ago in this area. Connecticut was one of the early States—I know there have been a number of States that have adopted a do not call list—to adopt a do not call list in the year 2000. In December 2001, I introduced a bill very similar to the one Connecticut has produced. Either since then or before then, other States—including Alabama, Alaska, the home of the distinguished Senator MURKOWSKI, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, and others—have also enacted legislation.

This is a very positive outcome. Clearly, what has happened is, as we are talking about the use of the telephone, the telemarketing idea, America has phoned in and said to please give them some relief. We just would like a few minutes of privacy and quiet. It is hard enough to get a family together with all the pressures on them today. When you might just be able to get them to sit down for a meal, that phone starts ringing. What they are saying is: Give me the choice of saying I don't want to be bothered and buy this. They ought to have that right.

The obvious problem with this bill—I say it is a problem, but I am confident we can correct it; it is the difference between the bill I introduced several years ago and the one before us today—is the loophole that allows any prior business relationship to be an exception to the otherwise clear prohibition supported by this legislation.

As was pointed out in one news account in the last day or so, there has been a tremendous surge of telemarketing in the last number of weeks by businesses trying to establish a "prior business relationship" with a customer base in this country which would then allow them to become part of the exception even under this legislation.

The point I am making is, even though we will pass this bill—and I am very glad we are doing so; again, I commend the authors for moving as rapidly as they are on this legislation—we have not heard the end of this issue. There are going to be people coming back, once they discover that any prior business relationship pretty much will allow the exception to occur, which means you will have that phone continue to ring. And I presume they are going to be asking us to come back and even close the loophole down further.

Much as we have in Connecticut and as other States are doing this. As I've

said, Connecticut has enacted legislation and the bill I introduced mirrors my State's efforts in that regard.

Justice Brandeis said it so eloquently years and years ago, as he always could, this wonderful, brilliant mind of a Supreme Court Justice. He always had the ability of taking a difficult concept and simplifying it in terms that were so understandable by everyone. He said: Privacy is nothing more than the simple right to be left alone. That is what we are really talking about. He couldn't have imagined, when he said that, the technology that would make it possible for telemarketing to occur. But the right to be left alone is really at the heart of what we are talking about—the right to say to someone: You don't have the right to call me anytime you want. I should have some ability to control that intrusive invasion in the privacy of my family's life.

I am glad the Federal Trade Commission acted. It certainly made a difference. But clearly we need to respond to the court's decision in this matter, and we are doing that by adopting this legislation.

I am pleased to add my name as a cosponsor. I implore my colleagues in their respective committees to take a look at the bill I have introduced. I know others have introduced legislation, but take a look at this bill. Let's monitor what happens over the coming months to see if we are achieving the desired results that this legislation is designed to achieve. If not, we may have to go a bit further along the lines I have suggested. I am sure others have as well.

With that, I am pleased to be a part of this effort and congratulate the authors of it.

I yield back the remainder of the time.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, yesterday, the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma declared the Federal Trade Commission's national Do-Not-Call registry invalid after concluding that the Commission lacked the authority to implement the rule. Today, I stand here with my colleagues to set the record straight—H.R. 3161, which the House passed earlier this morning by a vote of 412-8, provides congressional authorization for the creation and implementation of the Do-Not-Call registry.

The Do-Not-Call registry provides a very important service—preventing undue intrusions from marketers. Citizens should have the right not to be disturbed by unsolicited calls in their own homes and the Do-Not-Call registry empowers citizens to stop these calls.

Support for the registry is unprecedented. To date, after only four months, the registry contains over 50 million phone numbers. In Maine alone, over 241,000 phone numbers have been registered and this number is growing everyday. Ultimately, the Federal Trade Commission expects 60 per-

cent of the Nation's households to sign onto the registry potentially blocking eighty percent of telemarketing calls.

Specifically, the Federal registry will supplement State Do-Not-Call lists. It works by requiring telemarketers to search the registry every 3 months and synchronize their call lists with the phone numbers on the registry. If you don't want to be disturbed by marketing calls, you simply register online with the FTC or call a toll free number and request that your telephone number be added to the registry. More importantly, this law has enforcement power—a telemarketer who disregards the national Do-Not-Call registry could potentially be fined up to \$11,000 for each call.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my disappointment at the Oklahoma Federal district court decision preventing the Federal Trade Commission from going forward on implementing the Do Not Call list.

The Do Not Call list has proven to be one of the most popular and necessary consumer initiatives in history. From the day consumers have been able to sign up for the Do Not Call list on June 26, over 50 million Americans have registered, including 138,841 in Montana. So urgent was the public's need to stop intrusive telemarketers that in the first 14 hours of enrollment on June 26, over 650,000 citizens added their numbers to the list.

Yesterday's ill-considered decision by the Federal district court in Oklahoma would prevent the Do Not Call list from going into effect next Wednesday. The decision is dead wrong in its core assumption that the FTC acted without statutory authority in creating and administering the Do Not Call list. In fact, Congress clearly granted the FTC the authority to set up the Do Not Call list by passing the Do Not Call Implementation Act in February of this year. This act gave the agency authority to collect fees from telemarketers to establish and enforce the list. The Omnibus Appropriations Act in February also authorized the FTC to enforce the do not call provisions.

Rather than waiting for an appeals court to overturn this wrongheaded decision, we must act quickly so that Americans do not have to suffer the needless and unwarranted intrusions into their lives by aggressive telemarketing. Unwanted telemarketing calls have reached unacceptable levels in our country. By one estimate, telemarketers attempt almost 105 million calls daily; implementation of the Do Not Call list would reduce these calls by almost 80 percent.

Americans are rightly sick and tired of these endless interruptions in their private lives, which often take place during the dinner hour, or at times when parents wish to spend uninterrupted quality time with their children. By responding rapidly to overturn this reckless and sloppy decision

by the Oklahoma district court, Congress sends a clear message that this destructive hyper-marketing will no longer be tolerated. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that would leave no doubt in anyone's mind as to the FTC's authority to maintain and implement the Do Not Call Registry.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I was disappointed to learn that early this week a Federal district judge issued a ruling to delay the October 1 implementation of the national Do Not Call Registry.

Sign-up for the national Do Not Call list began June 27. To date, the registry has grown to 50 million Americans who submitted their telephone numbers and unequivocally said they do not want to receive business solicitation calls.

There has been near unanimity that the Oklahoma Federal judge simply got it wrong when he found that Congress did not give the Federal Trade Commission the requisite statutory authority to create and implement a nationwide Do Not Call Registry.

To clarify the matter once and for all, the pending bill explicitly authorizes the Federal Trade Commission to compile and implement a Do Not Call Registry, pursuant to the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act.

The bill also ratifies the relevant provisions of the Telemarketing Sales Rules promulgated by the Commission early this year.

A nationwide Do Not Call Registry is particularly important to the citizens of New Jersey. Although 27 States already have local do not call lists, some States, such as my home State of New Jersey, have not yet enacted do not call legislation.

A New Jersey State law is expected to go into effect next spring, but the residents of New Jersey and the other 23 States deserve the protection that the FTC rule provides.

The FTC's rules are reasonable. They require telemarketers to check the Do Not Call list every 3 months to see who does not want to be called. Those who call listed people face fines up to \$11,000 for a violation. Consumers would be allowed to file complaints to an automated phone or online system.

There are about 166 million residential phone numbers in the United States and an additional 150 million cell-phone numbers. The FTC expects 60 percent of the Nation's households to sign onto the registry.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill which ratifies the FTC's Do Not Call Registry, permitting implementation of the registry on October 1.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important measure, which will likely pass the House and Senate by an overwhelming margin and in record speed. This bill makes it perfectly

clear that the Federal Trade Commission, FTC, has the authority to implement and enforce the Do Not Call program that until yesterday's court ruling was scheduled to go into effect on October 1. I am usually not in favor of quick legislative reaction to lower court decisions. We have an appellate process to determine if a lower court is mistaken, as this one surely was, and that process serves us well. However, this case is different, and I am pleased that this Congress is prepared to react so quickly and so decisively.

There is no doubt in my mind that the FTC has the authority to create the Do Not Call program. It is true that the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, TCPA, passed in 1991, allowed the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, not the FTC, to create a national database of telephone numbers from Americans who wanted to avoid telephone solicitation. But in 1995, in the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act, TCFAPA, Congress also directed the FTC to establish rules on telemarketing activities. The FCC and the FTC have jurisdiction over different telemarketers, so it makes sense that there is some overlapping authority.

The FTC initially promulgated the Telemarketing Sales Rule, TSR, which contained a variety of restrictions on telemarketing, such as prohibiting such calls between the hours of 9 pm and 8 am and requiring telemarketers to cease making calls to consumers who specifically request not to be contacted again. Complaints about telemarketing continued and in 2000, the FTC began a proceeding to consider revisions to the TSR. That led to the adoption of the national Do Not Call Registry. The FTC announced the final rule on December 18, 2002.

Just a few months ago, in March 2003, Congress passed and the President signed Do Not Call Implementation Act, DNCA. That statute authorized the FTC to collect fees sufficient to create and administer the database. The Consolidated Appropriations Act passed a month earlier also authorized the FTC to collect fees for the enforcement and implementation of the program, estimated at \$18.1 million for fiscal year 2003. With this history, it is as clear as day that Congress has at least ratified the FTC's view of its statutory authority to create the Do Not Call list. Simply put, the district court decision yesterday was wrong.

Mr. President, the public response and support for the Do Not Call program have been tremendous. Americans have voluntarily registered over 50 million phone numbers on the database. They have waited a long time for this measure to finally be implemented. Months ago, they began adding their phone numbers to the list with the expectation that on October 1, finally, the calls would stop. That is why we must act decisively to reverse the court decision. It adversely affects millions of people. It thwarts a good

program that has received overwhelming public support and participation. And it ignores clear evidence of congressional authorization. Even the few months that it would take to reverse the decision, and I am convinced it ultimately would be reversed, would be too long. The time has come for the national Do Not Call program to go into effect, and for Americans to be able to eat dinner or watch TV with their families free of interruptions by telephone solicitors. I am proud to support this bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I support the FTC's authority to establish a Do Not Call Registry, I find myself in good and widespread company. Many in the Senate, like many of my constituents in Vermont, share the frustration that I have with the recent district court decision striking down the Do Not Call Registry established at the Federal Trade Commission. Apparently we in Congress need to make things a little more clear, and this is what we are doing with this legislation: We authorize the FTC to set up and operate such a registry.

Vermont has been a leader in protecting the privacy and peace of its households from unwanted telemarketing calls. Federal law currently requires individual companies to remove consumers from their calling lists if the consumers ask them to do so. There is also a national "telephone preference service" registry to which consumers can submit their names and which telemarketers can consult to avoid calling those who do not wish to hear from them—but industry compliance is entirely voluntary. Two years ago, Vermont enacted a law which gives consumers a private right of action against companies that continue to call after being requested to cease. Vermonters can also sue if they are called by a telemarketer after they have put their name on the national "telephone preference service" registry. The FTC has expressed no intention of attempting to pre-empt such state systems, and I hope that federal agencies continue to respect the efforts and institutions established at the state level. Federal agencies should not be in the business of undercutting state efforts that are pursuing these same goals.

Those goals are simple and laudable. People should be able to enjoy the peace and quiet of their own homes, undisturbed by unsolicited sales calls. Of course, some consumers welcome such calls, and they certainly should be able to receive them. But for the thousands of Vermonters, and the millions of other Americans, who do not want to receive such calls, the FTC's Do Not Call Registry is a long-awaited relief. I understand that more than 50 million households have signed up, many of them, on-line, to be included in the Do Not Call Registry, which is set to begin its operations next week. This is an astonishing number of people, and this overwhelming response to the FTC's

announcement is the best possible affirmation of the need for and of the good sense of the plan.

The Do Not Call Registry should also appeal to enlightened telemarketers. They do not, of course, want to waste time and effort talking to people who do not wish to hear from them, for whatever reason. Once the registry is operational—and I hope that this bill will meet with speedy approval and make that so—telemarketers will be able to focus their resources, their time and personnel, on the households for which they provide a useful service. Consumers will be better served, the companies seeking to make sales will be better off, and telemarketers will be more effective for both their corporate clients and the potential customers they contact.

So I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill, H.R. 3161. The national Do Not Call Registry is a sensible way to protect the privacy of the American people. It deserves our support, and it deserves this effort to allow the registry to begin serving the public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 3161) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote "aye".

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 365 Leg.]

YEAS—95

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Akaka | Brownback | Collins |
| Alexander | Bunning | Conrad |
| Allard | Burns | Cornyn |
| Allen | Byrd | Corzine |
| Baucus | Campbell | Craig |
| Bayh | Cantwell | Crapo |
| Bennett | Carper | Daschle |
| Biden | Chafee | Dayton |
| Bingaman | Chambliss | DeWine |
| Bond | Clinton | Dodd |
| Boxer | Cochran | Dole |
| Breaux | Coleman | Domenici |

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Dorgan | Kohl | Reid |
| Durbin | Kyl | Roberts |
| Ensign | Landrieu | Rockefeller |
| Enzi | Lautenberg | Santorum |
| Feingold | Leahy | Sarbanes |
| Feinstein | Levin | Schumer |
| Fitzgerald | Lincoln | Sessions |
| Frist | Lott | Shelby |
| Graham (SC) | Lugar | Smith |
| Grassley | McCain | Snowe |
| Hagel | McConnell | Specter |
| Harkin | Mikulski | Stabenow |
| Hatch | Miller | Stevens |
| Hollings | Murkowski | Sununu |
| Hutchison | Murray | Talent |
| Inhofe | Nelson (FL) | Thomas |
| Inouye | Nelson (NE) | Thomas |
| Jeffords | Nickles | Voinovich |
| Johnson | Pryor | Warner |
| Kennedy | Reed | Wyden |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|-------------|-------|-----------|
| Edwards | Gregg | Lieberman |
| Graham (FL) | Kerry | |

The bill (H.R. 3161) was passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF DANA MAKOTO SABRAW, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider calendar No. 359, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Dana Makoto Sabraw, of California, to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Under the previous order, there will now be a period of 4 minutes for debate equally divided between the leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the next two votes be limited to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer my support for the nominee for the Southern District Court of California, Dana Makoto Sabraw.

I want to emphasize the excellent process that we have in place to select District Court nominees in California. In a truly bipartisan fashion, the White House Counsel, Senator FEINSTEIN and I worked together to create four judicial advisory committees for the State of California, one in each Federal judicial district in the State.

Each committee has a membership of six individuals: three appointed by the White House, and three appointed jointly by Senator FEINSTEIN and me. Each member's vote counts equally, and a majority is necessary for recommendation of a candidate.

The nominee before the Senate this evening was reviewed by the Southern District Committee and strongly recommended. I continue to support this excellent bipartisan process and the high quality nominees it has produced.

Judge Sabraw has roots in my area of California, Marin County. From there,

he has embarked on a very impressive legal career and served the people of my State with distinction. He currently is a judge on the San Diego Superior Court.

He is a graduate of San Diego State University and the McGeorge School of Law at the University of the Pacific.

Beyond his service on the bench, he is very involved with the community, receiving commendation from the Pan Asian Lawyers of San Diego for his community outreach efforts.

The Southern District will benefit greatly from the exemplary services of Judge Sabraw, and I fully support confirmation of this nominee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we yield back the remainder of our time.

Mr. SANTORUM. We yield back our time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my support for the nomination of Dana Makoto Sabraw for the United States District Court for the Southern District of California.

Judge Sabraw has nearly two decades of experience as a litigator and as a jurist. He began his legal career as an associate with the firm of Postel & Parma in 1985, then joined the nationally recognized firm of Baker & McKenzie in 1989.

In 1995, he was appointed to the North County Municipal Court of San Diego County, where he was named Presiding Judge in 1998. That same year, he was appointed to the San Diego Superior Court, and in 2000 was named Criminal Presiding Judge.

Judge Sabraw is a proven scholar, a disciplined judge, and a noted humanitarian. He will make an outstanding addition to the Federal bench of the Southern District of California. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting his nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased that we are now turning to the nomination of Dana Makoto Sabraw for the Southern District of California. This well-qualified nominee is the product of the exemplary bipartisan commission that Senators FEINSTEIN and BOXER have worked so hard to maintain. It is a testament to their diligence that we have such stellar nominees heading to California's Federal courts.

Judge Sabraw has served for 8 years on the State trial bench. Prior to his appointment to the bench, Judge Sabraw was a partner and associate at Baker & McKenzie in San Diego. In addition to Judge Sabraw's public service as a judge, he has also been active in his community.

As an attorney, he received Certificates of Appreciation from the Pan Asian Lawyers of San Diego for his service to the association and its community outreach programs and recognition New Entra Casa for his pro bono work. Also as a private attorney, Mr. Sabraw provided pro bono services to the Legal Aid Society of Santa Bar-

bara Project Outreach for several years. He also founded Positive Impact Program in 1998, a program in which the court, its staff, the Bar Association of North San Diego County, the local DAs office and others partnered with the local school districts to educate fifth graders about the justice system. The program involved a class curriculum, school assembly, mock trial, tour of the courthouse, and essay contest and reached approximately 6,000 students in lower socioeconomic neighborhoods.

The Southern District of California is the busiest Federal district in the Nation. In light of their demanding caseload, the Judiciary Committee expedited consideration of nominations to the Southern District. The Judiciary Committee held hearings for Dana Makoto Sabraw and Judge Burns, also nominated to this Southern District, just before the August recess and they were unanimously reported by the Judiciary Committee at our first meeting on September 4. That was 3 weeks ago. It is unfortunate that Judge Sabraw has been pending on the floor all month but I am pleased that we are voting on him today. Two more nominees to two additional vacancies recently created for the Southern District of California were voted out of the Judiciary Committee today.

Senator FEINSTEIN also deserves much credit for working so hard to create these additional judgeships in the Department of Justice authorization we passed in 2002. These judgeships are among those we created for border districts that have a massive caseload and that needed more Federal judges. We did what the Republican majority refused to do in the years 1995 through 2000 when there was a Democratic President, namely, create additional needed judgeships for the Southern District of California. We did so under Senate Democratic leadership with a Republican President. They have been available to be filled since July 15. The expedited path of Judge Sabraw's nomination demonstrates the fact that the Senate can act expeditiously when we receive well-qualified, consensus nominations on courts that need additional judges. I regret that the nomination has languished on the Senate calendar for most of the month for no reason. This nomination will undoubtedly be confirmed without a single dissenting vote in the Senate. Democratic Senators have been ready and willing to vote at any time. The Republican leadership will have to explain to the Chief Judge in the Southern District of California and the people of southern California what took so long.

I congratulate the California Senators on their outstanding work and this nominee and his family on this confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Dana Makoto Sabraw, of California, to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of California?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARD), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote "aye."

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 366 Ex.]

YEAS—95

| | | |
|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Akaka | DeWine | Lugar |
| Alexander | Dodd | McCain |
| Allard | Dole | McConnell |
| Allen | Domenici | Mikulski |
| Baucus | Dorgan | Miller |
| Bayh | Durbin | Murkowski |
| Bennett | Ensign | Murray |
| Biden | Enzi | Nelson (FL) |
| Bingaman | Feingold | Nelson (NE) |
| Bond | Feinstein | Nickles |
| Boxer | Fitzgerald | Pryor |
| Breaux | Frist | Reed |
| Brownback | Graham (SC) | Reid |
| Bunning | Grassley | Roberts |
| Burns | Hagel | Rockefeller |
| Byrd | Harkin | Santorum |
| Campbell | Hatch | Sarbanes |
| Cantwell | Hollings | Schumer |
| Carper | Hutchison | Sessions |
| Chafee | Inhofe | Shelby |
| Chambliss | Inouye | Smith |
| Clinton | Jeffords | Snowe |
| Cochran | Johnson | Specter |
| Coleman | Kennedy | Stabenow |
| Collins | Kohl | Stevens |
| Conrad | Kyl | Sununu |
| Cornyn | Landrieu | Talent |
| Corzine | Lautenberg | Thomas |
| Craig | Leahy | Voinovich |
| Crapo | Levin | Warner |
| Daschle | Lincoln | Wyden |
| Dayton | Lott | |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|-------------|-------|-----------|
| Edwards | Gregg | Lieberman |
| Graham (FL) | Kerry | |

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, after the next vote we will resume the DC appropriations bill and expect to be on the DC appropriations bill tonight and tomorrow. There will be further debate tonight. I encourage Members with amendments to come forward so we can continue to make progress on the DC appropriations bill.

I understand the two managers will not require any more rollcall votes on any action on the bill tonight or tomorrow. Thus, the next rollcall vote will be the last rollcall vote for tonight and for tomorrow. Again, we will be in session tomorrow for further debate on the DC appropriations bill.

With regard to Monday's schedule, we will be announcing what Monday's schedule will be in terms of voting. We will have votes on Monday in the late afternoon. We will have further announcements on that tomorrow. The Democratic leader and I have had discussions over the course of the day, and from where we started early this morning they have settled a lot in terms of looking forward to the next week and a half. I can tell all Members no more rollcall votes after this vote tonight, no rollcall votes tomorrow; DC appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. Will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. FRIST. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I would rather my leader propounded this question but inasmuch as I am the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, the reason I hoped all Members would sit—although there is no requirement they have to in the rules, unless the Chair insists on it—we have a problem. I think the full Senate ought to know about it. That is why I have urged Senators sit if they will; then they will be more comfortable. I don't know how long it will last, I hope it will not last long.

We have a problem in that we have the Iraq appropriations measure before the Senate Appropriations Committee. We have had hearings Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday in that committee. There have been other committees that have been having hearings, too; I believe the Foreign Relations Committee, and I know the Armed Services Committee has had hearings.

Here is my problem as ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. We had hearings this past Monday on the Iraq bill. Our members were not fully informed that there would be hearings on Monday but we proceeded with hearings, in any event. Several of the members could not get there until very late. I have protested pretty consistently in that committee, saying we need more hearings, that we do not need to rush that bill through. It would be well to have the House act, let us see that bill so we would better know what amendments we should try to offer.

I have urged that outside witnesses be called. Why should we just hear one side of the question, that being, of course, the administration's position? But we could be wiser, I think, if we had outside witnesses. That has been rejected. That proposal has been rejected. So we have pressed on, against my wishes. I believe we ought to have more hearings.

Now we come down to this point. We have completed what hearings we are going to have, as I understand it, in the Appropriations Committee.

Now the pressure is on to have the bill marked up. When? Monday. We all know that Senators, in recent years especially, are more likely to be late get-

ting in on Monday. They have faraway points of the compass to come from, and some of them have made appointments that will cause them not to get in until Tuesday morning perhaps. And yet we are being forced to have a markup on this coming Monday. This greatly creates a disadvantage to many of our Appropriations members.

So I have expressed the hope we would not have that markup on Monday. There is no great reason to begin to have this markup. But we have been pressed hard to get through these hearings, and now we are being pressed to mark up the bill on Monday.

Many of our Members cannot be here Monday. So I have acquainted my leader and my side of the aisle with this problem. And I have said we could have a markup on Tuesday. But my wife—and I hesitate to continue to inject my own personal problems into this matter—I said my wife has to have an operation on Tuesday morning. Not a major operation, but any operation at our age—if I were 40 or 50 or 60 again, I would say: You go on and have your operation and I'll see you at suppertime; see you tonight. That is not the way she wants it. That is not the way I want it.

I have said this afternoon, speaking to Mr. REID, and to Mr. STEVENS: If you want to have this on Tuesday, go ahead. If I am 2 hours there or 3 hours or 5, I will come when I can. But go ahead and have the markup Tuesday. The word comes back that the Republicans say: OK, but there is a little catch to that: We will wait till Tuesday, but you have to give consent to take up the bill on the next day. That consent could be objected to, of course, causing a little longer wait.

So now we are faced with: OK, you can take it up Tuesday—I hope I am not misrepresenting anyone here; at least this is the way I understand it—so you can have it on Tuesday, but you have to give consent to go to it Wednesday on the floor.

I don't want to enter into that deal. In the first place, I don't think there is a necessity for our having that markup on Monday or on Tuesday. I think we ought to have more hearings. I think we are entitled to more hearings. I see this bill as being ramrodded through the Senate, when there is no necessity for that.

I will not go into that further except to say, I am willing to proceed on Tuesday, but I am not willing for it to be in accordance with a deal. Call it a deal. Call it whatever you want—an agreement, whatever—"yes, we'll do that if." There are times when we do that around here, but on this occasion I don't think we ought to take it up on the floor that fast. We need more time on the floor. So I am unwilling to say: OK on Tuesday, but we will agree to taking it up on the floor on Wednesday.

So here we are, Thursday afternoon, with no votes tomorrow, I guess, and many Members going home, and a Jewish holiday tomorrow. Here we are

under this kind of pressure: You can have it on Tuesday, but you have to give us consent to take it up on Wednesday.

I understand now the—this is just my understanding—the other side is not willing to go on Tuesday without such an agreement. As I further understand it, they are saying—I may be wrong about this, but that is what I understand—that the majority is saying: OK, you don't want any deal; we will do it on Monday. So there is where it creates a great hardship on the part of a lot of our Senators and, I suppose, on Senators on the other side.

I think we are in a quandary, and we just ought to open it up here and have a full discussion of it rather than have the onus on me as the old plebeian soldier around here. OK. I don't want to cause my comrades on either side to have to come here on Monday and mark this up.

There is some reason it has to be Monday or else. This bill is being pushed through, rammed through, and I think we ought to take more time on it. I think the American people are entitled to more time on it.

Why don't we have more hearings? Is it that the majority is afraid to have questions asked? Do the questions hurt? What is the problem? Why do we have to have this—we are just not up against it. We passed the Defense appropriations conference report today.

I would like to know, I say to the leader, why we have to mark up this bill in the Appropriations Committee Monday or Tuesday, and why, if we push it—if the majority is willing to go over to Tuesday—why they are going to exact that pound of flesh: OK, we will go over, but let us take it up on the following day.

I am not willing to do that. If it were absolutely necessary to do that, I would be willing to do it. But that is not necessary. And in all my years here, I have never—I have never—seen the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and especially the minority—this place is for the protection of the minority, a minority of Senators. I have said that many times.

But to jam us up here against a Sunday and a Jewish holiday just preceding it, and then to come in here and say, you have to have this markup on Monday or you have to let us take it up on the floor on Wednesday, I have to say, I think that is very unfair. I have argued this out in the committee under the public eye, and I have talked with my colleague, Senator STEVENS. I know he is under great pressure.

I would hope to have a response to that. More than that, I would hope we would not have to mark it up Monday or Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, the question is really centered on the debate, which we want to do in a thorough way. And the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, from day 1, has en-

couraged me to allow for adequate time for debate and amendment.

Starting about 2½ weeks ago, I made it very clear that the President of the United States would shortly deliver a supplemental—which was now about a week ago—that I wanted to take 2 weeks—and it could be longer or it could be shorter—that we can focus on it in an organized way, and an organized way is to spend time in hearings.

Indeed, after a lot of discussion, we organized hearings in such a way, as you pointed out, that the Armed Services Committee has had hearings on it, the Foreign Relations Committee has had hearings on it, the Appropriations Committee has had hearings on it. And, indeed, we have had at least seven committee hearings in the Senate. The House is having hearings at the same time.

We have had interested parties engaged in formal discussions coming by your party lunch, coming by our party lunch to have the discussion with the goal that we would focus on this issue. Indeed, we have done a good job this week. My goal was expressed 9 days ago. I didn't know about the surgery of your wife. Although the Jewish holiday begins tonight, we are not voting tomorrow because of a request from your side of the aisle. The Jewish holiday begins late tomorrow afternoon. But because of very specific requests from two of your Members through the assistant leader, we are bowing down once again to you for scheduling, which is fine, and I agree. If they need to travel back and there is no other way to get back, I am going to pay respect to their religion, just as I want to pay respect to you in every regard we can.

So there goes your Friday. So don't blame us on that. I don't think that is fair. It is not fair as we go forward, if you are looking at equity or fairness.

On this floor about 2 months ago—it was a little bit later at night—you came to me and said: We can't operate this place working 2 days a week or 3 days a week. And I agree. You have been in this particular situation in terms of scheduling. You know it is challenging, just like votes for tomorrow. That is why 9 days ago I said, we are going to spend all next week on the floor, if possible, debating and amending freely. And the Democratic leader and I talked earlier today. We want to stay on the bill. We don't want any trips or punches thrown that are not fair, but we will have a good discussion through next week. My objective is to bring it to the floor.

The question as to why? Because we are in a war. We are in a war against terrorism that our President has done. I think, an excellent job of spelling out. He has delivered to us, on behalf of the 150,000 military men and women there, a call for emergency funding through a supplemental that, although there is disagreement, the administration has said it is urgent we address.

Thus, when we can work on Monday, we should work on Monday. And I

would argue Tuesday, Tuesday morning, Tuesday night, Wednesday morning, Wednesday night, Thursday morning, Thursday night, Friday morning and Friday night, in response to that emergency request for funding that the experts have told us is an emergency.

To say, well, people aren't going to be back Monday and therefore let's do Tuesday, but, no, we can't do it Tuesday because of other scheduling reasons, therefore, let's put this off later. I can tell you—you know this; again, I should be speaking to the Chair—if we say Monday it is just too difficult for people to come back, when there are people at war and there are people dying every day when we turn on the news, because of a lack of security, and we know this funding supports security, how can we say, it is inconvenient Monday and Tuesday? Although, again, I say this with deep respect for your personal situation and your wife's surgery in the morning, but we need to respond.

I think you know, if we wait until Wednesday to mark it up, or Thursday, the same thing, maybe a little bit different, Thursday, and you know this, Thursday people will say, we are getting out of here. We don't have time to debate this. Let's do it 2 weeks from now.

Once again, we are on recess during that period of time. I am going to have a hard time leaving here on recess with the American people saying: The President of the United States delivered this urgent request to you for funding, and have the news every day of people dying, with people having told us that it does have to do with security and the war on terrorism. That is the why and the reason.

I think we just need to be addressing this up front. The dialog between our leadership has been good. I know it is challenging our committee members with all of the hearings we have had day in and day out. I know people are worn out. But it is a war, and it is a war on terrorism. I think the American people deserve that debate on the floor of this body—freely debating, freely amending, starting as soon as we can that is reasonable. That is why I continue to request that the Appropriations Committee mark up the bill Monday, if it can—if it can't, it is just convenience. I think that is hard to answer—or Tuesday. And then there is no quid pro quo. I would like to get it to the floor so people can debate it before we go on recess in the next few weeks. But if there is objection to bringing it to the floor, that is your right as we go forward. But I do want the American people to know we are ready to address this bill and debate it fully, looking at everybody's schedule in a very personal way. The reason is, we are at war. That is it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the distinguished leader yield further?

Mr. FRIST. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Let me emphasize I am not asking that it be put off until

Tuesday because of my wife's little problem. I said, go ahead, if I am 2 hours or 3 hours or 5 hours, I will get there when I can. I would rather you didn't, but in any event, if you do, I am going to be with her. That is an easy choice for me. But I didn't intend to get into the debate about the so-called war on terrorism as being the war in Iraq. I won't do that now. But the distinguished majority leader has opened an avenue for a great deal of debate in which I will partake, if the good Lord lets me live. I am not going to lie down and roll over for that argument that, oh, we are in a war and we have to press ahead here; we have people dying and so on, and we have to do this on Monday or Tuesday. I am as concerned about the people dying as is the distinguished majority leader. I was not for sending our people over there to die. But we won't get into that here. The distinguished Republican leader brought that up.

I am only saying I would hope that we would stage the markup at a time when we could have full attendance on both sides.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. FRIST. I am happy to yield.

Mr. NICKLES. There is a nomination of Judge Mosman. I wonder if it would be possible to vote on that nomination by voice vote or begin that vote momentarily for the convenience of all Members?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I am happy to propound that unanimous consent request for a voice vote on the judge under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the ranking member is not here. I am sure if he was, he would ask that we have a rollcall vote. We ought to.

Let me just say, I don't think there is any question that we have to move forward and have an opportunity to debate this in a much more meaningful and thorough way. The way we will do that is through a markup in the Appropriations Committee and through votes on the Senate floor. Throughout the day the majority leader and I have been trying to figure out a way to work through the schedule, and it is obvious there are differences of opinion about what the schedule should entail. Yes, there should be more hearings. Yes, there ought to be more accountability as to how we make these decisions. If we had our choice, we would bifurcate this request, send the money to the troops to make sure they get all they need to conduct their responsibilities, but then have a more deliberate and thoughtful debate about this aid for reconstruction. That would be our desire. We will have amendments in that regard whenever the bill comes to the floor.

We need to get on with the vote on the judge, and then we will talk further about schedule as the schedule presents itself.

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL W. MOSMAN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael W. Mosman, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to express my unqualified support for the nomination of Michael Mosman for the United States District Court for the District of Oregon and to urge my colleagues to confirm this fine nominee.

Mr. Mosman has excellent academic and professional qualifications for the federal bench. After graduating magna cum laude from the J. Reuben Clark Law School at Brigham Young University, he clerked first for D.C. Circuit Judge Malcolm Wilkey and then for Supreme Court Justice Lewis Powell.

Mr. Mosman also has impressive courtroom experience. As an Assistant U.S. Attorney and U.S. Attorney for the District of Oregon, Mr. Mosman has worked on cases in all four prosecuting units in his office: narcotics, violent crimes, organized crime, and fraud. He has tried about 50 cases, including large multifendant drug conspiracies, international money laundering, multimillion dollar counterfeiting cases, and multidistrict immigration fraud.

Mr. Mosman also displayed stellar leadership and integrity in the wake of the September 11 tragedy. He deftly guided his office in the apprehension and prosecution of several would-be terrorists, all the while taking steps to ensure that those individuals' civil liberties were not violated.

Mr. Mosman is an exceptional nominee. He merited an ABA rating of unanimously well-qualified, and I fully expect him to serve with distinction on the federal bench in Oregon.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about my good friend and fellow Oregonian Michael Mosman.

Recently, the ABA rated Mr. Mosman as well qualified for the position of District Court Judge. Those of us from Oregon, however, have long been aware of Mr. Mosman's stellar legal credentials and talents. It would be an honor to have Mr. Mosman serve our state as the next U.S. District Judge in Oregon. He has distinguished himself as a leader in our state and in the legal community. Since 1988, Mr. Mosman has worked for the United States Attorney's office in Oregon. First joining the Department of Justice as an Assistant U.S. Attorney, he was subsequently promoted to the position of U.S. Attorney for the District of Oregon in 2001.

In addition to his public service, Mr. Mosman has worked in private practice with the Portland law firm of Miller Nash LLP. He clerked for Judge Malcolm Wilkey of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit—and for U.S. Supreme Court Justice Lewis Powell. Graduating with highest honors, he received his undergraduate degree from Utah State University and his law de-

gree from BYU's J. Reuben Clark Law School.

With his academic and legal background—both in private and public practice—Mr. Mosman will bring a wealth of knowledge and, most importantly, compassion to the bench. In 2001, Senator WYDEN and I convened a bipartisan blue ribbon panel to interview applicants for the position of U.S. attorney—our unanimous No. 1 recommendation was Mike Mosman. Earlier this year, we convened another bipartisan blue ribbon panel to interview applicants for the U.S. District Court. Once again, our unanimous No. 1 recommendation was Mike Mosman.

It is, therefore, with great pleasure that I highly recommend to you my friend, Mr. Mosman, and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of his confirmation as United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. LEAHY. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Michael W. Mosman, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon? The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) would vote "yea".

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote "aye".

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

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 367 Ex.]

YEAS—93

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Akaka | Breaux | Cochran |
| Alexander | Brownback | Coleman |
| Allard | Burns | Collins |
| Allen | Byrd | Conrad |
| Baucus | Campbell | Cornyn |
| Bayh | Cantwell | Corzine |
| Bennett | Carper | Craig |
| Biden | Chafee | Crapo |
| Bingaman | Chambliss | Daschle |
| Boxer | Clinton | Dayton |

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| DeWine | Jeffords | Pryor |
| Dodd | Johnson | Reed |
| Dole | Kennedy | Reid |
| Domenici | Kohl | Roberts |
| Dorgan | Kyl | Rockefeller |
| Durbin | Landrieu | Santorum |
| Ensign | Lautenberg | Sarbanes |
| Enzi | Leahy | Schumer |
| Feingold | Levin | Sessions |
| Feinstein | Lincoln | Shelby |
| Fitzgerald | Lott | Smith |
| Frist | Lugar | Snowe |
| Graham (SC) | McCain | Specter |
| Grassley | McConnell | Stabenow |
| Hagel | Mikulski | Stevens |
| Harkin | Miller | Sununu |
| Hatch | Murkowski | Talent |
| Hollings | Murray | Thomas |
| Hutchison | Nelson (FL) | Voynovich |
| Inhofe | Nelson (NE) | Warner |
| Inouye | Nickles | Wyden |

NOT VOTING—7

| | | |
|---------|-------------|-----------|
| Bond | Graham (FL) | Lieberman |
| Bunning | Gregg | |
| Edwards | Kerry | |

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider has been laid upon the table. The President shall be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

The Senator from Ohio.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 1787, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, in regard to the Feinstein amendment, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

I ask unanimous consent that order be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1787), as modified, was agreed to.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 69, the continuing resolution, which is at the desk; provided further that the resolution be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

Mr. REID. No objection.

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

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 69) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004—Continued

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank the leadership on both sides for allowing us the opportunity to get back to the DC appropriations bill, a bill Senator DEWINE and I have worked very hard on over the last, actually, several months. We are very proud of so many portions of this bill that do such good work for the District, and do so in conjunction with the leadership of the District and the residents of the District. So we are thankful that as it has worked out today, we can actually get back on this bill.

It is my hope, and I think the chairman of this committee shares this goal, since there are a couple of points in this bill that warrant further debate, the most obvious one being the issue of education improvement in the District of Columbia, it would be my idea, and I hope it is shared by my colleagues and even on the other side, that we give as much time to this debate as possible because it is a very important issue, not just for the District but for the whole Nation. As a public policy, we would be hard pressed to find a public policy that is more important right now, other than, of course, national defense and homeland security. I think we all agree the challenge to our public education system is one that continues to warrant our attention.

Tonight it is my intention, and Senator DEWINE understands, to speak for a minute about an amendment Senator CARPER and I want to lay down at some time, and to talk in detail about what that amendment is. He and I are prepared to talk for maybe an hour about the details of it.

I understand there are other Members who might want to speak tonight. We have no intention, obviously, of having the vote tonight or tomorrow, but we hope next week to proceed with some voting on this very important bill.

The way I would like to start, just for a few moments, though, is to say the reason our amendment would be necessary and other amendments would be warranted is because the debate will show the publicly stated goals, however laudable—and we have read those goals in the newspaper, we have read them in press releases, we have heard the goals stated by the voucher proponents, that the aim of this is to help children in failing schools, poor children in failing schools have options—this debate will show the bill itself does not actually do that. Even with the Feinstein amendment, the bill does not do that.

There is another really puzzling aspect to this. I want to submit something for the record to show why I will say it is puzzling. We received today the Statement of Administration Policy. I would like to read it for the record and then explain why it is confusing. This is the Statement of Administration Policy that was issued

today on the DC bill. This policy, not from the House but from the White House, says this: We like the DC bill, basically. I am paraphrasing the first part. The administration looks forward to working with Congress to ensure its priorities and amounts of money are within the overall budget goal.

Additional Administration views regarding the Committee's version of the bill are, [No. 1], School Choice Incentive Fund.

The Administration is pleased the Committee bill included \$13 million for the President's School Choice Incentive Fund. This innovative reform will increase the capacity of the District to provide parents—particularly low-income parents—with more options for obtaining a quality education for their children who are trapped in low-performing schools. The Administration appreciates the Committee's support for strengthening the District's school system and strongly urges the Senate to retain this initiative.

The puzzling thing about this is the White House has said they support the Mayor's position. The Mayor was on the floor today. Mayor Williams is one of the most honorable people I know. He is a reformer for public education. But I don't know if the White House realizes that is not the Mayor's position.

The Mayor's position is a three-pronged approach: A third for vouchers, a third for charter schools, and a third for improvements to public schools. That is because the Mayor has suggested that vouchers-only is insufficient, and the Mayor has also said some other things about the voucher-only proposal. So I just lay this down.

I ask the chairman if perhaps he could get to the bottom of this. I don't know why the White House wouldn't say we understand the Senate bill has three clear sections on this issue. We like all those sections. We ask you to keep them all in the bill. But it doesn't say that.

I am going to have this printed in the RECORD. That is why we are going to have a lot of debate on this, because we have to get clear what the administration is really asking for or advocating.

I ask unanimous consent to print the Statement of Administration Policy in the RECORD.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, September 24, 2003.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
(This statement has been coordinated by OMB with the concerned agencies.)

S. 1583—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 2004

(Sponsors: Stevens (R), Alaska; Byrd (D), West Virginia)

The Administration supports Senate passage of the FY 2004 District of Columbia Appropriations Bill, as reported by the Appropriations Committee.

While this bill exceeds the President's request by \$145 million, the Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to ensure that the FY 2004 appropriations bills ultimately fit within the top line funding level agreed to by both the Administration and the Congress. The President supports a discretionary spending total of \$785.6

billion, along with advance appropriations for FY 2005—consistent with his Budget and the FY 2004 Congressional Budget Resolution. Only within such a fiscal environment can we encourage increased economic growth and a return to a balanced budget. The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to ensure that its priorities are met within that overall total.

Additional Administration views regarding the Committee's version of the bill are:

SCHOOL CHOICE INCENTIVE FUND

The Administration is pleased the Committee bill includes \$13 million for the President's School Choice Incentive Fund initiative. This innovative reform will increase the capacity of the District to provide parents—particularly low-income parents—with more options for obtaining a quality education for their children who are trapped in low-performing schools. The Administration appreciates the Committee's support for strengthening the District's school system and strongly urges the Senate to retain this initiative.

FEDERAL FUNDING FOR DC

The Administration applauds the Committee for fully funding the President's request for \$17 million for District resident tuition support, as well as \$15 million for emergency planning and security costs in the District.

ATTORNEY'S FEES UNDER THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT (IDEA)

The Administration is pleased that the Committee has retained the provision that caps the award of plaintiff's fees in cases brought against the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) under IDEA. The Administration strongly supports the education of children with disabilities according to the principles embodied in IDEA, and it is in the best interest of the District's children if DCPS uses its limited resources to improve its special education programs rather than pay excessive attorneys' fees.

LOCAL BUDGET AUTONOMY

The Administration continues to support local budget autonomy, which would free the District's local funds from any delay in the appropriations process past the beginning of the fiscal year. We appreciate Congress' consideration of this proposal and recognize Congress would continue to ensure responsible use of Federal and local funds through the enactment of the District's annual appropriations bill.

OTHER ISSUES

The Administration is disappointed that the Senate version of the bill modifies current law with respect to allowing local funds to be used for needle exchange.

The Administration is concerned with the number of unrequested earmarks contained in the Committee bill, including \$20 million provided to the District of Columbia Chief Financial Officer for a variety of unspecified projects.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I would like to start with the Landrieu-Carper amendment that we will offer at some time, and describe again why it is puzzling that we are having difficulty with the administration and the voucher proponents coming to some agreement. I am going to read the simple text, and without any rhetoric or signs or charts or anything, I am going to read the text of it because it is quite simple. I want the people who are listening—and, of course, there is a lot of interest in this—to understand what basically has been rejected.

Before I do that, I will give a very brief history of how we got here because it will help to set this debate.

Three years ago we were in what I would call a quandary in public education in the Nation. That quandary was this: Our schools were improving but not fast enough. We had a lot of kids who needed help. We really had to do something.

There were a group of people who wanted to give up on public schools and go to vouchers and say we can't, we tried, nothing is working, let's go to vouchers. There was a group of people who said no, what we need is just more money, the same thing, pump the money in and more resources will do it.

Both proposals were rejected. They were rejected by a broad-based coalition of Democrats and Republicans who rejected both. We said no to vouchers which will undermine public schools; no, vouchers will not work. And, no, just dumping more money in the system, as much needed as the money is, just dumping money is not going to help.

We found a third way called Leave No Child Behind which the President himself led. Many of us were proud to work with him to do that. We crossed party lines. Republicans went to the Democratic side. Democrats went to the Republican side. There were great coalitions forged to get that done.

Here we are not even 2 years into Leave No Child Behind and there are still grumblings on both sides. You can understand why. The money we promised isn't forthcoming. So people have a legitimate argument. They say: We haven't received the money. I understand. I keep saying: Let us go forth.

I know people want vouchers. No matter what we do, they want vouchers. They want them yesterday, today, and tomorrow. That is just what they want.

Here we are with Leave No Child Behind. One would think if the administration wanted to prove something, they would try to prove it anywhere in the country—the District, New Orleans, Louisiana, Ohio—that Leave No Child Behind could work.

There is some confusion. From my point of view, I think what would come out of the President's proposal is something like this: I am sorry. We are short of money. I am sorry. We can't fund everything that we thought we could fund, but let me just give enough money to the District of Columbia, which is a city and a symbol, and let me fully fund Leave No Child Behind. Let me double the amount for charter schools. Let me push contracts for public schools. Let me increase tutorial services. Let me have afterschool and let us implement early childhood education.

As a person who helped write the bill that laid those principles down, that is what I would fully expect. I would have stood shoulder to shoulder with him, and I would have said with the Mayor's help, with the Congresswoman's help,

with the Republicans' help and the Democrats' help, let us show the country what we meant when we passed the bill. They don't believe it. Neither sides believes it. So let us show them what we meant. Instead, we get the same old, tired, worn out, inadequate vouchers—vouchers, vouchers.

Mr. CARPER, the Senator from Delaware, and I, and others who worked very closely, think we are not hearing correctly. We think this couldn't possibly be. So we tried. The chairman could not have been more gracious. We tried. We think maybe it is something we don't understand. So we tried to talk. The talks aren't going very well.

So we think: Let us just put it down in an amendment form and see maybe if we are missing something. This is our amendment. I will read for the RECORD what the gist of the amendment is because it is very simple. Tomorrow I will have this blown up so when I speak on it next week people can see what it is.

This is what we said. Even though you don't want to fund title I in the District, you don't want to double the amount of charter schools, you don't want to have private contracts which the law allows, you don't want to increase tutorial services, you don't want to have afterschool, you don't want to have early childhood, we will just take what the administration thinks—or what the voucher proponents think—and we will just go back to see if we can make vouchers work.

We say: OK. We will do a couple of things. If you will agree that the same children will take the same test because the administration was very strong on tests—they wanted the same test—that took a little work but we finally got the same test.

Then they said last year that it is very important for teachers in public schools to have a college education. That was a big deal. We said, yes, at a minimum. They can have alternative certifications but you have to have a college education. Let us have a college education for teachers who would be teaching students using public money to go to private schools. That has been agreed to.

Because one of the problems with this debate is that nobody has the research to tell whether it really works or not—we agree with that—we said, let us have a very rigorous evaluation so that after 5 years we would know for sure, I mean for positive.

Let me speak for a minute about this. The Milwaukee program has been going on for 13 years. There are 11,000 children in vouchers and there are 89,000 children who aren't in vouchers. The Senators from that State can talk more about the details than I can. But what I do know about it is many studies have been conducted, and there is still no definitive data that I have been able to find—that anybody has been able to find—about whether those children are doing better academically. There is some evidence to suggest that

some parents are happier and more satisfied. I acknowledge that. That is very good.

I remind this body that we did not start down this road to make parents happy. That is not what the President said. We want parents to be satisfied. We want parents to be satisfied, but that is not the goal. It is desirable. But the goal is a quality education with public accountability because public dollars are being spent. We don't know after 13 years.

We said: OK. Let us have an evaluation component. The evaluation component in this bill, to date, is inadequate to, even after 5 years, give us those answers, and we think that is a real problem.

This is the most important. All of these are important, but this is really the telling portion of why I think we are at a real standstill and a crossroads.

We said in our amendment that you say you want to limit this or you want to help children who are in a trap. That is what this says. I want to read it again. This is the administration's policy. This is for children who are trapped in low-performing schools, which would mean trapped in failing schools. That is what we can do in Leave No Child Behind. We said no more of this. You have to be good. If you are not good and you are a failing school, you need improvement or you have to close and be reconstituted. We said let us limit it to children in failing schools. That is part of our amendment.

The word back so far is, no, I am sorry we can't limit this to children in failing schools because we want this to be available to children in all schools.

The sixth provision that we asked is to make sure all the civil rights laws which are required in Leave No Child Behind are adhered to. The other side said that wouldn't be a problem. We assumed that would be fine. But it is not in this bill.

The other part of our amendment says make sure the scholarship itself—whether it is \$7,500 or \$3,500 or \$1,000—is sufficient to actually get a child by lottery from a failing school into another school. The school can't discriminate. The child gets to go. But that language was rejected.

I don't know what the other side is thinking. If a school costs \$15,000 and the voucher is only worth \$7,500, we can't figure out how that child gets to the school if their voucher is only worth \$7,500. We wanted to make sure that the voucher would be received as payment in full so a parent couldn't be told: We would love to take your child into the school but your voucher is only worth \$7,500 and we need \$15,000. I am sorry. Our private scholarship fund is out of money. We would love to help you, Ms. Jones. We really know that your two sons would do great in our school. We would love to give them vouchers. You can either have a bake sale or raise money from your neigh-

bors or go into your savings account, but we can't put up the other \$7,500.

Senator CARPER and I thought it would be reasonable to say the voucher—no matter where you get the money—has to get the kid in the school.

The seventh thing we asked was—because this White House, when we were debating Leave No Child Behind, insisted on yearly progress reports for children in public schools—we would like to craft a way to make sure these 2,000 slots available that we are talking about, where they take the same test that has been agreed to—we would have these yearly progress reports as defined by Leave No Child Behind. The same reports, no difference. No, I am sorry, we can't do that. We cannot have yearly progress reports. So, again, accountability is out the window.

And finally, our amendment said, OK, we do not believe this should be a Federal mandate. We are being told by the voucher opponents, that the city wants this; it is the choice of the city. I said, fine, remove the language that makes the money contingent because in committee I asked the Senator handling the bill if he could just state for the record: Does Mayor Williams have a choice? In other words, in order to get any money, does he have to take the voucher money? To get any money, does he have to take vouchers? The answer was yes.

I and others strongly opposed forcing any city, anywhere, at any time, being held hostage by voucher opponents that would say: We are happy to give you \$40 million; we are glad to give you \$20 million; we are glad to give you \$8 million; but you have to institute a voucher program. And not just vouchers for children in failing schools, but you must have a voucher program for children in all schools.

That proposal will not pass with much Democratic support, let me assure Members.

This has been rejected today. Maybe cooler heads will prevail. The Senator from Delaware and I are still open to discussion. Why? I would stay here all night, all next week, all next month, all next year. My children are home; I would like to get home. His children are home. But that is how important this education reform is for this country. It was a hard fought victory and a wonderful victory and a powerful victory.

The ink is not even dry and we are talking about undoing it, unraveling it, undermining it. I don't understand it.

Senator CARPER will talk, and then I will finish with a few more comments about our amendment. I would like Senator CARPER to explain from his perspective what our amendment hoped or sought to do.

Mr. CARPER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding. Before I was elected, I served as Governor of Delaware for 8 years, following Mike Castle, who launched near the end of his second term education reform.

What we began in his last term and I tried to do in the 8 years I was privileged to serve as Governor was to focus more on raising student achievement than on anything else. We were willing to experiment rather boldly to try to accomplish that. We established rigorous academic standards, not standards in math, science, English, and social studies that the politicians thought were important, but we gathered the best teachers in the State, the best scientists, to develop academic standards of what we expected kids to know at different grade levels in their academic careers.

We wanted to test students objectively, measure whether they were making academic progress to the standards. We wanted to be objective.

And, finally, we wanted to make sure we held everyone accountable—students, schools, school districts, even the educators. Trying to hold parents accountable would be the hardest part of all.

During the course of those reforms, we sought to identify what was working to raise student achievement. Did smaller class sizes work? If so, the idea was to replicate that and do that in other schools. We eventually found that smaller class sizes in kindergarten and classes for age 7 had the most impact.

We learned investment in early childhood paid huge dividends and concluded that in the first 6 years of our life, by the time we are age 6 and in first grade, we have learned about half of what we are going to learn in our lives. If we waste the first 6 years, it is hard to catch up later on.

We learned that if we can harness technology, we can help equalize the playing field for a whole lot of kids. We learned that it is not just enough to hook up classrooms to the Internet. It is not enough to have even decent computers. If you do not have teachers comfortable in using the technology to bring the outside world into the classroom and making the learning come alive and using it effectively as a tool, the money for all the wiring and the computers is money that is not well spent. Teachers have the professional development and the familiarity of using this technology lining up with the curriculum, the lesson plan, and making the learning come alive.

We learned in the course of our experiments in Delaware that all kids can learn. Some learn more quickly than others. Mary might learn faster than Tom, but Tom could learn. He just might need extra time or be taught in different ways. We learned maybe longer school days are helpful for doing that, afterschool programs, and maybe summer schools. We have schools, for example, for kids who are entering ninth grade. We can bring those kids in for a month or so in the summer before they go into ninth grade, put them in a summer academy, and they have a better chance of helping the kids to meet the standards they need in ninth grade.

We did all this in an effort to try to learn what worked to raise student achievement. We did so because we wanted to be able to invest the limited dollars that we had in programs that would raise student achievement. Of all the things we did in my State during the time that I served as its Governor, preparing the workforce for the 21st century was most important. If we are going to be successful as a nation, it will be because we prepare and create a workforce that is able to beat any workforce in the world.

What does that have to do with what we are talking about? The schools in the District of Columbia are not doing the job for many of the kids who live there. The public schools in this District are not doing the job for many of the kids who live there. And a good deal is being done to try to turn that around. This District has begun to experiment rather boldly with charter schools, some of the things I talked about earlier—extra learning time, technology, and professional development—in order to raise student achievement. They have a long way to go.

As we dealt with the issue and tackled the issue of leaving no child behind in a failing school, we did not say that the Federal Government would go out there and establish academic standards. We said, we will let the States establish their own academic standards. Let them figure it out and know what they should be doing. We said the same thing about the District of Columbia. They develop their academic standards in the District of Columbia. We do not do that.

No Child Left Behind also says we expect kids to make progress every year. We expect all kids can learn, and over a period of a decade or so we expect virtually all children to be able to reach the academic standards, whether it is the District of Columbia, Delaware, Ohio, Louisiana, or Alabama. Of the public schools in the District of Columbia, or Minnesota or Delaware, under No Child Left Behind, if a school does not meet adequate yearly progress for 1 year, that school is essentially put on notice that they are deficient.

If they continue to not meet the adequate yearly progress for a second or a third year, there are consequences for the failure to do so. By the fourth year, if a public school—4 years in a row, in any of our States or in the District of Columbia—fails to meet adequate yearly progress, there are consequences that can be rather severe. The school can be closed and restructured, the faculty changed, leadership changed. The school can be transformed into a charter school. Public school choice can be demanded, required, including the funding of transportation to other public schools. But the consequences are severe.

If a charter school in Minnesota, where I think charter schools may have originated, or in any of the other States that are represented here is de-

ficient, and the students there—for 1 year or 2 years or 3 years or 4 years—do not demonstrate adequate yearly progress, or those schools do not show progress year after year, then there are consequences as well. There is also help. We try to provide extra help: extra money, tutorial assistance, that kind of thing. But in the end, if there is not progress, we do not want to continue to throw good money after bad.

I want to talk about an area we got hung up on, and it is a little complicated; but I want to take a minute to talk about it anyway. I said earlier, if you have kids in public schools in this District of Columbia who are not making adequate yearly progress, there are consequences for those schools. There are efforts to help them, but there are also consequences.

For charter schools here, if kids are not making progress, if you continue year after year to fall short, there are consequences for that school, and in the end fairly severe ones. If instead of taking this \$13 million and distributing it in vouchers to send the kids to, let's say, 80 different schools—instead of doing that, with maybe 25 kids to a school—instead, we are going to take that \$13 million and fund one new school for 2,000 kids, and maybe have 80 classrooms, with 25 kids in a classroom, if we use the \$13 million in that way, we would expect that school and those students under No Child Left Behind to make progress and to make adequate yearly progress. And if they did not, under No Child Left Behind, that school would get help. And eventually, if they continue to fail, they would face dire consequences.

Stick with me on this, if you will. What we propose to do with this voucher demonstration is to take \$13 million, and instead of creating one school with 80 classrooms, we might take the \$13 million and give it to kids who will go to 80 different private schools somewhere here in the District; and it might be roughly 25 kids in each of those schools, but they add up to 2,000.

Some will go to schools, and they are going to be tested, and they will do pretty well. Some will go to schools, and they will be tested, under the District's test, and they are not going to do so well; and they may not do so well next year and the year after that and the year after that.

I wish it were possible somehow to take the results of those 2,000 kids who are going to be spread, in this example, in 80 schools across the District to actually bring back, to aggregate, and to see how well they did in making adequate yearly progress. And as it turns out, we could actually do that. We would not have to impose No Child Left Behind on the individual private schools. I would not want to do that. But we can certainly find out how those kids are doing in those private or parochial schools, and see if they are making, collectively, adequate yearly progress.

Earlier this year—I wish I could find the quotation—President Bush was

talking—I think it was maybe in July—about this experiment with vouchers in the District of Columbia.

If you bear with me, I want to see if I can find that quotation. At the very least, I will give you part of it. He said words to this effect: It is the taxpayers' money. We want to know. We want to know in a public school or in a private school whether or not the children are learning.

Bear with me just for one moment. The quote is too good to miss. I will find it, and then I will be able to read it in its entirety. Here is what the President said. And again, this is from July of this year. I am going to read it because I think he has it right. This is absolutely on the money talking about his vision for a DC voucher program. This is what he said:

The same accountability system applies to the recipient school as it does the public schools in Washington. After all, it's taxpayers' money. We want to know. We want to know in a public school or a private school whether or not the children are learning.

I could not have said it better myself.

The negotiations we have had with our friends on the other side—and I just want to say to Senator DEWINE, I said this privately, and I will say it publicly, I very much admire the way he and Senator LANDRIEU work together as the chairman of the subcommittee and as ranking member. I thank them very much for the good faith that I think they and their staff demonstrated in trying to find a middle ground on some of these complex and admittedly difficult issues.

While I believe it is important that the kids who will use these vouchers in this experimental program come out of schools that are failing—not everyone thinks that; I think so—I think it is important that the voucher actually offsets the cost of the tuition fully. Not everyone agrees with that. I certainly think so.

I think the teachers in those private and parochial schools have to meet certain standards or credentialing qualifications. We could probably work through most of that.

We fell apart in our negotiations on three points. One was this idea of: Is there some way we can fairly reasonably make sure we hold those who are using public dollars, Federal dollars—for the first time, I think, for vouchers—can we hold them accountable under No Child Left Behind, and in a way somewhat as we hold charter schools and other public school kids accountable?

I had a conversation with an administration official this afternoon, and I thought it was a telling conversation. She said to me—words to this effect—we can't agree with doing what you and Senator LANDRIEU want because the kids who are coming from these schools, who will be using these vouchers—falling under certain income limits; 185 percent of poverty—they are going to be some of our toughest kids

to help raise student achievement and to demonstrate adequate yearly progress. And there was just a reluctance and a fear they were setting themselves up for failure under this demonstration program.

What the President said is the same accountability system applies to recipient schools as it does to the public schools of Washington, DC.

We have to be smart enough to figure out a way to put that kind of accountability plan in place in a voucher program so that it does not discourage private or parochial schools from joining in this experiment. And if the kids who use those vouchers and go to the public and private schools don't make adequate yearly progress, we should not continue to fund those programs.

One of the great frustrations for me with what we are setting up here, without the kind of provisions Senator LANDRIEU and I are talking about, is we will end up not knowing for sure at the end of the day, and for 5 years, or whatever, whether this actually works to raise student achievement, comparing apples and apples, oranges and oranges, being able to compare those 2,000 kids with another 2,000 kids in charter schools and 2,000 kids in public schools. We will not know absolutely. And we should know.

For people who don't like vouchers, for those who think we should not put a dime in vouchers, they should know after 5 years that it works. And maybe we should consider, as we said, other school districts. By the same token, for those who think vouchers are the best thing since sliced bread, it would be great to have an experiment that demonstrated that at the end of 5 years, maybe it does not work. And other schools around the State, other cities or school districts would say: They tried it in DC. It was a fair experiment, and it didn't work. They could decide to go ahead and have their own experiment and do it themselves. But we need a test and experiment that nobody can question at the end of the day that it wasn't done fairly and squarely on all counts.

I feel disappointed tonight. I really do. I am not angry, but I am disappointed. I have invested some personal time. My staff has. Senator LANDRIEU has invested a whole lot more. I know Senator DEWINE has. I don't feel good about this because we ended up having spent all this time without coming to the kind of consensus I hoped we could. I fear we will pass a bill ultimately that will be flawed, not flawed in the sense of the Senate version, but the House version, because that is a badly flawed voucher proposal. I fear we will pass something that is not what it could be. We will go to conference and what comes out of conference will be a whole lot worse than what is being contemplated here in the Senate.

The last thing I want to say is this: If we had been able to reach agreement that these vouchers would only be used

for some of the 9,400 kids who are today in failing schools in the District, we would have eliminated a real stumbling block going forward. If we had been able to work out with smart people in the administration, smart people who work around here, a way to make sure that the same accountability or some comparable accountability system that we used under No Child Left Behind for charter schools and public schools—that we can apply that in the way I described earlier for these 2,000 kids—if we can do that, we have eliminated a major stumbling block.

Senator LANDRIEU and I are reluctant, though, even if we passed a measure that had those provisions in it and the other principle she has talked about already, to go to conference even with a good bill without the assurance that what is going to come out of conference will be consistent with those principles. I would feel pretty foolish if we struck a good agreement, a sound agreement that we felt proud of, and went to conference and ended up with something else that was a horse of a different color.

We are not going to come to agreement, I am afraid, on those two major principles that we talked about here tonight, if our friends on the other side can't give us an assurance that even if we were, those principles would survive the conference. I understand that is a difficult thing to do. Having said that, I must say that that understanding doesn't diminish at all my disappointment that we have fallen short.

I yield back.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware who, as usual, has described beautifully his position and the position which several of us on this side, who are cosponsors of the No Child Left Behind Act, believe in strongly. I would like to add to what he said briefly by referring to what President Bush, 2 years ago in August, as we were preparing for this debate, wisely said:

Accountability is an exercise in hope. When we raise student standards, children raise their academic sights. When children are regularly tested, teachers know where and how to improve. When scores are known to parents, parents are empowered to push for change. When accountability for our schools is real, the results for our children are real.

This would be part of the Landrieu-Carper amendment that was, in essence, rejected. So it becomes a question, Is it just accountability for taxpayer money when it comes to public schools but not taxpayer money when it goes to private schools? Again, let me say, if we started out on this course with a goal, the only goal being parental satisfaction, we should never have started, because no amount of money in the Treasury will ever make every parent in America happy. It would be a false, foolish journey to that end.

That wasn't why we started. We started to say the public money, if spent and managed correctly, could provide a very good education meas-

ured by academic performance. And along the way, if we could increase parental satisfaction and taxpayer confidence, that would be the best we could hope for. Yet proponents want to twist that debate, forget the accountability piece, and just keep saying: If parents are happy, we have accomplished our goal. That is not our goal. We want parents to be satisfied, but that is not our goal.

Accountability is an exercise in hope. When we raise student standards, children raise their academic sights. When children are regularly tested, teachers know how to improve. When scores are known to parents, parents are empowered to push for change. When accountability for our schools is real, the results for our children are real and the taxpayers get their money's worth. That is what this issue is about.

I will close, because my chairman has been very gracious, with a quote from another President, John Kennedy, on a similar subject.

I thank, again, my chairman, who has been more than gracious in terms of the time on this, and his staff. The two of us can come to a lot of agreements. It is just other Members, other interests. So we will soldier on. But I just want him to know that he continues to have my greatest respect as we work through this very important debate.

Let me close with a quote from a former President on another equally urgent matter to sort of capture my disappointment. I am not angry, but I am disappointed. President Kennedy, many years ago when our Nation was faced with being left behind in the space race, as we are challenged today being left behind in public education, to marshal the forces necessary to achieve the goal at that time, which was to win the race to space and put a man on the Moon, said:

We possess all the resources and all the talents necessary. But the facts of the matter are that we have never made the national decisions or marshaled the national resources for such leadership. We have never specified long-range goals on an urgent time schedule, or managed our resources and our time so as to ensure their fulfillment. . . .

Let it be clear that I am asking the Congress and the country to accept a firm commitment to a new course of action—a course which will last for many years and carry very heavy costs . . . [but] if we were to only go halfway, or reduce our sights in the face of difficulty, it would be better not to go at all.

He was right. We didn't go halfway; we didn't go part of the way. We didn't go for 2 years and then say I am sorry, we made a mistake, let's go to another proposal. We stayed the course and, because of that, less than 8 years later, we landed a man on the moon. In June in 1969, 8 years and 1 month after the speech, Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin landed on the moon and Neil Armstrong said, "One small step for America, one giant leap for mankind."

Mr. President, I will tell you as firmly—as I represent the people of my State—and as strongly as I can express

it, if we would stay the course, we would meet the goal. If we would marshal the resources, we would meet the goal. But this debate, getting us off course, going in a different direction, undermining what we are doing and underfunding what we are doing, will never get us there. That is what this debate is about.

I thank the chairman for allowing us to talk tonight. We will proceed with this debate over the course of the next week until we can come to some agreement as to how to proceed.

I yield back my time, and I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, again, I thank the ranking member, Senator LANDRIEU, for her good comments and, more importantly, I thank her for her good work on this bill.

There is a lot more to this bill, frankly, than just the scholarship portion of the bill. You would not know that by the debate, but there is an awful lot in this bill on which we all agree. Frankly, there is a lot on the education part we agree on as well.

I thank my colleague from Delaware for his good statement. They have both contributed a lot to the debate tonight. I appreciate their good faith and their commitment to the children and their good comments.

I want to take a moment before my friend from Alabama speaks, who has been on the floor for some time, to, at least from my perspective, explain where I think these negotiations are and what happened with them. I am afraid my perspective is a bit different than what my colleague said, but I hope not too different. We negotiated in regard to the topics my colleagues have just discussed for 2 or 3 days. These were negotiations that went on at the staff level, but they also went on at the Member level. All three of us were directly involved. We spent all day yesterday involved in negotiations.

Quite frankly, the issues they have raised on the floor, I felt, and continue to feel, are very legitimate issues. These are not trivial issues; these are important issues. I felt and still feel at this moment—I guess I am an eternal optimist—that these issues could be resolved on a policy basis among the three of us. I still feel they can be resolved. The negotiations, candidly, broke down, as my colleague from Delaware said, when my two colleagues on the other side of the aisle came to me and said there is one condition you have to meet that is not negotiable, and that condition is you have to guarantee these items will come out of conference. That is one thing as chairman of the subcommittee I cannot guarantee. I can guarantee I will fight for them in conference. I can guarantee I will represent the Senate position and that I will do everything I can to get as much of what we agree on through the conference; but what I am not in a position to do is to give any kind of iron-clad guarantees to my colleagues—as much as I would like to—that every

single thing we would agree to, every single sentence, paragraph, word, comma, will come out of the conference committee with the other body. That just cannot be done. I am not in a position to do that and to tell them that in good faith. I suppose I can tell them that and it would not happen, but I am not going to do that. So that is when the negotiations broke off.

I want the other Members of the Senate, both on my side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle, to understand that that is when the negotiations broke off. If that is the condition of making an agreement on this amendment we all could agree on, and that we can get this bill passed, then that is not going to happen.

Now if it is trying to work out all the very legitimate issues my colleagues have just raised, then we can continue these negotiations. I am an eternal optimist, and I think we can work these out. I have told both of my colleagues that. I don't think we are that far apart. These are legitimate issues, and we can work them out.

I see my colleague on her feet. I will not yield the floor, but I will yield for a question.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, did the Senator know—and I fully appreciate his position and I most certainly understand that even as the powerful chairman he is, he is not able, of course, to make those confirmations. I also know there are powers that can make such arrangements, and the chairman is well aware of that. So we offer this amendment in good faith, recognizing that if there truly is a view or a desire to create a real, accountable pilot for children in failing schools in the District of Columbia that would show definitively whether it works or not in 5 years, that meets the parameters of Leave No Child Behind, that could be something that could be reached. That is what my intention would be. That is not the position of every single member of the Democratic caucus. So as ranking member, I will also represent their position. But at this point, we don't see the possibility of that. I thank the chairman. I understand his position.

We look forward to continuing to lay down amendments that will try to improve and perfect this proposal, or eventually to strike the language and try to move on a bill without any reference to the voucher proposal.

Mr. DEWINE. I appreciate my colleague's comments. Let me take a moment to state where I think this bill is. My colleagues have talked about some of the improvements they would like to make in the bill. I was given a list here. We don't have an amendment before us. At this point we don't have an amendment, but I think they are going to present one at some point. So we don't have all the language to go through, but we have talking points or some power points to look at. I will go through a couple of these points.

The first point is that eligible participating students must take the same

tests as kids in public schools. That was met and that is now part of the bill, as amended by Senator FEINSTEIN's amendment. So we appreciate that contribution that now is a part of the bill as amended by Senator FEINSTEIN, which the Senate just adopted about an hour ago.

The second provision talks about eligible participating students are taught by a teacher who holds a college degree. That part of No. 2 is now in there as far as Senator FEINSTEIN had that in the amendment.

No. 3 requires a full and independent evaluation for the scholarship program. The Feinstein amendment that was passed by voice vote by this body about an hour ago does require a full, independent evaluation.

I say to my colleague, the ranking member of the subcommittee, Ms. LANDRIEU, that we are more than happy to incorporate the Senator's specific evaluation concerns that she has outlined and to work with her on additional language as far as incorporating that into the bill.

Her fourth point, scholarships are limited to students attending failing schools, the bill's language provides priority for students who are in failing schools. They are going to be the ones who get the priority. I point out to my colleagues that they are going to be the ones who are going to be first in line. So that is the state of play. That is where we are.

Let me make a couple of other additional points before I turn to my colleague from Alabama. One is, my colleague asked, what is the administration's position? Reference was made to the fact that in their letter the administration did not say they were for this three-pronged approach.

My colleague will be getting a letter from the administration outlining that, yes, they very definitely are for this three-pronged approach. They are for it. They are 100 percent behind it. They back it, and there will be a letter coming to her shortly and to this Senate outlining the administration's support of the three-pronged approach.

Earlier today we talked about the fact—I think it is significant—that it was the Mayor and the Mayor's team who originally decided and came to the Senate and the House and said: This is what we want; we want this three-pronged approach. We want the additional money, this add-on money, for the public schools.

We need to keep in mind that it has been this Mayor who has sought out additional money for the last several years for the public schools in the District of Columbia. So this is consistent with what he has done in the past. He sought this additional \$13 million. It is consistent with what he has done when he has asked for additional money for the charter schools. So in this bill we have an additional \$13 million for the charter schools, again what the Mayor requested.

The third prong, of course, is the \$13 million for the scholarships. So it is

the program of the Mayor of the District of Columbia. It is a very balanced approach, new money, not taking any money away from the public schools but, in fact, doing just the opposite, new money for the public schools, new money for the charter schools, and new money for this new scholarship program. I think it is very important for us to keep this in mind.

My colleagues who are concerned about this bill have talked about No Child Left Behind. My esteemed colleague from Louisiana has talked about this and has inferred that this is not really consistent with No Child Left Behind. It strikes me, with all due respect, that this is so consistent with our program of No Child Left Behind, because if there is anyplace in this great country of ours where children have been left behind, it is the District of Columbia. Through no fault of their own, the children of the District of Columbia have truly been left behind.

What a great tragedy it is, when people come to the District of Columbia, they come to our Nation's Capital and they see the great monuments, they see this great building, they see the great White House, they see this body, and yet if they truly understand what is going on here, they understand that there are children who are not getting the education they deserve. They are not getting the education other children across this country are getting.

With this bill and with this very balanced approach, we are taking a step towards giving the parents of these children more choices and giving more opportunity to these children. I truly believe this is consistent with our idea that there should be no child in this country left behind.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his leadership and hard work on this issue and the Senator from Louisiana who, I know, has also worked hard.

Education is a very important thing in this country. The title of the original education program proposed by President Bush, No Child Left Behind, is a powerful phrase. As the Senator from Ohio explained, this nation does not need to allow children to fall behind. We need to know what is going on. We need to find out how they are doing.

President Bush has proposed, and this Congress has passed, larger increases in funding for education in the last three years than we saw in the previous eight. We have had a tremendous increase in education funding from the Federal Government, but the problem was, and the challenge and the important impact of No Child Left Behind is, that we are not just going to put money into systems that are not operating effectively and efficiently; systems that are allowing children to fall behind.

Parents wake up, and their child is in the ninth or tenth grade and cannot do

basic reading or basic math. They drop out of school, become a discipline problem, and the child's life is not what it ought to be. They will not reach the full potential that they ought to reach.

My wife taught four years, and I taught one year in public schools. We care about education. Good friends of mine, as well as people we associate with, are full-time teachers and we try to keep up with education. We were active, particularly my wife, in our children's education. We talked about how things were going at the school. We wanted to know.

My two daughters graduated from a large inner-city high school, racially fifty-fifty, in Mobile, Alabama. They have done very well. They loved that high school, and it was very important to them. They are still loyal to Murphy High School.

This is a defining issue. That is why it has received so much attention. The Senator from Ohio is exactly correct, there are a lot of good things in this bill other than just the scholarship portion. However, it is a big deal. What we are saying is that we care about children more than we care about bureaucracies, laws and regulations that do not work. We are saying that what life gives in the form of education to children is important.

Make no mistake about it, this is about power. A middle-income child or a poor-income child in this city is in a certain school district. They cannot do anything with that. Maybe their parents bought a house there 10 years ago. Maybe they can't afford to sell it. Maybe the price has gone down. Or whatever—they are in that district. Then they are assigned to a certain school. If that school does not perform, what happens? They go to the school board, and they say sorry, that is your district.

The parent says: I don't like this school.

It doesn't make any difference. Doesn't make any difference to us. You don't like this school? By law you must go to this school. They are sent there by order of the State or the city or the school system, and they have no choice in the matter.

Some schools in this very District, and some schools all over the country, are not working. Some of them are not safe. Some of them are not effective or efficient. Some of them are not producing the quality of education they could produce. The children who are sent to those schools are sentenced to a situation that makes it far more difficult for them to achieve success in their educational life than they would any other way. It is a big deal.

What happens when Senators and Congressmen are in that situation? They just decide to move out to the Maryland or Virginia suburbs and buy a \$300,000 or \$500,000 house and they put their kids in a school they like. Vice President Gore sent his kids over to St. Albans. That probably costs as much or more than the University of Alabama

for a year. That is what they do because they can do those things.

But what happens to average Americans who cannot do that? They are stuck where the State sends them.

Dr. Paige, our Secretary of Education, himself a teacher of education and a former superintendent of the Houston school system, reformed that school system dramatically. Do you know what he said about it? He said: When I was there and we were losing students to private schools, my view was I cared about the kids. If they could get a better education in a private school, so be it. I hope they can go there. It doesn't hurt me. My job is to make this system work so they can be educated here. He said: With the money we have from the Government and advantages we have, there is no way we ought not to be able to compete with the private school system.

He said we lost kids, but he took firm control of discipline. He took firm control of the mismanagement. He took firm control by testing, and he made sure test scores were going up. He said in 5 years we were gaining kids back from private schools. They were happy to be in our school system. Not that it was a huge number one way or the other, but people did choose in that fashion.

But the average working American does not have those choices. It is just not financially possible for them. The wealthy can do it but not the poor. They are stuck. So this is what it is all about. You have the Mayor of this city, the leader of the school board of this city, and they care about children, too. They love the children; they want to see them succeed. When they have concluded that this program would help the children, why are we so upset about it? Why are we so determined and frustrated about it? Why do we get frustrated about it? I ask that question.

I think there is a resistance to change here. It has been said that they have totally eliminated religion from public schools. But within the establishment of the public schools, I would say that is not true, really. There is at least some religion left. There is one law that goes beyond logic to the point I would say of religion, and that is: Thou shalt not spend one dollar on schools that doesn't go through a system that the American Education Association doesn't have something to do with.

It is our money, they think. It has to be spent on our schools. Not one dime can be allowed to be spent by a child who might want to have an alternative or choice in their education. Frankly, I think we do not need to be that uptight about it.

The way this thing came up, we talked about it in the Senate and there was an effort in the No Child Left Behind bill to allow all the States to have scholarship programs. That did not go into the bill. It just was a fight we were not prepared to make at the time.

There was not agreement or consensus on it. But this is not a State. It

is the Federal District of Columbia. It is part of the Federal Government. It is an area that we do not have a separation of Federal and State governments, where there is not a State's rights question about these matters. It is a matter within our jurisdiction, No. 1.

No. 2, the Mayor and the school board president want it. They asked us for it.

The people want it. They have children lined up to get into this program. I love educators, and I love and appreciate education. I believe the public schools do a terrific job for the most part in America. I have been pleased with the public schools my children have attended. But if they were not getting a good education there, one that was sufficient, I would have done what I could to make sure they got a good education. I think most Americans would. But for the poor, they don't have that option. They can't send their children to St. Albans. They can't send their kids to some other school if they are not happy, and I think we need to deal with that.

I salute the chairman, Senator DEWINE. I suggest the Feinstein amendment does many of the things that Senator LANDRIEU wants to do. I could support that, and I am comfortable with the Feinstein amendment. But if we are going to come up with an amendment that makes it so difficult for the schools in this area who have agreed to take children at a discount of 40 percent or more from the cost that is being expended for education in the District, that they will not accept them or it creates a bureaucracy—which is one of the things that makes it more difficult for public schools to perform well—if we are going to do that, I am not for it.

I know Senator DEWINE will be wrestling with that and listening to the Senators and their suggestions. But I would note we have a reality and that is there are two bodies, a House and a Senate. The House of Representatives deserves equal sway in these matters. That shouldn't change just because a few Senators believe something is important—I believe a lot of things are important and I have not been able to have them come out exactly as I want.

I think the Feinstein amendment does what Senator LANDRIEU wants. We have not seen the exact wording of Senator LANDRIEU's amendment, so I guess we will have to look at it to know. This body needs to act in the best interests of the schoolchildren of the District of Columbia. We have a Mayor elected to take care of them. We have a school board president who loves our children and wants them to succeed. They have said this program is the way to do it. This is what we need to improve their chances at a better life. I believe it is, too. I see no danger in going forward with it.

If the program turns out to be a failure, so be it. We will end it. I don't know that it will. Frankly, I think it is more likely to be a success than not.

I am glad the Senator from Ohio is leading this effort, and I look forward to working with him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Alabama for his very fine statement. I think he is absolutely right. This is a pilot program. But it is a chance we have to take. These are children who need this opportunity. Their parents need this opportunity.

As we have talked about before on the Senate floor, you have the Mayor of this city coming to this Congress and saying: Give me the tools. Give me the tools to help shape the educational system in the District of Columbia. For us to turn our back on the Mayor, to turn our back on children, and the parents, I think would be a very serious mistake.

We have the opportunity to do something very positive. I think we should take that opportunity.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

BILLING VETERANS FOR HOSPITAL FOOD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I take a brief few minutes to say a few words about a situation that I think is a slap in the face to a brave Nevadan but also to thousands of others who wear the uniform of our great Republic.

Bill Murwin is a deputy sheriff in Lyon County, one of 17 Nevada counties. It is a rural county, even though it is becoming more urban all the time with the tremendous growth in Fernley and Silver Springs. Still we think of it as a rural county, a little over 60 miles outside of Reno.

In addition to Bill being deputy sheriff, he is also a staff sergeant in the Marine Corps Reserve. When his country called, he left his family and went to fight in Iraq. He was wounded a few months ago when a grenade exploded in a vehicle in which he was riding. He was treated at a military hospital in Germany and then because of the seriousness of his injury he spent 4 weeks at Bethesda. I am sorry to say this, but at Bethesda Naval Hospital he had to have part of his left foot amputated.

Obviously, we owe a debt of gratitude to Sergeant Murwin, just as we owe a debt of gratitude to all those who bravely fought for our freedom over the years, particularly in the sands and cities of Iraq.

Instead of gratitude—it is hard to comprehend—Bill Murwin got a bill from the Government in the amount of \$243. Three days later he got a second bill, along with a threat that his ac-

count would be turned over to a collection agency if he did not pay up immediately.

For what did he owe this large sum of \$243? I say that somewhat facetiously, but to him \$243 was a large amount of money. It was for the food he ate when he was having his foot amputated. It seems that military personnel who do not eat in a messhall, including those who have families, receive a monthly allowance for their food. But when our troops are wounded, they eat in a hospital, they are billed by the Government \$8.10 a day for their hospital meals.

I found out what happened to Sergeant Murwin when a coworker sent an e-mail to my office. I was disillusioned, disappointed, and somewhat upset to learn we have a policy and it has been in place for 22 years.

Our troops in combat who are eating field chow are already allowed to keep their food allowance. Certainly, the same policy should apply to those who are in a hospital recovering from the injuries they received in the field.

When a soldier is wounded in combat, we should not add insult to injury by making him pay for his hospital food. I am proud of Sergeant Murwin for coming forward to shed light on this mistaken policy.

Today, he told a member of my staff:

This isn't about me. There are guys in the hospital who are 18 or 19 years old and have been there for three months or longer. . . . Some of them are expecting bills of \$1,000 or more. They [are] really fretting those bills.

I think it is a national disgrace that anyone in this country has to worry about decent health care—and 44 million people have to worry about decent health care. But, really, when a soldier who is wounded in combat lies in a hospital bed worrying about a bill from his own Government for the food he is eating in the hospital, that is a little too much.

I also acknowledge my friend, the Congressman from Florida, Representative YOUNG. When he heard about this, he sent a bill to the Government to repay this bill for Sergeant Murwin. So I publicly acknowledge and appreciate what I read in the paper that my friend, Congressman YOUNG, had done.

I am proud to cosponsor Senator GRAHAM's bill that would correct this ridiculous policy. I salute, as I said, Congressman YOUNG for introducing a similar bill in the House and for paying the bill, literally, of my constituent.

I hope every Member of both Chambers will act quickly to correct this outrage. And it is an outrage.

TRIBUTE TO GREG MADDUX

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to salute a great Nevadan, a great human being and a great athlete, my friend, Greg Maddux.

Mr. Maddux pitches for the Atlanta Braves baseball club. Since he went to Atlanta almost 11 years ago, the

Braves have won their division every single season.

This is no coincidence. Greg Maddux has been the heart and soul of the Atlanta Braves, and the key to their remarkable string of success.

From 1992 through 1995, he won the Cy Young award, as the best pitcher in baseball, four years in a row. No other pitcher has ever accomplished that and I doubt anyone else ever will.

He finished the 1990s with a 2.54 earned run average for the decade. Only two pitchers had posted a better ERA over a decade since 1910—Hoyt Wilhelm and Sandy Koufax. That is pretty good company. And in 1995, Maddux became the first pitcher to log back-to-back seasons with an ERA under 1.80.

From 1990 through 2001—12 consecutive years—Greg won the National League Gold Glove as the league's best-fielding pitcher.

He pitched nine scoreless innings in Game One of the 1995 World Series, leading the Braves over the Cleveland Indians.

Greg could have retired years ago, and he would still be assured of entering the Baseball Hall of Fame on the first day he is eligible.

But he keeps pitching, and he keeps setting a new standard of excellence.

Sunday, he broke a record that had been held by the great Cy Young himself, winning at least 15 games for the 16th consecutive season. Young's record of 15 games for 15 seasons had stood for 98 years, since 1905.

For a major league pitcher, winning 15 games in a season is a feat that only the best will ever accomplish. To do it for 16 straight years is almost unthinkable.

They say records are made to be broken. Well, I think this one will stand for a long, long time.

The success of Greg Maddux is even more amazing when you consider that he doesn't have overwhelming speed. In an era of 100 mph fastballs, his clock in the mid-80s. He doesn't try to overpower hitters; he just outsmarts them.

Maddux is an unsurpassed student of the game who relies on his pinpoint control and his unyielding determination. He never gives in to hitters. He makes them swing at his pitches.

After he defeated the Florida Marlins to break Cy Young's record, 72-year-old Florida manager Jack McKeon said, "He doesn't get you out—he makes you get yourself out."

Anybody who is a baseball fan, as I am, would be proud to know Greg Maddux. But he is more than a great athlete. He is a great person.

He is a devoted family man, married to a wonderful wife, Kathy. They have a daughter Amanda Paige, and a son Chase Alan.

Obviously, the Maddux family could live anywhere they want to. I am proud that they have chosen to live in Las

Vegas, where Greg grew up and graduated from Valley High School.

Greg doesn't endorse commercial products, and he has no interest in the glamorous life of a celebrity. Instead, he and his family live quietly, giving generously of their time and money for causes that benefit our community.

Kathy and Greg lead the Maddux Foundation, which is involved in several charitable activities in Las Vegas and Atlanta. The Foundation supports children's homes, domestic crisis shelters, and boys and girls clubs. In recent years, the Madduxes have expanded their philanthropic efforts, helping even more kids.

Greg's brother Mike also has a foundation that helps children. And he happens to be a pretty good pitcher in own right.

Mike Maddux began his major league career in 1986 with the Philadelphia Phillies, and played in the big leagues for 15 seasons. He, like his brother Greg, is a role model for Nevadas' and our voting youth.

Both of the Maddux brothers are great baseball players, but even more important, they are great neighbors.

Baseball fans all over America know Greg Maddux as one of the greatest pitchers in the history of the game.

In southern Nevada, we know him as a devoted family man, a positive role model for kids, and a generous contributor to our community.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the 2004 budget through September 22, 2003. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 2004 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, H. Con. Res. 95, as adjusted.

The estimates show that current level spending is above the budget resolution by \$3.092 billion in budget authority and by \$3.005 billion in outlays in 2003. Current level for revenues is \$1 million below the budget resolution in 2003.

Per section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95, provisions designated as an emergency are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the following current level report excludes budget authority of \$984 million from funds provided in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act of 2003, P.L. 108-69.

Since my last report, dated July 30, 2003, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that changed budget authority, outlays, or revenues: Family Farmer Bankruptcy Relief Act of 2003, P.L. 108-73; an act to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act, P.L. 108-74; Chile Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, P.L. 108-77; and, Singapore Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, P.L. 108-78.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and tables be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 23, 2003.

Hon. DON NICKLES,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached tables show the effects of Congressional action on the 2003 budget and are current through September 22, 2003. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004, as adjusted. Per section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95, provisions designated as an emergency are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes budget authority of \$984 million from funds provided in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-69).

Since my last report, dated July 28, 2003, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that changed budget authority, outlays, or revenues:

Family Farmer Bankruptcy Relief Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-73);

An Act to amend Title XXI of the Social Security Act (Public Law 108-74);

Chile Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 108-77); and

Singapore Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 108-78).

The effects of these new laws are identified in Table 2.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS HOLTZ-EAKIN,
Director.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT-LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003, AS OF SEPTEMBER 22, 2003

(In billions of dollars)

| | Budget resolution | Current level ¹ | Current level over/under (—) resolution |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---|
| ON-BUDGET | | | |
| Budget Authority | 1,874.0 | 1,877.1 | 3.1 |
| Outlays | 1,826.1 | 1,829.1 | 3.0 |
| Revenues | 1,310.3 | 1,310.3 | —* |
| OFF-BUDGET | | | |
| Social Security Outlays | 366.3 | 366.3 | 0 |
| Social Security Revenues | 531.6 | 531.6 | 0 |

¹ Current level is the estimated effect on revenue and spending of all legislation that the Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made.

*= Less than \$50 million.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT-LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003, AS OF SEPTEMBER 22, 2003

| (In millions of dollars) | | | |
|--|------------------|-----------|-----------|
| | Budget authority | Outlays | Revenues |
| Enacted in previous sessions: | | | |
| Revenues | n.a. | n.a. | 1,359,834 |
| Permanent and other spending legislation | 1,013,810 | 977,842 | n.a. |
| Appropriation legislation | 1,133,856 | 1,160,341 | n.a. |
| Offsetting receipts | -369,104 | -369,106 | n.a. |
| Total, enacted in previous sessions: | 1,778,562 | 1,769,077 | 1,359,834 |
| Enacted this session: | | | |
| Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (P.L. 108-11) | 79,190 | 42,024 | 2 |
| Postal Civil Service Retirement System Funding Reform Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-18) | 3,479 | 3,479 | 0 |
| Gila River Indian Community Judgment Fund Distribution Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-22) | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 2003 (P.L. 108-26) | 3,165 | 3,165 | 0 |
| Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-27) | 11,347 | 11,347 | -49,489 |
| Veterans' Memorial Preservation and Recognition Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-29) | 0 | 0 | * |
| Welfare Reform Extension Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-40) | 64 | 26 | 0 |
| Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act (P.L. 108-61) | 0 | 0 | -1 |
| Family Farmer Bankruptcy Relief Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-73) | 0 | 0 | * |
| An Act to amend Title XXI of the Social Security Act (P.L. 108-74) | 1,259 | 20 | 0 |
| Chile Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.L. 108-77) | 0 | 0 | ** |
| Singapore Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.L. 108-78) | 0 | 0 | ** |
| | 98,505 | 60,062 | -49,488 |
| Entitlements and mandates: | | | |
| Difference between enacted levels and budget resolution estimates for appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs | 0 | 0 | n.a. |
| Total Current Level ^{1, 2} .. | 1,877,067 | 1,829,139 | 1,310,346 |
| Total Budget Resolution ^{1, 2} | 1,873,975 | 1,826,134 | 1,310,347 |
| Current Level Over Budget Resolution ... | 3,092 | 3,005 | n.a. |
| Current Level Under Budget Resolution ... | n.a. | n.a. | 1 |

¹ Per section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004, provisions designated as an emergency are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current level excludes budget authority of \$984 million from funds provided in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-69).

² Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

Notes.—n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law; * = less than \$500,000; ** = revenue effects begin in fiscal year 2004.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, every year since 1968, in the period be-

tween September 15 and October 15, our Nation observes Hispanic Heritage Month. This month-long celebration offers us a special opportunity to reflect on and pay tribute to the innumerable ways that Hispanic Americans, and Hispanic culture, enrich both our daily lives and the diverse heritage of the Nation.

According to the Census Bureau, some 38 million Hispanic Americans today live in the United States—and increasingly, in every corner of the United States. While many Hispanic Americans choose to live in parts of the country with proud and long-established Hispanic traditions; others are finding work, raising families and building vigorous Hispanic communities in places where, until recently, they did not exist or were little noticed. In politics, the arts, the media, sports, our colleges and universities, Hispanic Americans are a vital presence—architects of the American spirit. Even our taste in food reflects the degree to which Hispanic traditions are now woven into the fabric of our lives: tortillas are as much a staple of the national diet as pizza and bagels, and salsa has ended the reign of ketchup as the nation's most popular condiment.

Hispanic Americans bring to American life not one culture but many. Their roots reach to Central and South America and the Caribbean, and beyond, to Europe and Africa; every community enriches a great, underlying cultural foundation with its own distinctive variations. My own State of Maryland offers a brilliant example. There are some 228,000 Hispanic Americans in the State, a number that has increased by 82 percent since the 1990 census. Marylanders today are fortunate to have co-workers and neighbors from Europe, Africa, South and Central America and close cultural ties to the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal. From Puerto Ricans in New York to the Mexican communities of California, Hispanic Americans are changing the face of America and teaching us to celebrate the glory of the multi-faith, multi-cultural family that constitutes this great country. In my own State of Maryland, there are 228,000 Hispanic Americans, an increase of more than 82 percent since 1990, and they come from at least a dozen countries. In every county in Maryland, from the Eastern Shore to the western reaches of the State, Hispanic Americans have found a home.

Nonetheless, across the country Hispanic Americans face numerous challenges. Eager to work, too often they can find only low-paying jobs; the income level of Hispanic households is on average \$15,000 less than that of white households, and almost one-third of Hispanic Americans live below the official poverty line. While Hispanics make up about 13 percent of the U.S. population, a study by the Hispanic Association on Corporate Responsibility found that Hispanics account for only 4.6 percent of U.S. firms' company offi-

cials and managers. Despite a 10 percent increase in population in just the last two years, Hispanic voting participation remains worryingly static.

In the great tradition of newcomers to the United States, Hispanic Americans come in search of better lives, decent jobs, and a chance to raise their families in peace and prosperity. Many of us in the Congress, whose families came here in an earlier time for just those reasons, know full well what that means. As public servants we have an obligation, and indeed I would say an obligation, to ensure that every generation of Americans has access to the opportunities that were given to us. In doing so we keep our Nation on course to achieving the principles set out in the founding documents of our Nation.

We must not let language or economic or social status stand in the way of the full participation of all our people in our community life, and we must not permit these factors to become a barrier to our public institutions and services. In the history of this country no opportunity has been more important than the chance to go to school—important to the individual, with incalculable benefits to the society as a whole. That is why I have cosponsored S. 1545, the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act, which would make it easier for States to provide in-state tuition status to students without regard to immigration status, and allow some immigrant students who have been in this country for five years or more to apply for legal status. It is my hope that for thousands of our newest Americans the DREAM Act will prove to be an important step along the way to living a rewarding and productive life.

As Hispanic Americans move proudly into the mainstream of American life, Hispanic Heritage Month is our time to celebrate all their accomplishments and contributions and to commit us anew to ensuring that all Americans have access to the wondrous opportunities our Nation offers.

MATTHEW J. RYAN VETERINARY HOSPITAL

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition regarding the renaming of the Veterinary Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania in memory of the former Speaker of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, Matthew J. Ryan.

Matt Ryan, whom I knew for many years, cared deeply for the people of Pennsylvania. He loved the Pennsylvania House of Representatives and made service his calling. Elected in 1962, he was one of its longest serving members and one of its longest serving Speakers, presiding for six terms.

As much as Speaker Ryan loved Pennsylvania, the people of Pennsylvania and his colleagues from both parties loved him. Known on both sides of the aisle for the fair manner in which he presided over the House, Matt was a

committed leader, tough debater, parliamentary tactician, and Pennsylvania booster. He spoke with great passion, and often was praised for his statesmanship, compassion, openness, Irish wit, and intelligence.

Upon his death earlier this year, he became the first person whose body lay in state in the Capitol Rotunda in Harrisburg since Abraham Lincoln.

A true friend of animals—especially his black Labrador, Magic—Matt Ryan was very proud of the University of Pennsylvania School of Veterinary Medicine. It is in no small part because of his decades of support that the school today is one of the finest in the world.

Founded in 1884, the University of Pennsylvania School of Veterinary Medicine was established at the urging of Penn's School of Medicine. It was recognized that prevention and control of animal diseases had important implications for human health. This is as true today as it was then—perhaps even more so—as we face a future in which advances in veterinary medicine's ability to understand biological threats will be critical in our ability to fight bioterrorism.

In February 2003, the month before Matt's untimely death, the University decided to honor his support by renaming the Veterinary Hospital after him. Benjamin Franklin is the only other State politician for whom a building on the University's campus has been named.

The renaming ceremony took place on Friday, September 19, 2003, and so I ask my colleagues to join me in reflecting on the legacy of Speaker Matthew J. Ryan, one of the truest Pennsylvanians and a champion of people.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent from the Senate earlier this week and missed rollcall votes Nos. 358 through 363. There were two reasons for my absence. First, I hosted a ceremony at the University of Connecticut honoring Bertie Ahern, Taoiseach of Ireland, and Tony Blair, Prime Minister of Great Britain. Second, I attended memorial services yesterday and today for Jack Bailey, the former Connecticut Chief State's Attorney and a close friend to both me and my family. Had I been present, I would have cast my votes as follows: on rollcall vote 358: aye; on rollcall vote 359: nay; on rollcall vote 360: nay; on rollcall vote 361: aye; on rollcall vote 362: aye; and on rollcall vote 363: aye.

TRIBUTE TO RALPH RAY MITOLA

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I take time today to tell the Senate about a hero who made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of his Nation—a young man who died in the Korean war. His name is Ralph Ray Mitola.

He came from Broad Channel, NY. For those Senators who are not famil-

iar with Broad Channel, it is a populated island in Jamaica Bay. It is part of Queens County, which is one of the boroughs of the City of New York. Cross Bay Boulevard connects Broad Channel to the Rockaways, which are a magnificent gateway to the Atlantic Ocean.

The American Legion Broad Channel Memorial Post 1404 recently honored the memory of Ralph Mitola, and four other young men from Broad Channel who died in the Korean war. The occasion for the ceremony was the 50th anniversary of the armistice in Korea, which was observed by American Legion Post 1404 as part of the 85th Annual Queens County Convention Parade. Mr. President, July 27, 1953 is the day in history when negotiators signed the armistice agreement at Panmunjom. The armistice led to a North Korean withdrawal across the 38th parallel, and the Republic of South Korea regained its status as a free and democratic nation. Korea was a critical battleground in the defense of liberty against the totalitarian ideologies of the 20th century. Ralph Mitola left his home and traveled half a world away to the Korean Peninsula to defend freedom.

Corporal Mitola was a member of Company C, 1st Battalion, 23d Infantry Regiment, 2d Infantry Division. On August 1, 1952, during a night attack on "Old Baldy" in North Korea, he was killed by small arms fire. Corporal Mitola was awarded the Purple Heart, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, the Korean Service Medal, the United Nations Service Medal, the National Defense Service Medal and the Korean War Service Medal.

As our Nation's soldiers are once again fighting for the cause of freedom overseas, it is all the more important to remember those who helped protect America on the Korean Peninsula a half century ago.

Ralph Mitola, born April 10, 1931, killed in action, August 1, 1952.

Mr. President, his loved ones and comrades in arms are eternally proud of him. I honor his memory.

TRIBUTE TO WALTER FRANCIS GROSS

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I take time today to tell the Senate about a hero who made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of his Nation—a young man who died in the Korean war. His name is Walter Francis Gross.

He came from Broad Channel, NY. For those Senators who are not familiar with Broad Channel, it is a populated island in Jamaica Bay. It is part of Queens County, which is one of the boroughs of the City of New York. Cross Bay Boulevard connects Broad Channel to the Rockaways, which are a magnificent gateway to the Atlantic Ocean.

The American Legion Broad Channel Memorial Post 1404 recently honored the memory of Walter Gross, and four

other young men from Broad Channel who died in the Korean War. The occasion for the ceremony was the 50th anniversary of the armistice in Korea, which was observed by American Legion Post 1404 as part of the 85th Annual Queens County Convention Parade. Mr. President, July 27, 1953 is the day in history when negotiators signed the armistice agreement at Panmunjom. The armistice led to a North Korean withdrawal across the 38th parallel, and the Republic of South Korea regained its status as a free and democratic nation. Korea was a critical battleground in the defense of liberty against the totalitarian ideologies of the 20th century. Walter Gross left his home and traveled half a world away to the Korean Peninsula to defend freedom.

Private First Class Gross was a member of Company C, 1st Battalion, 19th Infantry Regiment, 24th Infantry Division. He was taken Prisoner of War while fighting the enemy in South Korea on January 1, 1951 and died while a prisoner on July 31, 1951 at POW Camp 12 near Pyekdong, North Korea. Private First Class Gross was awarded the Prisoner of War Medal, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, the Korean Service Medal, the United Nations Service Medal, the National Defense Service Medal and the Korean War Service Medal.

As our Nation's soldiers are once again fighting for the cause of freedom overseas, it is all the more important to remember those who helped protect America on the Korean Peninsula a half century ago.

Walter Gross, born May 13, 1928, died while a prisoner of war, July 31, 1951.

Mr. President, his loved ones and comrades in arms are eternally proud of him. I honor his memory.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS W. AUGUST

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I would like to take some time today to tell the Senate about a hero who made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of his Nation—a young man who died in the Korean war. His name is Thomas W. August.

He came from Broad Channel, NY. For those Senators who are not familiar with Broad Channel, it is a populated island in Jamaica Bay. It is part of Queens County, which is one of the boroughs of the City of New York. Cross Bay Boulevard connects Broad Channel to the Rockaways, which are a magnificent gateway to the Atlantic Ocean.

The American Legion Broad Channel Memorial Post 1404 recently honored the memory of Thomas August, and four other young men from Broad Channel who died in the Korean war. The occasion for the ceremony was the 50th anniversary of the armistice in Korea, which was observed by American Legion Post 1404 as part of the 85th Annual Queens County Convention

Parade. July 27, 1953 is the day in history when negotiators signed the armistice agreement at Panmunjom. The armistice led to a North Korean withdrawal across the 38th parallel, and the Republic of South Korea regained its status as a free and democratic nation. Korea was a critical battleground in the defense of liberty against the totalitarian ideologists of the 20th century. Thomas August left his home and traveled half a world away to the Korean peninsula to defend freedom.

Private First Class August was a member of the 224th Infantry Regiment, 40th Infantry Division. He was killed in action while fighting the enemy near Satae-ri, North Korea on November 17, 1952. Private First Class August was awarded the Purple Heart, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, the Korean Service Medal, the United Nations Service Medal, the National Defense Service Medal and the Korean War Service Medal.

As our Nation's soldiers are once again fighting for the cause of freedom overseas, it is all the more important to remember those who helped protect America on the Korean peninsula a half century ago.

Thomas August born February 13, 1932, killed in action November 17, 1952.

His loved ones and comrades in arms are eternally proud of him. I honor his memory.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH DE PIETRO

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I would like to take some time today to tell the Senate about a hero who made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of his Nation—a young man who died in the Korean war. His name is Joseph De Pietro.

He came from Broad Channel, NY. For those Senators who are not familiar with Broad Channel, it is a populated island in Jamaica Bay. It is part of Queens County, which is one of the boroughs of the City of New York. Cross Bay Boulevard connects Broad Channel to the Rockaways, which are a magnificent gateway to the Atlantic Ocean.

The American Legion Broad Channel Memorial Post 1404 recently honored the memory of Joseph De Pietro, and four other young men from Broad Channel who died in the Korean war. The occasion for the ceremony was the 50th anniversary of the armistice in Korea, which was observed by American Legion Post 1404 as part of the 85th Annual Queens County Convention Parade. July 27, 1953 is the day in history when negotiators signed the armistice agreement at Panmunjom. The armistice led to a North Korean withdrawal across the 38th parallel, and the Republic of South Korea regained its status as a free and democratic nation. Korea was a critical battleground in the defense of liberty against the totalitarian ideologists of the 20th century. Joseph De Pietro left his home and traveled half a world away to the Korean Peninsula to defend freedom.

Private De Pietro was a member of Company H, 2nd Battalion, 38th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Infantry Division. He was killed in action during an attack on Hill 905 along "Heartbreak Ridge" near Sanggonbae, North Korea on October 10, 1951, while assisting a wounded comrade. Private De Pietro was awarded the Purple Heart, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, the Korean Service Medal, the United Nations Service Medal, the National Defense Service Medal and the Korean War Service Medal.

As our Nation's soldiers are once again fighting for the cause of freedom overseas, it is all the more important to remember those who helped protect America on the Korean Peninsula a half century ago.

Joseph De Pietro, born August 3, 1932, killed in action October 10, 1951.

His loved ones and comrades in arms are eternally proud of him. I honor his memory.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES F. FARRELL

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I would like to take some time today to tell the Senate about a hero who made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of his Nation—a young man who died in the Korean war. His name is James F. Farrell.

He came from Broad Channel, NY. For those Senators who are not familiar with Broad Channel, it is a populated island in Jamaica Bay. It is part of Queens County, which is one of the boroughs of the City of New York. Cross Bay Boulevard connects Broad Channel to the Rockaways, which are a magnificent gateway to the Atlantic Ocean.

The American Legion Broad Channel Memorial Post 1404 recently honored the memory of James Farrell, and four other young men from Broad Channel who died in the Korean war. The occasion for the ceremony was the 50th anniversary of the armistice in Korea, which was observed by American Legion Post 1404 as part of the 85th Annual Queens County Convention Parade. July 27, 1953, is the day in history when negotiators signed the armistice agreement at Panmunjom. The armistice led to a North Korean withdrawal across the 38th parallel, and the Republic of South Korea regained its status as a free and democratic nation. Korea was a critical battleground in the defense of liberty against the totalitarian ideologists of the 20th century. James Farrell left his home and traveled half a world away to the Korean Peninsula to defend freedom.

Private First Class Farrell was a member of Company K, 3rd Battalion, 9th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Infantry Division. On November 10, 1952, he was defending "Old Baldy" in North Korea when he was struck by enemy artillery fire. Private First Class Farrell was awarded the Purple Heart, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, the Korean Service Medal the United Nations Service

Medal, the National Defense Service Medal and the Korean War Service Medal.

As our Nation's soldiers are once again fighting for the cause of freedom overseas, it is all the more important to remember those who helped protect America on the Korean Peninsula a half century ago.

James Farrell, born August 7, 1933; killed in action November 10, 1952.

Mr. President, his loved ones and comrades in arms are eternally proud of him. I honor his memory.

INTERNET DOMAIN NAME ADDRESSING SYSTEM

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, last week the Department of Commerce signed the sixth amendment to a memorandum of understanding between the Internet Corporation of Assigned Names and Numbers, ICANN, and the Commerce Department. The first agreement was signed in 1998 to establish an organizational body to manage the technical coordination of the Internet Domain Name Addressing System. In the subsequent years the agreement has been amended to reflect the needs of the organization to accommodate the industry and constituency it was created to support.

The Department of Commerce is hopeful this will be the last agreement they have to sign with ICANN. The hope is for ICANN to show they have become a responsible organization and there can be a transition of the Domain Name System, DNS, management to private sector control, out of the hands of the department permanently.

Several items of interest have been brought to my attention during our oversight hearing on ICANN that I would like the Department of Commerce to consider before ICANN receives the freedom they want as an independent organization. They must first prove they are doing their job. I would encourage the Department of Commerce to establish dates of accomplishment to the milestones they have set out in their most recent memorandum of understanding with ICANN.

Specific, quantifiable goals will help ascertain if ICANN has created a stable environment where innovation and competition can flow freely for the area surrounding the DNS.

It was noted before Congress in the July 31, 2003, hearing that ICANN should be the organization to provide a forum for best practices for the naming and numbering system. The recent amendment to the memorandum of understanding notes the need to continue to develop and test accountability mechanisms. I would ask the department to set a date to determine if these best practices guidelines focusing on stability, security and interoperability have been determined and a set time for their implementation. The initial best practices could be established by a working group by the beginning of 2004 with a follow-up strategic plan for

implementation of the first best practice guideline for the industry with in the first 6 months of 2004.

The memorandum of understanding recommends the continued development and implementation of transparent procedures. I would again call for a date certain to ensure the decisionmaking process set by ICANN is transparent, predictable and timely for all parties involved in the decisions ICANN influences. Established procedures for a transparent decisionmaking process should be established by the end of this year to ensure ICANN has this as a top priority and as a signal to ensure the industry and constituents involved in ICANN can begin to plan for a process that will be applied equally across all parties and in a predictable fashion.

One concern that has been noted through our congressional oversight hearing is that parties with contractual obligations to ICANN are disadvantaged in providing services that non-ICANN contracted parties are free to offer. There is reason for this discrepancy to exist in an open market. ICANN should take into consideration the entire global Internet industry when making decisions. Disadvantaging contracted parties should be a thing of ICANN's past and new service level agreements should be negotiated with all ICANN participants that allow the rights of a registry and root zone operator to independently determine functionality, pricing and operations of existing services and sue services as part of their new agreement with the Department of Commerce.

The decisionmaking process needs visible criteria and independent arbitration procedures to ensure no party is being unjustly prosecuted by decisions made at the hands of the ICANN board. Ensuring that ICANN is considered a decisionmaker in global economic commerce hinges on their ability to reach agreements with the other international bodies. They have been required in previous memorandums of understanding to reach agreements with the other country code operators. I would call on the Department of Commerce to put a target date in place for ICANN to reach an agreement with a majority of the other country code operators.

The new leadership of both ICANN and at the National Telecommunications Information Administration should be able to take a fresh look at the challenges that lie before ICANN and its partners and bring a more orderly and professionally accountable way of doing business that encourages competition, innovation and stability for the global internet structure.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the

Local Law Enforcement Enhancement 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 in Boston, MA. On November 16, 2002, a 31-year-old Pakistani man was physically assaulted at a convenience store where he was working. Three men, believing the store clerk was from Afghanistan and associated with the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on America, shouted racial slurs at the man and then proceeded to kick, punch and throw things at him. The trio were later charged with a hate crime violation.

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.

IRAQ SECURITY AND STABILIZATION FUND ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I have joined with Senators BIDEN, KERRY and CORZINE to introduce legislation that will provide us with the necessary financial footing to appropriately execute our obligations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In 1998, following nearly 30 years of deficits and a 17-fold increase in Federal debt from \$365.8 billion to \$6.4 trillion, bipartisan cooperation brought the budget back into balance once again. For the first time in more than a generation, some of the funds which would have gone to pay interest on the debt were instead spent actually paying down the debt.

Now, deficits and interest costs are growing once again. Net interest payments on the Federal debt will increase sharply, from approximately \$170 billion in 2003 to more than \$300 billion by 2012.

We face a host of new challenges, particularly the war on terror, the war in Iraq, and the threat of North Korea. This has necessarily led to a shift in government spending toward improving our defense and homeland security capabilities. Yet many of the challenges predating September 11 are still with us: improving education, updating infrastructure, and preparing for the retirement of the baby-boom generation, which will severely strain the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

The Congressional Budget Office predicts that the Federal deficit for fiscal year 2004 will top \$500 billion. A portion of every dollar we spend from this day forward until the end of September 2004 will be borrowed money—money that our children and grandchildren will have to repay.

It is no secret that if citizens wish to receive services or undertake activities as a Nation, they have the right to levy

a tax upon themselves to achieve those ends. We have somehow lost this sense of obligation and have concluded that providing for our national defense or for the education of children requires no more than charging the costs to a government credit card. This must stop.

We are spending our way into economic oblivion. The President has decided that the best way to reelection is to cut taxes and leave spending alone. He refuses to make the tough decisions. So, with my colleagues in the Senate, I will help him. If the President wishes to engage our troops in Iraq, a decision that I agreed with and continue to support, then he must agree to pay for it.

By seeking a modest increase in the tax rate that affects those making more than \$310,000 in taxable income we can pay for the President's most recent supplemental request. This bill generates precisely \$87 billion—enough to cover a portion of the cost of the war in Iraq and an even smaller part of our obligation in Afghanistan.

This bill is a first step toward putting our fiscal house in order. It would pay for the President's supplemental spending request and it does not revoke the 2001 reduction in the top income tax rate. Nor would it affect any other element of the 2001 tax package. It would merely temporarily raise the marginal income tax rate on the richest in our society. These individuals would continue to benefit from the other aspects of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, many of which predominantly accrued to them.

Nearly a decade ago, thanks to the commitment of Senators from both parties and all ideological persuasions, we were able to put in motion a successful plan to balance the Federal budget, and laid the groundwork for an unprecedented period of economic growth and prosperity.

I believe this bill moves us back to this path and represents our understanding that we have an obligation as a society to raise money from time to time to pay for those activities we deem important to our national well-being.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONORING THE 55th ANNIVERSARY OF BLACK HILLS NATIONAL CEMETERY

• Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I wish to express our Nation's gratitude for the respectful services provided by Black Hills National Cemetery near Sturgis, SD. This year marks the 55th anniversary of the cemetery, and comes at a time when all Americans have been painfully reminded that our freedom is preserved by brave men and women in uniform who are willing to risk their lives in service to our Nation.

In the summer of 1862, thousands of soldiers had already died in a terrible

war that few believed would last more than a matter of months. On July 17 of that same year, Congress enacted legislation that would authorize the President to purchase cemetery grounds to be used as national cemeteries for soldiers who died while in service to the country. It was not long after that, in 1873, that all honorably discharged veterans became eligible for burial in national cemeteries. According to local legend, the hoofbeats of Custer's Cavalry may still be faintly heard today in the shadows of the Black Hills, where the Black Hills National Cemetery has provided a dedicated area for the honored burial of past and present South Dakota members of our Nation's armed forces and their eligible dependents for the past 55 years.

Too often, it seems that Congress forgets those men and women who sacrificed a part of their lives to serve their country. In a Nation as wealthy as ours, the very least we can do to repay veterans for their service is to provide them with the final resting place they deserve. Today, the National Cemetery Association ensures our veterans have a proper burial, while also maintaining the national cemeteries as shrines to their memory. In the words of Abraham Lincoln, the "nation must care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan."

The Black Hills National Cemetery has long been part of that respected tradition since World War II, when the first four burials were conducted on September 27, 1948. Three additional burials were done before the official dedication of the Black Hills National Cemetery on October 3, 1948. Since those initial entombments, the remains of more than 17,000 courageous soldiers who have served their country have been laid to rest there, including South Dakota's only casualty from Operation Iraqi Freedom, Hans Gukheisen.

The Black Hills National Cemetery is also the final resting place to such notable men as United States Senator Francis H. Case, who also gave the dedication address in 1948, suggesting that the Black Hills National Cemetery be the "Arlington of the West," and Brigadier General Richard E. Ellsworth, Commander of the Rapid City Air Force Base, which was later renamed Ellsworth Air Force Base in his honor, was also laid to rest there.

As the father of a soldier who has recently returned from Iraq, I have made it a priority to give veterans the recognition and treatment they deserve for their outstanding service to our country. I am proud to have the Black Hills National Cemetery located in my home State of South Dakota, and I am honored today to congratulate the Black Hills National Cemetery on their first 55 years of service. I know that our entire Nation shares in this expression of gratitude.●

MILLIE MAIRS AWARDED 2003 "ANGELS IN ADOPTION" AWARD

● Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of Mrs. Millie Mairs, a woman who has demonstrated her enormous capacity for love by serving some of West Virginia's most vulnerable children. Through her work with the West Virginia Children's Home Society Adoption Program, Millie has touched the lives of many new families in my home state and is a cornerstone of adoption services there. Later this month, Millie will be honored alongside other "Angels in Adoption." This is a special award created by the Congressional Adoption Caucus. I would like to take a moment to tell you more about the work and accomplishments of this quiet, gentle lady who has worked on behalf of children for more than twenty years at the West Virginia Children's Home Society.

The West Virginia Children's Home Society was created in 1896 and has long provided care for children in need. Today, the Society offers adoptive, child protective, and emergency services through an expanded mission. Twenty-eight years ago, Millie Mairs came to the Children's Home Society Adoption Program as an adoption secretary in order to assist West Virginia families who hoped to adopt a child. Since then, Millie has served those families in a variety of roles and has maintained a strong relationship with many of them, including some of her very first clients. From administering support services to meeting with perspective parents to guiding birth mothers through appropriate after care, Millie's name has become synonymous with adoption advocacy in West Virginia.

Those who know Millie best say that no one is better suited to serve as an adoption advocate than she. Her colleagues use words such as "rare," "special," "kind," and "considerate" in order to describe her. Her clients depend on her as they complete necessary paperwork and interviews, and as they work through the many emotions that adoption brings. And while Millie serves as a valuable resource for those entering into the adoption system today, her knowledge of previous adoptions is priceless to those who seek even the smallest amount of information about their past. Millie has provided a comforting ear and soothing words to these individuals since her first days at the Children's Home Society and has also reunited birth mothers and their children from that time. She has always understood and has tried to convey to others that adoption is a selfless act of love from the perspective of both birth mothers and adoptive parents. As you can imagine, this has brought great comfort to children, birth mothers, and adoptive parents alike.

The Angels in Adoption Award recognizes individuals like Millie who work every day to better the lives of others through the field of adoption. On Sep-

tember 30, Millie and other Angels will come to Washington in order to be recognized for their good works. While they will look just as any other visitors to the Capitol complex that day, I have been assured by Millie's colleagues and by others that they truly are angels in our midst. I hope that you will help me in welcoming them and honoring them. Further, I hope that you will carry their message with you: that all children deserve a safe, healthy, and permanent home and that, for some children, this is only possible through adoption.

I have worked for many years in bipartisan coalitions to promote adoption and improved services for abused and neglected children. While these issues rarely command headlines, they change the lives of children and families across our country. People like Millie Mairs and programs like Angels in Adoption remind us of the importance of our adoption and child welfare programs. In 1997, Congress passed the Adoption and Safe Families Act to ensure that a child's health and safety are paramount, and to express the belief that every child deserves a permanent home. Since then, adoptions from foster care have nearly doubled. While this is wonderful news, more than 100,000 children remain in foster care. As Millie and her peers would tell us, we clearly have more work to do.

I am delighted to have had this opportunity to tell you more about Millie Mairs and her work with the West Virginia Children's Home Society. I have long believed that the people of West Virginia are its greatest resource; individuals such as Millie prove this point again and again.●

HONORING JUDY HADLEY OF LINCOLN, RHODE ISLAND

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I wish to share with my colleagues a story demonstrating one person's ability to protect the environment from the threat of pollution, for the benefit of wildlife and human enjoyment alike.

Thirty years after the passage of the Clean Water Act, the Blackstone River has shaken off a legacy of neglect and re-emerged as a vital community asset. The water quality has improved, a bikeway is under construction, and mill buildings are being restored as apartments and condominiums. The National Park Service is promoting a new appreciation for the work and culture of the families who have made the Blackstone Valley their home. And just last week, I joined the Army Corps of Engineers in celebrating the restoration of wetlands in a floodplain that had been paved over for 50 years. So there is a great deal of activity on the banks of the Blackstone.

While the Federal Government has been a major player in the river's re-birth, none of these exciting developments would have been possible without the personal commitment of Blackstone Valley residents. It is their hard

work and, more importantly, their heightened vigilance and renewed sense of ownership of the river that have helped it to thrive.

One such resident is Judy Hadley of Lincoln, RI a town of about 21,000 people, located on the Blackstone River. As the chair of the Lincoln Land Trust, Judy is a staunch defender of her town's remaining open spaces and a passionate advocate on behalf of the Blackstone. She is active in a number of other local organizations, including the Friends of the Blackstone River, the Blackstone River Watershed Council, and the Lincoln Tree and Trail Commission. She has organized river cleanups and educated her fellow residents about the impact that stormwater has on the Blackstone and its wildlife population.

For many years, a 60-ton excavator sat abandoned on a man-made island in the river a relic of an old gravel mining operation. It was an eyesore and a potential environmental hazard. Two years ago, Judy Hadley went to work: canvassing State and Federal authorities, trying to find the best solution for this problem. No agency seemed to have the right equipment or the resources to handle such an unusual request, but Judy persisted. If she could have dismantled it herself and taken it away piece by piece, I think she would have.

Fortunately, it did not come to that. Last year, the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management removed more than 300 gallons of diesel fuel and other fluids from the machinery. The excavator itself was finally taken away this summer by the Army Corps via a temporary land bridge, as part of the wetland restoration project I mentioned earlier.

This was a great triumph, and Judy Hadley's dedication has been cheered by many local residents. Without her persistence, the excavator would still be slowly degrading, leaving open the possibility that oil and fuel would seep out, fouling valuable marsh habitat downstream. Walkers and canoeists would still be shaking their heads at the sight of a rusting hulk across the river. But Judy refused to accept the excavator as just another part of the landscape, insisting that it be removed. In so doing, she has reminded us of the Blackstone River's great worth, as well as its vulnerability, and inspired us to be better stewards of a rediscovered resource.

I know my colleagues join me in saluting Judy Hadley on this achievement.●

HONORING DONALD P. OULTON

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I bring to your attention today the exemplary work and most commendable service to one of our country's outstanding public servants. Mr. Donald P. Oulton, Chief of the International Law Branch, Office of the Staff Judge Advocate, U.S. Air Force Electronic Sys-

tems Center, Hanscom Air Force Base, MA. Mr. Oulton retired on September 1, 2003, following an extraordinary career of more than 30 years of service to the Nation.

Born in upstate New York at the beginning of the Great Depression, Mr. Oulton was one of 10 children. Part of a close and loving family, at an early age he and his siblings became accomplished singers and dancers, helping support their large family performing "minstrel shows" through those challenging years. Mr. Oulton became a one-handicap golfer in his teenage years while working as a caddy at a local country club. He had aspirations to become a professional golfer, but his plans were cut short by the call to service in the Korean war.

An outstanding marksman, Mr. Oulton served as an intelligence and reconnaissance scout with the Seventh Infantry Division in the Chorwon Valley. There, he spend much of his time in outposts far in front of the main line of resistance, scouting out enemy positions and coordinating artillery and mortar fire by American and United Nations forces. He performed these duties repeatedly under hostile fire and in extremely harsh and primitive conditions. Of his great physical courage and devotion to duty there can be no doubt.

After more than 9 months of combat at or in front of the main line of resistance, Mr. Oulton returned to the United States and was assigned to the United States National Honor Guard in Arlington, VA. Upon his honorable discharge from the Army he relocated to the greater Boston area, married his lovely wife Carol, and started his devoted family of four children David, Nancy, Sarah and Carol. After more than a decade, he also began to pursue his boyhood dream of becoming an attorney. In 1970, he achieved that goal, and after three years servicing as an Assistant District Attorney in Middlesex County, MA, he began his long association with the United States Air Force, and the Electronic Systems Center at Hanscom Air Force base.

Mr. Oulton's contributions have been monumental. He was on the ground floor of many novel, complex issues arising from the passage of the Arms Control Act of 1976. He quickly became, and remains, one of the Department of Defense's leading experts on the act, security assistance, and foreign military sales. His contributions over three decades are too numerous to recount, but among the most significant have been as the lead attorney for the sale of the Airborne Warning and Control System, AWACS, to a variety of U.S. allies, including the United Kingdom, France, Turkey, Australia, Japan, and most notably NATO. In the build up to, and in the wake of, Operation Desert Storm, Mr. Oulton provided the expert legal advice that served as the foundation for the early deployment of the Joint STARS aircraft before the Air Force formally accepted it. His efforts have been instrumental in promoting

the common defense and freedom throughout the world.

A well-recognized legal expert, Mr. Oulton was the 1980 recipient of the James O. Wrightson Award, as the outstanding Air Force civilian attorney. In 1983, he was selected as the outstanding senior civilian in the electronic systems division of Air Force Systems Command, and presented the Harold M. Wright award. He is widely published and cited in the field of security assistance and foreign military sales, has been an adjunct faculty member at Western New England College, and has been a guest lecturer on International Law at Harvard University.

I ask that my colleagues join me and Mr. Oulton's many friends and family in saluting his many distinguished years of selfless service to the United States of America. I know our Nation, his wife Carol, and his family are extremely proud of his accomplishments. It is fitting that the Senate honors this true patriot today.●

LIEUTENANT GENERAL EMIL R. "BUCK" BEDARD, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

● Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to LTG Emil R. "Buck" Bedard, who will retire Monday and return to private life after more than 36 years of selfless service to our Nation as a United States Marine. I have had the pleasure to work with Lieutenant General Bedard on matters of importance to the U.S. Marine Corps and to our Nation's defense. His experience and expertise will be missed by many of us in the Senate, as will his integrity, keen insight, and good judgment.

Buck Bedard was born in Argyle, MN, where he graduated from Argyle high school. He then slipped away from Minnesota's grasp and attended the University of North Dakota. Following his graduation, he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps in December 1967. General Bedard also holds a master of science degree, and his formal military education includes the U.S. Army Advanced Infantry Course, the Armed Forces Staff College, and the Army War College.

While he was a lieutenant, Buck Bedard served as a rifle platoon commander and company executive officer with 2d Battalion, 27th Marines, and 3d Battalion, 3d Marines, in the Republic of Vietnam. Subsequently, he was ordered to Quantico, VA, where he served as a staff officer and then as the commander with Schools Demonstrations Troops.

Then-Captain Bedard was assigned to the U.S. Army Intelligence School as an instructor, and he later served as a company commander in the 3d Marine Division in Okinawa, Japan. Following that tour of duty, Captain Bedard became the Marine officer instructor at the Naval Reserve Officer Training Unit at Vanderbilt University and was

a Platoon and Company Commander at the Marine Corps Officer Candidate School in Quantico, VA. Following his promotion to major, he served as the Logistics Officer, 7th Marines, and then as the executive officer, 3d Battalion, 7th Marines.

Then-Lieutenant Colonel Bedard served as the assistant operations officer, 1st Marine Amphibious Force, G-3, Pacific Plans Officer, and finally as the G-5. Assigned to NATO and stationed in Holland, LTC Bedard served in the Central Region Operations Division in charge of reinforcement operations of Allied Forces to Central Europe.

Then-Colonel Bedard was reassigned to Twenty-Nine Palms, California, where he directed the Combined Arms Exercise Program at the Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center. He became the Assistant G-3 for Operations for the 7th Marine Expeditionary Brigade and the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. From May 1991, through June 1993, Colonel Bedard commanded the 7th Marine Regiment, which deployed to Somalia in December, 1992. In July, 1993, he was assigned as the Assistant Division Commander for the 1st Marine Division, Camp Pendleton, California, and in October 1993, he was reassigned as J-3 Operations Officer, Joint Task Force, Somalia.

In June, 1994, Colonel Bedard was advanced to Brigadier General and was assigned as the President, Marine Corps University and Commanding General Marine Corps Schools, Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia. His next assignment in June, 1995, was as the Deputy Commander, Marine Forces Pacific, Camp H.M. Smith, Hawaii. General Bedard assumed command of 2d Marine Division in July 1997, and was promoted to Major General on September 1, 1997. He assumed command of 2d Marine Expeditionary Force in July 1999. On June 29, 2000, General Bedard relinquished command of Second Marine Expeditionary Force and was advanced to his current rank. Lieutenant General Bedard has been the Deputy Commandant of Plans, Policies and Operations at Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, since July 2000, where he has skillfully guided Marine Corps operations following September 11th, 2001, and during Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom.

Throughout his career as a U.S. Marine, Lieutenant General Bedard has demonstrated his outstanding character, discerning wisdom, and deep sense of duty to his Country, his Corps, his Marines, and their families. On behalf of the U.S. Senate I thank Lieutenant General Bedard for his exemplary career, his many accomplishments, and his devoted service to our Nation. We also thank his wife, Linda, and their three children for sharing him with his country. Congratulations, Lieutenant General Bedard; your mission has been very well accomplished. ●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:57 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3087. An act to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

H.R. 3146. An act to extend the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program, and certain tax and trade programs, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 69. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2754) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints the following Members as the managers of the conference on the part of the House: Mr. HOBSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. OBEY.

The message further announced that the Speaker appoints the following Members as additional conferees in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3) to prohibit the procedure commonly known as partial-birth abortion: Mr. CHABOT, and Ms. LOFGREN.

At 12:12 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 2555. An act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2657. An act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

S. 111. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the national significance of the Miami Circle site in the State of Florida as well as the suitability and feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System as part of Biscayne National Park, and for other purposes.

S. 233. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of Coltsville in the State of Connecticut for potential inclusion in the National Park System.

S. 278. An act to make certain adjustments to the boundaries of the Mount Naomi Wilderness Area, and for other purposes.

At 12:55 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3161. An act to ratify the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to establish a do-not-call registry.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 1657. A bill to amend section 44921 of title 49, United States Code, to provide for the arming of cargo pilots against terrorism.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on September 25, 2003, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 111. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the national significance of the Miami Circle site in the State of Florida as well as the suitability and feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System as part of Biscayne National Park, and for other purposes.

S. 233. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of Coltsville in the State Connecticut for potential inclusion in the National Park System.

S. 278. An act to make certain adjustments to the boundaries of the Mount Naomi Wilderness Area, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-4397. A communication from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Interest Rate" (Rev. Rul. 2003-104) received on September 22, 2003; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4398. A communication from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "The Jobs and Growth Act of 2003—Information Reporting for Payments in Lieu of Dividends" (Notice 2003-67) received on September 22, 2003; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4399. A communication from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

"Built-in Gains or Losses Under Section 382(h)" (Notice 2003-65) received on September 22, 2003; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4400. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological Materials from Cambodia" (RIN1515-AD34) received on September 22, 2003; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4401. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the audit of the Telecommunications Development Fund; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4402. A communication from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Steel: Monitoring Developments in the Domestic Industry"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4403. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4404. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Documentation of Nonimmigrants Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, As Amended: Automatic Visa Revalidation: Final Rule" (22 CFR Part 21) received on September 22, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4405. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management and Budget, Department of the Interior, transmitting, the Department's annual report relative to grants streamlining and standardization; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-4406. A communication from the Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting, a report relative to the effects of regulation and paperwork on the economy and Federal agency consultations that take place with State, local, and Tribal governments; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-4407. A communication from the Director, Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances, Mine Safety and Health Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Emergency Evacuations" (RIN1219-AB33) received on September 22, 2003; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4408. A communication from the Directorate, Directorate of Construction, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Standards for Signs, Signals, and Barricades" (RIN1218-AB88) received on September 17, 2003; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4409. A communication from the Chief, Coordination and Review Section, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Race, Color, or National Origin in Programs Receiving Federal Assistance; Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap in Programs Receiving Federal Assistance; Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Age in Programs Receiving Federal Assistance" (RIN1190-AA49) received on September 22, 2003; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4410. A communication from the Director, Regulations Management, Veterans Health Administration, transmitting, pursu-

ant to law, the report of a rule entitled "VA Homeless Providers Grant and Per Diem Program" (RIN2900-AL30) received on September 22, 2003; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4411. A communication from the Director, Regulations Management, Veterans Health Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Eligibility for an Appropriate Government Marker for a Grave Already Marked at Private Expense" (RIN2900-AL40) received on September 22, 2003; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 98. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week of October 12, 2003, through October 18, 2003, as "National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Week".

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 209. A resolution recognizing and honoring Woodstock, Vermont, native Hiram Powers for his extraordinary and enduring contributions to American sculpture.

S. Res. 222. A resolution designating October 17, 2003 as "National Mammography Day".

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1293. A bill to criminalize the sending of predatory and abusive e-mail.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1451. A bill to reauthorize programs under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WARNER for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Gordon England, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Lance L. Smith.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. William R. Looney III.

Army nomination of Colonel Dennis P. Geoghan.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Claude V. Christianson.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. William E. Ward.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Peter L. Andrus.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) James M. McGarrath.

Navy nomination of Capt. Richard E. Cellon.

Navy nomination of Capt. Ben F. Gaumer.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Henry G. Ulrich III.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. John G. Cotton.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Timothy J. Keating.

Navy nomination of Capt. Robert F. Burt.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Jan C. Huly.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report

favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the Records on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning Mark T. Allison and ending Frederick M. Wolfe, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2003.

Air Force nominations beginning Geoffrey H. Hills and ending John B. Steele, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 2, 2003.

Air Force nominations beginning Craig H. Morris and ending Sherice D. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 2, 2003.

Air Force nomination of Brian P. Olson.

Air Force nominations beginning Teri L. Poulton-Consoldane and ending Sheldon G. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 2, 2003.

Air Force nominations beginning Scott G. Book and ending Sara K. Slavens, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 2, 2003.

Air Force nominations beginning Stephen W. Humphrey and ending Randy J. Yovanovich, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 4, 2003.

Air Force nomination of Gerilyn A. Posner.

Army nominations beginning William T. Barbee, Jr. and ending Kenneth W. Yates, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2003.

Army nominations beginning Stephen W. Austin and ending Nathan L. Zimmerman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 30, 2003.

Army nominations beginning Michael J. Bullock and ending Paul A. Trapani, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 30, 2003.

Army nominations beginning Madelfia A. Abb and ending X0007, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 1, 2003.

Army nominations beginning Richard K. Addo and ending Veronica S. Zsido, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record August 1, 2003.

Army nominations beginning Bryan K. Adams and ending Joseph M. Yoswa, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 1, 2003.

Army nominations beginning Scott E. Alexander and ending William H. Woods, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 1, 2003.

Army nomination of Kevin J. Chapman.

Navy nominations beginning Michael S. Agabegi and ending Reid J. Winkler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning John R. Anderson and ending Nicolas D. I. Yamodis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Alan L. Adams and ending Georges E. Younes, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning James D. Abbott and ending Robert W. Zurschmit, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Tim K. Adams and ending Timothy P. Zinkus, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2003.

By Mr. HATCH for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mauricio J. Tamargo, of Florida, to be Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for a term expiring September 30, 2006.

Carlos T. Bea, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Marcia A. Crone, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas.

William Q. Hayes, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

John A. Houston, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Ronald A. White, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

Robert Clive Jones, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.

Phillip S. Figa, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado.

John Francis Bardelli, of Connecticut, to be United States Marshal for the District of Connecticut for the term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

Army nomination of Mary M. McCord.

Army nomination of Charles A. Jarnot.

Army nomination of Joseph T. Ramsey.

Army nomination of John B. Munozatkinson.

Army nomination of Andrew D. Stewart.

Army nominations beginning Tyrone C. *Abero and ending X3713, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 10, 2003.

Army nomination of Gregory S. Johnson.

Army nomination of Timothy C. Kelly.

Army nominations beginning Paul D. Harrell and ending William S. Lee, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2003.

Marine Corps nomination of Bryan D. McKinney.

Marine Corps nomination of Jon C. Rhodes.

Marine Corps nomination of Colin D. Smith.

Navy nominations beginning Stephen M. Saia and ending David A. Tubley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 30, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Roland E. Arellano and ending Marva L. Wheeler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 30, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Vida M. Antolinjenkins and ending Dominick G. Yacono, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 30, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning James J. Anderson and ending John F. Zollo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 30, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Michael T. Akin and ending Peter G. Woodson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 30, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Richard E. Aguila and ending Scott D. Thomas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 30, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Linda M. Acosta and ending Joan L. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 30, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Leanne K. Aaby and ending Michael J. Zuccherro, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 30, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Lee A. Axtell and ending Dennis W. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 30, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Emma J.M. Brown and ending Marcia L. Ziemba, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 1, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Brent T. Channell and ending Matthew W. Edwards, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 1, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Marc E. Boyd and ending Wendy L. Snyder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 3, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Olivia L. Betha and ending Theresa A. Talbert, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 3, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Jason B. Babcock and ending Timothy J. Zinck, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 3, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Reid B. Applequist and ending Bret A. Washburn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 3, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Tracie L. Andrusiak and ending Robert A. Wolf, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 3, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Timothy A. Anderson and ending Douglas T. Wahl, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 3, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Sowon S. Ahn and ending Scott D. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 3, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Leon S. Abrams and ending Carl Zeigler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 3, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Rafael A. Acevedo and ending Todd A. Zirkle, which nominations were received by the Senate and

appeared in the Congressional Record on September 3, 2003.

Navy nomination of Paul C. Brown.

Navy nomination of Paul H. Evers.

Navy nomination of Robert E. Stone.

Navy nominations beginning William K. Bane and ending Andy J. Lancaster, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Bradley A. Appleman and ending Florencio J. Yuzon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2003.

Navy nominations beginning Erskine L. Alvis and ending Randy E. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2003.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ENSIGN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SMITH, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GRAHAM of Florida, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. REED, Mr. WARNER, Mr. FRIST, Mr. BURNS, Mr. LUGAR, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. AKAKA, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CHAFEE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BAYH, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. INOUE, Mr. REID, Mr. DODD, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. SPECTER):

S. 1655. A bill to ratify the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to establish the do-not-call registry; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORZINE:

S. 1656. A bill to address regulation of secondary mortgage market enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BUNNING (for himself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1657. A bill to amend section 44921 of title 49, United States Code, to provide for the arming of cargo pilots against terrorism; read the first time.

By Mr. DASCHLE (for Mr. GRAHAM of Florida):

S. 1658. A bill to make residents of Puerto Rico eligible for the earned income tax credit, the refundable portion of the child tax credit, and supplemental security income benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 1659. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 57 Old Tappan Road in Tappan, New York, as the "John G. Dow Post Office Building; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. REID):

S. 1660. A bill to improve water quality on abandoned and inactive mine land, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1661. A bill to require the Federal Trade Commission to establish a list of consumers who request not to receive telephone sales calls; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 1662. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the work opportunity tax credit to include trade adjustment assistance as a targeted group; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. DOLE:

S. 1663. A bill to replace certain Coastal Barrier Resources System maps; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. MILLER, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. KOHL, Mr. TALENT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. CONRAD, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. BREAUX):

S. 1664. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to provide for the enhanced review of covered pesticide products, to authorize fees for certain pesticide products, and to extend and improve the collection of maintenance fees; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. Res. 234. A resolution honoring the Detroit Shock on winning the Women's National Basketball Association Championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DAYTON (for himself and Mr. COLEMAN):

S. Res. 235. A resolution honoring the life of the late Herb Brooks and expressing the deepest condolences of the Senate to his family on his death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 55

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 55, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the annual determination of the rate of the basic benefit of active duty educational assistance under the Montgomery GI Bill, and for other purposes.

S. 573

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 573, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote organ donation, and for other purposes.

S. 596

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the investment of foreign earnings within the United States for productive business investments and job creation.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against manufacturers, distributors, dealers, or importers of firearms or ammunition for damages resulting from the misuse of their products by others.

S. 695

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 695, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the above-the-line deduction for teacher classroom supplies and to expand such deduction to include qualified professional development expenses.

S. 736

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 736, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to strengthen enforcement of provisions relating to animal fighting, and for other purposes.

S. 853

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 853, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate discriminatory copayment rates for outpatient psychiatric services under the medicare program.

S. 854

At the request of Mr. DAYTON, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 854, a bill to authorize a comprehensive program of support for victims of torture, and for other purposes.

S. 859

At the request of Mr. CORZINE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 859, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to facilitating the development of microbicides for preventing transmission of HIV and other diseases.

S. 982

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 982, a bill to halt Syrian support for terrorism, end its occupation of Lebanon, stop its development of weapons of mass destruction, cease its illegal importation of Iraqi oil, and hold Syria accountable for its role in the Middle East, and for other purposes.

S. 1032

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1032, a bill to provide for alternative transportation in certain federally owned or managed areas that are open to the general public.

S. 1222

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the name of the Senator from

Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1222, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in determining eligibility for payment under the prospective payment system for inpatient rehabilitation facilities, to apply criteria consistent with rehabilitation impairment categories established by the Secretary for purposes of such prospective payment system.

S. 1234

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1234, a bill to reauthorize the Federal Trade Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 1261

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1261, a bill to reauthorize the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 1297

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1297, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the jurisdiction of Federal courts inferior to the Supreme Court over certain cases and controversies involving the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to reauthorize the assault weapons ban, and for other purposes.

S. 1494

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1494, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the special 5-year carryback of certain net operating losses to losses for 2003, 2004, and 2005.

S. 1558

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1558, a bill to restore religious freedoms.

S. 1622

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM of Florida, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. DOLE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1622, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to exempt certain members of the Armed Forces from the requirement to pay subsistence charges while hospitalized.

S. 1642

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1642, a bill to extend the duration of the immigrant investor regional center pilot program for 5 additional years, and for other purposes.

S. 1645

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1645, a bill to provide for the adjustment of status of certain foreign agricultural workers, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform the H-2A worker program under that Act, to provide a stable, legal agricultural workforce, to extend basic legal protections and better working conditions to more workers, and for other purposes.

S. 1654

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1654, a bill to ratify the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to establish a do-not-call registry.

S. CON. RES. 21

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 21, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that community inclusion and enhanced lives for individuals with mental retardation or other developmental disabilities is at serious risk because of the crisis in recruiting and retaining direct support professionals, which impedes the availability of a stable, quality direct support workforce.

S. RES. 202

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 202, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the genocidal Ukraine Famine of 1932–33.

S. RES. 222

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 222, a resolution designating October 17, 2003 as “National Mammography Day”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1786

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1786 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2765, a bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the reve-

nues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORZINE:

S. 1656. A bill to address regulation of secondary mortgage market enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I rise to introduce The Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Modernization Act of 2003, legislation to establish a new, world-class regulator for our housing Government Sponsored Enterprises (GSEs)—Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac—as an agency within the Department of Treasury.

There is no doubt that housing finance is essential to our economy and has been one of our Nation's few economic bright spots in recent years. Given its critical role, and the size and complex financial structures of the GSE's, which account for billions of mortgage-finance dollars, we need a credible, world-class regulator that can provide effective oversight.

Regrettably, the current system of GSE supervision fails to meet that standard.

This legislation has four primary objectives: establishing a new, independent regulator that is credible and capable; ensuring safe and sound capital; promoting market discipline and transparency through enhanced disclosures; and providing an incremental approach to ultimately consolidating supervision of the Federal Home Loan Banks under the regulatory framework contained in this legislation.

The proposal also recognizes the importance of the GSEs' underlying housing mission and leaves responsibility for establishing the GSEs annual housing goals and overseeing their compliance with fair housing laws with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

The legislation would create a new agency, the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision (OFHES), as a bureau within the Department of the Treasury, with a structure similar to that of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) and the Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS).

The agency would have general regulatory, supervisory and enforcement authority with respect to the enterprises, be independent of Treasury with regard to its comments and congressional testimony, and have a director, appointed for a five-year term, who would be given a seat on the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC). To ensure that the enterprises' activities remain consistent with the scope of their charter, the agency would be authorized to approve all new enterprise programs, but in close consultation with HUD.

Additionally, the agency would be given broad new authority to hire expe-

rienced personnel, a significant portion of whom will be designated specifically to carry out examinations and supervisory activities, to make certain that the agency can fulfill its safety and soundness responsibilities.

Central to that oversight function is ensuring that the enterprises maintain safe and sound capital through vigorous, continuous monitoring. The legislation therefore requires the new agency to ensure that the enterprises remain in continuous compliance with their statutorily prescribed minimum capital holding requirements.

By ensuring that the GSEs maintain adequate capital, we will mitigate the risks to the enterprises, and our financial markets, from unforeseen shocks that can, and do, occasionally occur in our financial markets. To accomplish this, the legislation takes a multi-pronged approach to the issue of risk-based capital.

First, the legislation requires the new agency to continually monitor the risk-based capital held by the enterprises, but it also provides the new agency's director with the flexibility to adjust the risk-based capital level of the enterprises in order to ensure their safe and sound financial operation.

The legislation also authorizes the new agency to conduct a comprehensive review of the enterprises' risk-based capital rule every five years. Part of the review would include a report to Congress entailing what, if any, proposed changes the new agency believes are needed to the risk-based capital rule to better align the capital held by the enterprises with risk, and reflect evolving best practices for risk-based capital standards for large, complex financial institutions. However, on a continual basis the Director would have the authority to adjust elements to the enterprises' stress test other than those specifically prescribed in the risk-based rule.

With regard to the GSE non-mortgage related investments, this legislation affirms the notion that those investments should be of the highest quality and within the scope of the enterprises' respective charters. It does so by requiring the new agency to continuously monitor the appropriateness of the investments in the liquid and non-liquid portfolios of the GSEs and by certifying that the liquidity management practices of the enterprises conform with recommendations contained in the “Sound Practices for Managing Liquidity in Banking Organizations” established by the Basel Committee.

The capital and liquidity management provisions of this legislation are balanced. They ensure that the enterprises maintain appropriate minimum capital and are adequately capitalized relative to their risks. They also empower the new agency to take appropriate action if enterprises become undercapitalized, and promote sound liquidity management practices. At the same time, the bill is not so overly prescriptive that it would undermine the

essential liquidity the enterprises' provide, which has enabled America's housing markets to become the envy of the world.

The third element of this bill that should dramatically improve the GSE's regulatory framework promotes transparency through enhanced disclosures requirements.

This legislation statutorily requires Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and the Federal Home Loan Banks to disclose a variety of information that will provide the public, investors, and Congress with a better understanding of the underlying financial health of our housing enterprises.

First, the legislation requires the GSEs to register their equities under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and to comply with SEC disclosure and reporting requirements contained under sections 12 (Registration Requirements for Securities), 14 (Proxy Voting Information) and 16 (Insider Sales) of the 1934 Act.

These disclosures are consistent with the highest standards of corporate governance and disclosure required of other public companies and in my mind there is no reason why the GSEs should not be required to do so as well.

Second, this legislation would require Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to disclose information regarding their interest rate and credit risks. Specifically, each enterprise would regularly report the impact on their mortgage portfolios of a 50 basis point change in interest rates and a 25 basis point change in the slope of the yield curve. They would also be required to disclose, on a quarterly basis, the financial impact on each enterprise of an immediate 5 percent decline in U.S. home prices.

Additionally, the bill requires the GSEs to acquire credit ratings from an SEC-recognized credit rating agency to provide an assessment of the risk to the government and independent financial health of each enterprise. This "stand-alone" rating would be derived from the underlying credit quality of each enterprise and assume no direct support from the Federal Government.

These disclosures will ensure that the standards of financial disclosure of the GSEs are in line with the rest of corporate America, making the enterprises subject to public scrutiny and market disciplinary forces.

Finally, the bill takes an incremental approach towards incorporating oversight of the Federal Home Loan Banks into the new regulatory framework created under this bill.

The bill requires Treasury, in consultation with HUD, to issue a report to Congress no later than six months after the date of the bill's enactment on the appropriate manner upon which to consolidate the responsibilities of the Federal Housing Finance Board, and oversight of the Federal Home Loan Banks (FHLBs), into the regulatory framework contained under this bill.

And as I mentioned earlier, the FHLBs would be required to immediately comply with financial disclosure and reporting requirements under the 1934 act in a manner similar to those required of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac under this bill.

Lastly, the legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to designate an individual to serve as one of the five Federal Housing Finance Board members. This authority, transferred from HUD, would immediately involve Treasury in the regulatory rubric of the FHFB and ease the transition of the consolidation of the FHFBs regulatory responsibilities into this new agency.

In conclusion, the reforms contained in this proposal are very important. They would establish a new regulatory framework that promotes sound and safe financial operations at the GSEs. They would promote stability in our capital markets by providing investors with better information about the financial health of the enterprises. They would affirm the GSEs' critical role in our nation's housing market. And they would protect investors and taxpayers, while preserving the opportunity of millions of families to pursue the American dream of homeownership.

I urge my colleagues to support this, important legislation.

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

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

S. 1656

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Modernization Act of 2003".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

TITLE I—REFORM OF REGULATION OF FANNIE MAE AND FREDDIE MAC

Subtitle A—Improvement of Supervision

Sec. 101. Establishment of Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision in the Department of the Treasury.

Sec. 102. Duties and authorities of Director and HUD.

Sec. 103. Examiners and accountants.

Sec. 104. Regulations.

Sec. 105. Assessments.

Sec. 106. Independence of Director in congressional testimony and recommendations.

Sec. 107. Nonmortgage-related investments.

Sec. 108. Reports.

Sec. 109. Review of enterprises.

Sec. 110. Risk-based capital test for enterprises.

Sec. 111. Minimum and critical capital levels.

Sec. 112. Required disclosures.

Sec. 113. Federal Housing Finance Board.

Sec. 114. Definitions.

Subtitle B—Prompt Corrective Action

Sec. 131. Capital classifications.

Sec. 132. Supervisory actions applicable to undercapitalized enterprises.

Sec. 133. Supervisory actions applicable to significantly undercapitalized enterprises.

Subtitle C—Enforcement Actions

Sec. 151. Cease-and-desist proceedings.

Sec. 152. Temporary cease-and-desist proceedings.

Sec. 153. Removal and prohibition authority.

Sec. 154. Enforcement and jurisdiction.

Sec. 155. Civil money penalties.

Sec. 156. Criminal penalty.

Subtitle D—General Provisions

Sec. 161. Conforming and technical amendments.

Sec. 162. Effective date.

TITLE II—TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS, PERSONNEL, AND PROPERTY

Sec. 201. Abolishment of OFHEO.

Sec. 202. Continuation and coordination of certain regulations.

Sec. 203. Transfer and rights of employees of OFHEO.

Sec. 204. Transfer of property and facilities.

TITLE I—REFORM OF REGULATION OF FANNIE MAE AND FREDDIE MAC

Subtitle A—Improvement of Supervision

SEC. 101. ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE SUPERVISION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4501 et seq.) is amended by striking sections 1311 and 1312 and inserting the following:

"SEC. 1311. ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE SUPERVISION.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision, which shall be an office in the Department of the Treasury.

"(2) AUTHORITY.—The Office shall succeed to the authority of the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the general regulatory and any other authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the enterprises (except as specifically provided otherwise in this title, the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1716 et seq.), the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.), or any other provision of Federal law).

"(b) PROHIBITION OF MERGER OF OFFICE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Treasury may not merge or consolidate the Office, or any of the functions or responsibilities of the Office, with any function or program administered by the Secretary.

"(c) SAVINGS PROVISION.—The authority of the Director to take actions under subtitles B and C does not in any way limit the general supervisory and regulatory authority granted to the Director under subsection (a).

"SEC. 1312. DIRECTOR.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION.—There is established the position of the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision, who shall be the head of the Office.

"(b) APPOINTMENT; TERM.—

"(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among individuals who are citizens of the United States.

"(2) TERM.—The Director shall be appointed for a term of 5 years.

"(3) VACANCY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A vacancy in the position of Director that occurs before the expiration of the term for which a Director was appointed shall be filled in the manner established under paragraph (1).

“(B) TERM.—The Director appointed to fill a vacancy under subparagraph (A) shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

“(4) SERVICE AFTER END OF TERM.—An individual may serve as Director after the expiration of the term for which the individual was appointed until a successor has been appointed.

“(5) TRANSITIONAL PROVISION.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight of the Department of Housing and Urban Development on the date of enactment of the Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Modernization Act of 2003, shall serve as the Director until not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of that Act.

“(C) PROHIBITION ON FINANCIAL INTERESTS.—The Director shall not have a direct or indirect financial interest in any enterprise, nor hold any office, position, or employment in any enterprise.”

(b) APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR.—Notwithstanding the effective date under section 162, or any other provision of law, the President may, at any time after the date of enactment of this Act, appoint an individual to serve as the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision, as established under this Act, in accordance with section 1312 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, as amended by subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 102. DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF DIRECTOR AND HUD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1313 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4513) is amended to read as follows: “SEC. 1313. DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF DIRECTOR.

“(a) DUTIES.—

“(1) PRINCIPAL DUTIES.—The principal duties of the Director shall be to ensure that the enterprises—

“(A) operate in a financially safe and sound manner;

“(B) carry out their missions in a financially safe and sound manner, and only through activities that have been authorized under, and are consistent with the purposes of, the provisions of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1716 et seq.), and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.), as applicable; and

“(C) remain adequately capitalized.

“(2) OTHER DUTIES.—To the extent consistent with paragraph (1), the Director shall be exercise general supervisory and regulatory authority over the enterprises, in accordance with this title, the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1716 et seq.), the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.), and any other applicable provision of law.

“(b) AUTHORITY EXCLUSIVE OF SECRETARY.—Except as specifically provided under this title, the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act, or any other provision of Federal law, the authority of the Director with respect to the enterprises shall not be subject to the review, approval, or intervention of the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(c) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The Director may delegate to officers and employees of the Office any of the functions, powers, and duties of the Director, with respect

to supervision and regulation of the enterprises, as the Director considers appropriate.”

(b) PRIOR APPROVAL AUTHORITY FOR NEW PROGRAMS.—Part 1 of Subtitle A of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4501 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1319H. PRIOR APPROVAL AUTHORITY FOR NEW PROGRAMS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, in consultation with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, shall require each enterprise to obtain the approval of the Director, in the manner prescribed by regulation of the Director, for any new program of the enterprise before implementing the program.

“(b) STANDARD FOR APPROVAL.—The Director shall approve any new program of an enterprise for purposes of subsection (a), unless—

“(1) in the case of a new program of the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Director determines that the program is not authorized under section 304 or paragraph (2), (3), (4), or (5) of section 302(b) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1717(b));

“(2) in the case of a new program of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, the Director determines that the program is not authorized under paragraph (1), (4), or (5) of section 305(a) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.); or

“(3) the Director determines that the new program is inconsistent with or undermines the safe and sound operation of the enterprise, consistent with section 1313(a)(1).

“(c) PROCEDURE FOR APPROVAL.—

“(1) SUBMISSION OF REQUEST.—An enterprise shall submit to the Director a written request for approval of a new program under this section that describes the program in such form as prescribed by regulation of the Director.

“(2) RESPONSE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of submission of a request for approval under paragraph (1), the Director shall—

“(i) approve the request; or

“(ii) deny the request and submit a report explaining the reasons for the denial to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

“(B) EXTENSION.—The Director may extend the time period under subparagraph (A) for a single additional 15-day period only if the Director requests additional information from the enterprise.

“(3) FAILURE TO RESPOND.—If the Director fails to approve a request for approval under this section, or fails to submit a report under paragraph (2)(A)(ii) during the period provided, the request shall be considered to have been approved by the Director.

“(4) REVIEW OF DISAPPROVAL.—

“(A) SUBMISSION OF NEW INFORMATION.—If the Director submits a report under paragraph (2)(A)(ii) denying a request for reasons listed under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b), the Director shall provide the enterprise submitting the request with a timely opportunity to review and supplement the administrative record.

“(B) NEW PROGRAMS NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.—If the Director submits a report under paragraph (2)(A)(ii) denying a request after finding that the program is inconsistent with or undermines the safe and sound operation of the enterprise, as described in subsection (b)(3), the Director shall provide the enterprise with notice and

opportunity for a hearing on the record regarding such denial.”

(c) REPEAL OF HUD AUTHORITY.—Part 2 of subtitle A of title XIII of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4501 et seq.) is amended by striking sections 1321 and 1322.

(d) AUTHORITY OF HUD FOR HOUSING GOALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1331 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4561) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence of subsection (a), by inserting “of Housing and Urban Development” after “The Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this part, the term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.”

(2) ANNUAL REPORT ON HOUSING GOALS.—Section 1324 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4544) is amended by inserting “of Housing and Urban Development” after “Secretary” each place such term appears.

(e) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) FANNIE MAE.—Section 302(b)(6) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1717(b)(6)) is amended by striking “Secretary under section 1322” and inserting “Director under section 1319H”.

(2) FREDDIE MAC.—Section 305(c) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1454(c)) is amended by striking “Secretary under section 1322” and inserting “Director under section 1319H”.

(3) FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION COUNCIL.—Section 1004(a) of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3303(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision.”

SEC. 103. EXAMINERS AND ACCOUNTANTS.

(a) EXAMINATIONS.—Section 1317 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4517) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence of subsection (c), by striking “The” and inserting “During the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Modernization Act of 2003, the”; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “Federal Reserve banks” and inserting “Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision”.

(b) ENHANCED AUTHORITY TO HIRE EXAMINERS AND ACCOUNTANTS.—Section 1317 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4517) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) APPOINTMENT OF ACCOUNTANTS, ECONOMISTS, AND EXAMINERS.—

“(1) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies with respect to any position of examiner, accountant, and economist at the Office, with respect to supervision and regulation of the enterprises, that is in the competitive service.

“(2) APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director may appoint candidates to any position described in paragraph (1)—

“(i) in accordance with the statutes, rules, and regulations governing appointments in the excepted service; and

“(ii) notwithstanding any statutes, rules, and regulations governing appointments in the competitive service.

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The appointment of a candidate to a position under this paragraph shall not be considered to cause such position to be converted from the competitive service to the excepted service.

“(3) REPORTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the end of fiscal year 2003 (for fiscal year 2003) and 90 days after the end of fiscal year 2005 (for fiscal years 2004 and 2005), the Director shall submit a report with respect to the exercise of the authority granted to the Director by paragraph (2) during such fiscal years to the—

“(i) Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

“(ii) Committee on Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

“(B) CONTENTS.—The reports submitted under subparagraph (A) shall describe the changes in the hiring process authorized by paragraph (2), including relevant information related to—

“(i) the quality of candidates;

“(ii) the procedures used by the Director to select candidates through the streamlined hiring process;

“(iii) the numbers, types, and grades of employees hired under the authority;

“(iv) any benefits or shortcomings associated with the use of the authority;

“(v) the effect of the exercise of the authority on the hiring of veterans and other demographic groups;

“(vi) the way in which managers were trained in the administration of the streamlined hiring system; and

“(vii) a list of the specific functional responsibilities of Office personnel (such as examinations, supervision, regulatory oversight, and risk analysis) and the percentage of the total personnel employed within the Office that are engaged in each such activity.”.

(c) ALLOCATION OF PERSONNEL RESOURCES.—Section 1315 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4515), as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) MAINTENANCE OF ADEQUATE EXAMINATION AND SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL.—In carrying out this Act, the Director shall ensure that a significant amount of the Office resources allocated for the hiring and support of personnel are applied to personnel engaged in the examination and supervision of the enterprises.”.

SEC. 104. REGULATIONS.

Section 1319G of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4526) is amended in subsection (c), by striking “Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs” and inserting “Committee on Financial Services”.

SEC. 105. ASSESSMENTS.

Section 1316 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4516) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS.—The Director shall establish and collect from the enterprises annual assessments in an amount not exceeding the amount sufficient to provide for all reasonable costs and expenses of the Office, including—

“(1) the expenses of any examination under section 1317; and

“(2) the expenses of obtaining any review or credit assessment under section 1319.”;

(2) in subsection (b), in paragraph (2), by moving the margin 2 ems to the right;

(3) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following: “The Director may adjust the amounts of any semiannual assessments for an assessment under subsection (a) that are to be paid pursuant to subsection (b) by an enterprise, as necessary in the discretion of the Director, to ensure that the costs of enforcement activities under subtitles B and C

for an enterprise are borne only by that enterprise.”;

(4) in subsection (f), by striking “Any assessments collected” and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting the following: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any assessments collected by the Director pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the Fund in an account for the Director. Any amounts in the Fund are hereby made available, without fiscal year limitation, to the Director (to the extent of amounts in the Director’s account) for carrying out the supervisory and regulatory responsibilities of the Director with respect to the enterprises, including any necessary administrative and nonadministrative expenses of the Director in carrying out the purposes of this title, the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1716 et seq.), and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.)”; and

(5) in subsection (g), by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) FINANCIAL OPERATING PLANS AND FORECASTS.—Before the beginning of each fiscal year, the Director shall submit a copy of the financial operating plans and forecasts for the Office to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

“(2) REPORTS OF OPERATIONS.—As soon as practicable after the end of each fiscal year and each quarter thereof, the Director shall submit a copy of the report of the results of the operations of the Office during such period to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.”.

SEC. 106. INDEPENDENCE OF DIRECTOR IN CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

Section 111 of Public Law 93-495 (12 U.S.C. 250) is amended by inserting “the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury,” after “the Federal Housing Finance Board,”.

SEC. 107. NONMORTGAGE-RELATED INVESTMENTS.

Subtitle B of title XIII of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4611 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking the subtitle designation and heading and inserting the following:

“**Subtitle B—Required Capital Levels for Enterprises, Special Enforcement Powers, and Nonmortgage-Related Assets**”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1369E. NONMORTGAGE-RELATED ASSETS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) LIQUIDITY PORTFOLIO.—On a quarterly basis, the Director shall review and provide written comment to each enterprise on the nonmortgage-related assets held by each enterprise in the liquidity portfolio of such enterprise. The Director shall define the term ‘nonmortgage-related asset’ for purposes of this section.

“(2) ASSETS OUTSIDE OF LIQUIDITY PORTFOLIO.—The Director may review and provide written comment to each enterprise on the quality and appropriateness of nonmortgage-related assets held by an enterprise outside of the liquid portfolio of such enterprise.

“(b) REPORT.—On a biennial basis, the Director shall submit a report to Congress containing information on—

“(1) any written comments provided to the enterprises under subsection (a)(1) or (2); and

“(2) whether or not each enterprise is in compliance with the Sound Practices for Managing Liquidity in Banking Organizations established by the Basel Committee, or any successor thereto.”.

SEC. 108. REPORTS.

Sections 1327 and 1328 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12

U.S.C. 4547, 4548) are amended by striking “Secretary” each place it appears and inserting “Director”.

SEC. 109. REVIEWS OF ENTERPRISES.

Section 1319 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4519) is amended—

(1) by striking the heading and inserting the following:

“SEC. 1319. REVIEW OF ENTERPRISES.”;

(2) by inserting after “any entity” the following: “that the Director considers appropriate, including an entity”;

(3) by inserting “(a) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE FOR REVIEWS.—” before “The”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) BIENNIAL DETERMINATION OF CREDIT RATING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On a biennial basis, the Director shall provide for 2 entities recognized by the Division of Market Regulation of the Securities and Exchange Commission as nationally recognized statistical rating organizations, each to conduct an assessment of the financial condition of each enterprise for the purpose of determining the level of risk that the enterprise will be unable to meet its obligations, taking into consideration the legal status evidenced by the statements required under—

“(A) the penultimate sentence of section 304(b) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1719(b));

“(B) the last sentence of section 304(d) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1719(d));

“(C) the penultimate sentence of section 304(e) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1719(e)); and

“(D) section 306(h)(2) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1455(h)(2)).

“(2) CREDIT RATING.—The assessment under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) assigning a credit rating for each enterprise, using a scale similar to that used by such organization with respect to obligations of other financial institutions; and

“(B) the report regarding such assessment and the rating in the report of the Director under section 1319B(a).”.

SEC. 110. RISK-BASED CAPITAL TEST FOR ENTERPRISES.

Section 1361 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4611) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (f), (g), and (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) PERIODIC REVIEW OF RISK-BASED CAPITAL TEST.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Modernization Act of 2003, and once every 5 years thereafter, the Director shall conduct a review of the risk-based capital test adopted in accordance with this subtitle and submit a report to Congress on the findings of such review, the appropriateness of the risk-based capital test, and any legislative recommendations that would, as necessary—

“(A) better align capital with risk; and

“(B) reflect evolving best practices for risk-based capital standards for large, complex financial institutions.”

“(2) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Director shall retain all authority under this section to modify the current risk-based capital rule as the Director determines.

“(e) REVIEW OF RISK-BASED CAPITAL LEVEL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the Director determines that

the risk-based capital level of an enterprise is inadequate, the Director may make such adjustments to the risk-based capital level of that enterprise as the Director determines necessary to ensure the safe and sound financial operation of that enterprise.”.

SEC. 111. MINIMUM AND CRITICAL CAPITAL LEVELS.

Section 1362(b) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4612) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) AUTHORITY TO ISSUE REGULATIONS.—The Director shall issue such regulations as the Director determines necessary to ensure that the enterprises comply with the requirements of subsection (a).”.

SEC. 112. REQUIRED DISCLOSURES.

(a) FANNIE MAE AND FREDDIE MAC.—Part 1 of subtitle A of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4501 et seq.), as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1319I. REGISTRATION OF STOCK AND PUBLIC DISCLOSURES.

“(a) REGISTRATION OF STOCK UNDER THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding its status as an exempted security for purposes of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 pursuant to section 311 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act and section 306 of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act, as applicable, the common stock of each enterprise shall be subject to—

“(A) section 12(g) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; and

“(B) sections 14 and 16 of that Act.

“(2) REVIEW.—All reports, statements, and forms filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission under this subsection shall be reviewed and commented upon by the Commission to the same extent and with the same frequency as comparable reports and materials filed by other issuers.

“(b) CREDIT RATING.—An enterprise shall annually disclose to the public the credit rating of such enterprise.

“(c) MORTGAGE PORTFOLIO.—An enterprise shall disclose to the public, on a monthly basis, the effect on its mortgage portfolio of—

“(1) a 50 basis point change in interest rates; and

“(2) a 25 basis point change in the slope of the yield curve.

“(d) CREDIT RISK DISCLOSURES.—An enterprise shall disclose to the public, on a quarterly basis, the financial impact on the enterprise of an immediate 5 percent decline in the average price of single-family housing within the United States.”.

(b) FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS.—Section 6 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1426) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) REGISTRATION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Class A stock and Class B stock issued by each Federal home loan bank shall be subject to—

“(A) section 12(g) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; and

“(B) sections 14 and 16 of that Act.

“(2) REVIEW.—All reports, statements, and forms filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission under this subsection shall be reviewed and commented upon by the Commission to the same extent and with the same frequency as comparable reports and materials filed by other issuers.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, or such later date as determined by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

SEC. 113. FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO FHFB.—Section 2(11) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1422(11)) is amended by striking “Secretary of Housing and Urban Development” and inserting “Secretary of the Treasury”.

(b) STUDY OF MERGER OF FHFB WITH OFHES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, shall study and report on any recommendations regarding the consolidation of the responsibilities of the Federal Housing Finance Board, including oversight of the Federal home loan banks, and the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a report to Congress on—

(A) the results of the study conducted under subsection (a); and

(B) any recommendations regarding legislative or administrative changes.

SEC. 114. DEFINITIONS.

Section 1303 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4502) is amended—

(1) in each of paragraphs (5) and (14), by striking “Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight of the Department of Housing and Urban Development” each place that term appears and inserting “Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury”; and

(2) in paragraphs (8), (9), (10), and (19), by inserting “of Housing and Urban Development” after “Secretary” each place that term appears;

(3) by striking paragraph (15);

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (14) (as amended by this Act) as paragraphs (8) through (15), respectively; and

(5) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) ENTERPRISE-AFFILIATED PARTY.—The term ‘enterprise-affiliated party’ means—

“(A) any director, officer, employee, or controlling stockholder of, or agent for, an enterprise;

“(B) any shareholder, consultant, joint venture partner, and any other person, as determined by the Director (by regulation or case-by-case), who participates in the conduct of the affairs of an enterprise; and

“(C) any independent contractor (including any attorney, appraiser, or accountant), to the extent that such person knowingly or recklessly participates in—

“(i) any violation of any law or regulation;

“(ii) any breach of fiduciary duty; or

“(iii) any unsafe or unsound practice, which caused or is likely to cause more than a minimal financial loss to, or a significant adverse effect on, the enterprise.”.

Subtitle B—Prompt Corrective Action

SEC. 131. CAPITAL CLASSIFICATIONS.

Section 1364 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4614) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) DISCRETIONARY CLASSIFICATION.—

“(1) GROUNDS FOR RECLASSIFICATION.—The Director may reclassify an enterprise under paragraph (2), if—

“(A) at any time, the Director determines in writing that an enterprise is engaging in conduct that could result in a rapid depletion of core capital or that the value of the property subject to mortgages held or securitized by the enterprise has decreased significantly;

“(B) after notice and an opportunity for hearing, the Director determines that an en-

terprise is in an unsafe or unsound condition; or

“(C) pursuant to section 1371(b), the Director deems an enterprise to be engaging in an unsafe or unsound practice.

“(2) RECLASSIFICATION.—In addition to any other action authorized under this title, including the reclassification of an enterprise for any reason not specified in this subsection, if the Director takes any action described in paragraph (1) the Director may classify an enterprise—

“(A) as undercapitalized, if the enterprise is otherwise classified as adequately capitalized;

“(B) as significantly undercapitalized, if the enterprise is otherwise classified as undercapitalized; and

“(C) as critically undercapitalized, if the enterprise is otherwise classified as significantly undercapitalized.”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) RESTRICTION ON CAPITAL DISTRIBUTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An enterprise shall make no capital distribution if, after making the distribution, the enterprise would be undercapitalized.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Director may permit an enterprise to repurchase, redeem, retire, or otherwise acquire shares or ownership interests, if the repurchase, redemption, retirement, or other acquisition—

“(A) is made in connection with the issuance of additional shares or obligations of the enterprise in at least an equivalent amount; and

“(B) will reduce the financial obligations of the enterprise or otherwise improve the financial condition of the enterprise.”.

SEC. 132. SUPERVISORY ACTIONS APPLICABLE TO UNDERCAPITALIZED ENTERPRISES.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE FOR SUPERVISORY ACTIONS.—Regulations issued by the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision under section 1361(e) of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, as amended by section 161(a)(5)(A) of this Act, shall become effective not earlier than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) SUPERVISORY ACTIONS.—Section 1365 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4615) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2) the following:

“(1) REQUIRED MONITORING.—The Director shall—

“(A) closely monitor the condition of any undercapitalized enterprise;

“(B) closely monitor compliance with the capital restoration plan, restrictions, and requirements imposed under this section; and

“(C) periodically review the plan, restrictions, and requirements applicable to the undercapitalized enterprise to determine whether the plan, restrictions, and requirements are achieving the purpose of this section.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) RESTRICTION OF ASSET GROWTH.—An undercapitalized enterprise shall not permit its average total assets during any calendar quarter to exceed its average total assets during the preceding calendar quarter, unless—

“(A) the Board has accepted the capital restoration plan of the enterprise;

“(B) any increase in total assets is consistent with the plan; and

“(C) the ratio of tangible equity to assets of the enterprise increases during the calendar quarter at a rate sufficient to enable the enterprise to become adequately capitalized within a reasonable time.

“(5) **PRIOR APPROVAL OF ACQUISITIONS AND ISSUANCE OF NEW PRODUCTS.**—An undercapitalized enterprise shall not, directly or indirectly, acquire any interest in any entity or issue a new product, unless—

“(A) the Director has accepted the capital restoration plan of the enterprise, the enterprise is implementing the plan, and the Director determines that the proposed action is consistent with and will further the achievement of the plan; or

“(B) the Director determines that the proposed action will further the purpose of this section.”;

(2) in the subsection heading for subsection (b), by striking “FROM UNDERCAPITALIZED TO SIGNIFICANTLY UNDERCAPITALIZED”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (c) (as amended by subsection (a) of this section) as subsection (d); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) **OTHER DISCRETIONARY SAFEGUARDS.**—The Director may take, with respect to an undercapitalized enterprise, any of the actions authorized to be taken under section 1366 with respect to a significantly undercapitalized enterprise, if the Director determines that such actions are necessary to carry out the purpose of this subtitle.”.

SEC. 133. SUPERVISORY ACTIONS APPLICABLE TO SIGNIFICANTLY UNDERCAPITALIZED ENTERPRISES.

Section 1366 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4616) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “DISCRETIONARY SUPERVISORY ACTIONS” and inserting “SPECIFIC ACTIONS”;

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may, at any time, take any” and inserting “shall carry out this section by taking, at any time, 1 or more”;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively;

(D) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) **IMPROVEMENT OF MANAGEMENT.**—

“(A) **NEW ELECTION OF BOARD.**—Order a new election for the board of directors of the enterprise.

“(B) **DISMISSAL OF DIRECTORS OR EXECUTIVE OFFICERS.**—Require the enterprise to dismiss from office any director or executive officer who had held office for more than 180 days immediately before the date on which the enterprise became undercapitalized. Dismissal under this subparagraph shall not be construed to be a removal pursuant to the Director's enforcement powers under section 1377.

“(C) **EMPLOY QUALIFIED EXECUTIVE OFFICERS.**—Require the enterprise to employ qualified executive officers (who, if the Director so specifies, shall be subject to approval by the Director).”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) **OTHER ACTION.**—Require the enterprise to take any other action that the Director determines will better carry out the purpose of this section than any of the other actions specified in this paragraph.”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) **RESTRICTION ON COMPENSATION OF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS.**—An enterprise that is classified as significantly undercapitalized may not, without prior written approval by the Director—

“(A) pay any bonus to any executive officer; or

“(B) provide compensation to any executive officer at a rate exceeding the average rate of compensation of that officer (excluding bonuses, stock options, and profit sharing) during the 12 calendar months preceding the calendar month in which the enterprise became classified as significantly undercapitalized.”.

Subtitle C—Enforcement Actions

SEC. 151. CEASE-AND-DESIST PROCEEDINGS.

Section 1371 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4631) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

“(a) **ISSUANCE FOR UNSAFE OR UNSOUND PRACTICES AND VIOLATIONS OF RULES OR LAWS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director may issue and serve upon the enterprise or an enterprise-affiliated party a notice of charges under this section if—

“(A) in the opinion of the Director, an enterprise or any enterprise-affiliated party is engaging or has engaged, or the Director has reasonable cause to believe that the enterprise or any enterprise-affiliated party is about to engage, in an unsafe or unsound practice in conducting the business of the enterprise or is violating or has violated; or

“(B) the Director has reasonable cause to believe that the enterprise or any enterprise-affiliated party is about to violate, a law, rule, or regulation, or any condition imposed in writing by the Director in connection with the granting of any application or other request by the enterprise or any written agreement entered into with the Director.

“(2) **LIMITATIONS.**—The Director may not enforce compliance with—

“(A) any housing goal established under subpart B of part 2 of subtitle A;

“(B) section 1336 or 1337;

“(C) subsection (m) or (n) of section 309 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1723a(m), (n)); or

“(D) subsection (e) or (f) of section 307 of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1456(e), (f)).

“(b) **ISSUANCE FOR UNSATISFACTORY RATING.**—If an enterprise receives, in its most recent report of examination, a less-than-satisfactory rating for asset quality, management, earnings, or liquidity, the Director may (if the deficiency is not corrected) deem the enterprise to be engaging in an unsafe or unsound practice for purposes of this subsection.”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “or director” and inserting “director, or enterprise-affiliated party”.

SEC. 152. TEMPORARY CEASE-AND-DESIST PROCEEDINGS.

Section 1372 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4632) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) **GROUND FOR ISSUANCE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director may issue a temporary order under paragraph (2) if the Director determines that the violation or threatened violation or the unsafe or unsound practice or practices specified in the notice of charges served upon the enterprise or any enterprise-affiliated party under section 1371(a), or the continuation thereof, is likely to cause insolvency or significant dissipation of assets or earnings of the enterprise, or is likely to weaken the condition of the enterprise prior to the completion of the proceedings conducted pursuant to sections 1371 and 1373.

“(2) **CONTENTS OF ORDER.**—Upon making a determination under paragraph (1), the Di-

rector may issue a temporary order requiring the enterprise or such party to cease and desist from any such violation or practice and to take affirmative action to prevent or remedy such insolvency, dissipation, condition, or prejudice pending completion of such proceedings. Such order may include any requirement authorized under section 1371(d).”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “or director” and inserting “director, or enterprise-affiliated party”;

(3) in subsection (d), striking “or director” and inserting “director, or enterprise-affiliated party”; and

(4) by striking subsection (e) and in inserting the following:

“(e) **ENFORCEMENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of violation or threatened violation of, or failure to obey, a temporary cease-and-desist order issued under this section, the Director may apply to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or the United States district court within the jurisdiction of which the headquarters of the enterprise is located, for an injunction to enforce such order.

“(2) **ISSUANCE OF INJUNCTION.**—If the court determines that there has been a violation or threatened violation or failure to obey a temporary cease-and-desist order under paragraph (1), the court shall issue an injunction against the enterprise to enforce such order.”.

SEC. 153. REMOVAL AND PROHIBITION AUTHORITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle C of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act (12 U.S.C. 4501 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 1377 through 1379B (12 U.S.C. 4637–41) as sections 1379 through 1379D, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 1376 (12 U.S.C. 4636) the following:

“SEC. 1377. REMOVAL AND PROHIBITION AUTHORITY.

“(a) **AUTHORITY TO ISSUE ORDER.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director may serve upon an enterprise-affiliated party a written notice of the Director's intention to remove such party from office or to prohibit any further participation by such party, in any manner, in the conduct of the affairs of any enterprise in any case to which paragraph (2) applies.

“(2) **CRITERIA.**—The Director may serve written notice under paragraph (1) whenever the Director determines that—

“(A) any enterprise-affiliated party has, directly or indirectly—

“(i) violated—

“(I) any law or regulation;

“(II) any cease-and-desist order which has become final;

“(III) any condition imposed in writing by the Director in connection with the grant of any application or other request by such enterprise; or

“(IV) any written agreement between such enterprise and the Director;

“(ii) engaged or participated in any unsafe or unsound practice in connection with any enterprise; or

“(iii) committed or engaged in any act, omission, or practice which constitutes a breach of such party's fiduciary duty;

“(B) by reason of the violation, practice, or breach described in any subparagraph of paragraph (1)—

“(i) such enterprise has suffered or will probably suffer financial loss or other damage; or

“(ii) such party has received financial gain or other benefit by reason of such violation, practice, or breach; and

“(C) such violation, practice, or breach—

“(i) involves personal dishonesty on the part of such party; or

“(ii) demonstrates willful or continuing disregard by such party for the safety or soundness of such enterprise.

“(b) SUSPENSION ORDER.—

“(1) SUSPENSION OR PROHIBITION AUTHORITY.—If the Director serves written notice under subsection (a) to any enterprise-affiliated party of the Director's intention to issue an order, the Director may suspend such party from office or prohibit such party from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the enterprise, if the Director—

“(A) determines that such action is necessary for the protection of the enterprise; and

“(B) serves such party with written notice of the suspension order.

“(2) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Any suspension order issued under this section—

“(A) shall become effective upon service; and

“(B) unless a court issues a stay of such order under subsection (g), shall remain in effect and enforceable until—

“(i) the date on which the Director dismisses the charges contained in the notice served under subsection (a) with respect to such party; or

“(ii) the effective date of an order issued by the Director to such party under subsection (a).

“(3) COPY OF ORDER.—If the Director issues a suspension order under this section to any enterprise-affiliated party, the Director shall serve a copy of such order on any enterprise with which such party is affiliated at the time such order is issued.

“(c) NOTICE, HEARING, AND ORDER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A notice of intention to remove an enterprise-affiliated party from office or to prohibit such party from participating in the conduct of the affairs of an enterprise shall—

“(A) contain a statement of the facts constituting grounds for such action; and

“(B) fix a time and place at which a hearing will be held on such action.

“(2) HEARING.—The Director shall hold the hearing not earlier than 30 days nor later than 60 days after the date of service of notice under paragraph (1), unless an earlier or a later date is set by the Director at the request of—

“(A) the enterprise-affiliated party, and for good cause shown; or

“(B) the Attorney General of the United States.

“(3) REMOVAL OR PROHIBITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director may issue such orders of suspension or removal from office, or prohibition from participation in the conduct of the affairs of the enterprise, if—

“(i) the enterprise-affiliated party named in the notice issued under paragraph (1) fails to appear at the hearing in person, or by a duly authorized representative; or

“(ii) the Director determines, based upon the record of the hearing, that any of the grounds for removal or prohibition specified in the notice issued under paragraph (1) have been established.

“(B) EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER.—Any order issued under subparagraph (A) shall become effective at 30 days after service of the order to the enterprise-affiliated party and the relevant enterprise, except in the case of an order issued upon consent, which shall become effective at the time specified therein.

“(C) TERM.—Any order issued under subparagraph (A) shall remain effective and enforceable, except to such extent as it is stayed, modified, terminated, or set aside by action of the Director or a reviewing court.

“(d) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES.—Any person subject to an order issued under this section shall not—

“(1) participate in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of any enterprise;

“(2) solicit, procure, transfer, attempt to transfer, vote, or attempt to vote any proxy, consent, or authorization with respect to any voting rights in any enterprise;

“(3) violate any voting agreement previously approved by the Director; or

“(4) vote for a director, or serve or act as an enterprise-affiliated party.

“(e) INDUSTRY-WIDE PROHIBITION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (2), any person who, pursuant to an order issued under subsection (h), has been removed or suspended from office in an enterprise or prohibited from participating in the conduct of the affairs of an enterprise may not, while such order is in effect, continue or commence to hold any office in, or participate in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of any enterprise.

“(2) EXCEPTION IF DIRECTOR PROVIDES WRITTEN CONSENT.—If, on or after the date an order is issued under this section which removes or suspends from office any enterprise-affiliated party or prohibits such party from participating in the conduct of the affairs of an enterprise, such party receives the written consent of the Director, the order shall, to the extent of such consent, cease to apply to such party with respect to the enterprise described in the written consent. If the Director grants such a written consent, the Director shall publicly disclose such consent.

“(3) VIOLATION OF PARAGRAPH (1) TREATED AS VIOLATION OF ORDER.—Any violation of paragraph (1) by any person who is subject to an order described in such subsection shall be treated as a violation of the order.

“(f) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall only apply to a person who is an individual, unless the Director specifically finds that it should apply to a corporation, firm, or other business enterprise.

“(g) STAY OF SUSPENSION AND PROHIBITION OF ENTERPRISE-AFFILIATED PARTY.—Not later than 10 days after any enterprise-affiliated party has been suspended from office or prohibited from participation in the conduct of the affairs of an enterprise under this section, such party may apply to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or the United States district court for the judicial district in which the headquarters of the enterprise is located, for a stay of such suspension or prohibition pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice served upon such party under this section, and such court shall have jurisdiction to stay such suspension or prohibition.

“(h) SUSPENSION OR REMOVAL OF ENTERPRISE-AFFILIATED PARTY CHARGED WITH FELONY.—

“(1) SUSPENSION OR PROHIBITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Whenever any enterprise-affiliated party is charged in any information, indictment, or complaint, with the commission of or participation in a crime involving dishonesty or breach of trust which is punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year under State or Federal law, the Director may, if continued service or participation by such party may pose a threat to the enterprise or impair public confidence in the enterprise, by written notice served upon such party, suspend such party from office or prohibit such party from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of any enterprise.

“(B) PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO NOTICE.—

“(i) COPY.—A copy of any notice under subparagraph (A) shall also be served upon the relevant enterprise.

“(ii) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—A suspension or prohibition under subparagraph (A) shall remain in effect until the information, indictment, or complaint referred to in such subparagraph is finally disposed of or until terminated by the Director.

“(2) REMOVAL OR PROHIBITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a judgment of conviction or an agreement to enter a pretrial diversion or other similar program is entered against an enterprise-affiliated party in connection with a crime described in paragraph (1)(A), at such time as such judgment is not subject to further appellate review, the Director may, if continued service or participation by such party may pose a threat to the enterprise or impair public confidence in the enterprise, issue and serve upon such party an order removing such party from office or prohibiting such party from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the enterprise without the prior written consent of the Director.

“(B) PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO ORDER.—

“(i) COPY.—A copy of any order under paragraph (2)(A) shall also be served upon the relevant enterprise, whereupon the enterprise-affiliated party who is subject to the order (if a director or an officer) shall cease to be a director or officer of such enterprise.

“(ii) EFFECT OF ACQUITTAL.—A finding of not guilty or other disposition of the charge shall not preclude the Director from instituting proceedings after such finding or disposition to remove such party from office or to prohibit further participation in enterprise affairs under subsection (a), (d), or (e).

“(iii) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Any notice of suspension or order of removal issued under this subsection shall remain effective and outstanding until the completion of any hearing or appeal authorized under paragraph (4) unless terminated by the Director.

“(3) AUTHORITY OF REMAINING BOARD MEMBERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If at any time, because of the suspension of 1 or more directors pursuant to this section, there shall be on the board of directors of an enterprise less than a quorum of directors not so suspended, all powers and functions vested in or exercisable by such board shall vest in and be exercisable by the director or directors on the board not so suspended, until such time as there shall be a quorum of the board of directors.

“(B) SUSPENSION OF ALL DIRECTORS.—In the event all of the directors of an enterprise are suspended pursuant to this section, the Director shall appoint persons to serve temporarily as directors in their place and stead pending the termination of such suspensions, or until such time as those who have been suspended, cease to be directors of the enterprise and their respective successors take office.

“(4) HEARING REGARDING CONTINUED PARTICIPATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after receipt of service of any notice of suspension or order of removal issued under paragraph (1) or (2), the enterprise-affiliated party may request in writing an opportunity to appear before the Director to show that the continued service to or participation in the conduct of the affairs of the enterprise by such party does not, or is not likely to, pose a threat to the interests of the enterprise or threaten to impair public confidence in the enterprise.

“(B) TIMING.—Upon receipt of a request for a hearing under subparagraph (A), the Director shall fix a time (not more than 30 days after receipt of such request, unless extended at the request of such party) and place at which such party may appear, personally or through counsel, before the Director or 1 or more designated employees of the Director,

to submit written materials (or, at the discretion of the Director, oral testimony) and oral argument.

“(C) NOTIFICATION OF DETERMINATION.—Not later than 60 days after the hearing under this paragraph, the Director shall notify the enterprise-affiliated party whether the suspension or prohibition from participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the enterprise will be continued, terminated, or otherwise modified, or whether the order removing such party from office or prohibiting such party from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the enterprise will be rescinded or otherwise modified. Such notification shall contain a statement of the basis for the Director's decision, if adverse to such party.

“(D) RULES.—The Director is authorized to prescribe such rules as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

“(i) HEARINGS AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(1) VENUE AND PROCEDURE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any hearing provided for in this section shall be held in the District of Columbia or in the Federal judicial district in which the headquarters of the enterprise is located, unless the party afforded the hearing consents to another place, and shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code.

“(B) ISSUANCE OF DECISION.—After a hearing under subparagraph (A), and within 90 days after the Director has notified the parties that the case has been submitted to the court for final decision, the court shall render its decision (which shall include findings of fact upon which its decision is predicated) and shall issue and serve upon each party to the proceeding an order or orders consistent with the provisions of this section. Judicial review of any such order shall be exclusively as provided in this subsection.

“(C) MODIFICATION.—Unless a petition for review is timely filed in a court of appeals of the United States, as provided in paragraph (2), and thereafter until the record in the proceeding has been filed as so provided, the Director may at any time, upon such notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify, terminate, or set aside any such order. Upon such filing of the record, the Director may modify, terminate, or set aside any such order with permission of the court.

“(2) REVIEW OF ORDER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any party to any proceeding under paragraph (1) may obtain a review of any order served pursuant to paragraph (1) (other than an order issued with the consent of the enterprise or the enterprise-affiliated party concerned, or an order issued under subsection (h) of this section) by filing in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit or court of appeals of the United States for the circuit in which the headquarters of the enterprise is located, within 30 days after the date of service of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Director be modified, terminated, or set aside.

“(B) FILING OF RECORD.—A copy of a petition filed under subparagraph (A) shall be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Director, and thereupon the Director shall file in the court the record in the proceeding, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

“(C) JURISDICTION.—Upon the filing of a petition under subparagraph (A), the court in which it is filed shall have jurisdiction, which upon the filing of the record shall (except as provided in the last sentence of paragraph (1)) be exclusive, to affirm, modify, terminate, or set aside, in whole or in part, the order of the Director.

“(D) REVIEW.—Review of the petition by the court shall be had as provided in chapter

7 of title 5, United States Code. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari, as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

“(3) PROCEEDINGS NOT TREATED AS STAY.—The commencement of proceedings for judicial review under paragraph (2) shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of any order issued by the Director.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) 1992 ACT.—Section 1317(f) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4517(f)) is amended by striking “section 1379B” and inserting “section 1379D”.

(2) FANNIE MAE CHARTER ACT.—The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 308 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1723(b)) is amended by striking “The” and inserting “Except to the extent that action under section 1377 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 temporarily results in a lesser number, the”.

(3) FREDDIE MAC ACT.—The second sentence of subparagraph (A) of section 303(a)(2) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1452(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “The” and inserting “Except to the extent action under section 1377 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 temporarily results in a lesser number, the”.

SEC. 154. ENFORCEMENT AND JURISDICTION.

Section 1375 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4635) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) ENFORCEMENT.—The Director may, in the discretion of the Director, apply to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or the United States district court within the jurisdiction of which the headquarters of the enterprise is located, for the enforcement of any effective and outstanding notice or order issued under this subtitle or subtitle B, or request that the Attorney General of the United States bring such an action. Such court shall have jurisdiction and power to order and require compliance with such notice or order.”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “or 1376” and inserting “1376, or 1377”.

SEC. 155. CIVIL MONEY PENALTIES.

Section 1376 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4636) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “or any executive officer or” and inserting “any executive officer of an enterprise, any enterprise-affiliated party, or any”;

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) AMOUNT OF PENALTY.—

“(1) FIRST TIER.—Any enterprise which, or any enterprise-affiliated party who—

“(A) violates any provision of this title, the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1716 et seq.), the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.), or any order, condition, rule, or regulation under any such title or Act, except that the Director may not enforce compliance with any housing goal established under subpart B of part 2 of subtitle A of this title, with section 1336 or 1337 of this title, with subsection (m) or (n) of section 309 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1723a(m), (n)), or with subsection (e) or (f) of section 307 of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1456(e), (f));

“(B) violates any final or temporary order or notice issued pursuant to this title;

“(C) violates any condition imposed in writing by the Director in connection with the grant of any application or other request by such enterprise;

“(D) violates any written agreement between the enterprise and the Director; or

“(E) engages in any conduct the Director determines to be an unsafe or unsound practice,

shall forfeit and pay a civil penalty of not more than \$10,000 for each day during which such violation continues.

“(2) SECOND TIER.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)—

“(A) if an enterprise, or an enterprise-affiliated party—

“(i) commits any violation described in any subparagraph of paragraph (1);

“(ii) recklessly engages in an unsafe or unsound practice in conducting the affairs of such enterprise; or

“(iii) breaches any fiduciary duty; and

“(B) the violation, practice, or breach—

“(i) is part of a pattern of misconduct;

“(ii) causes or is likely to cause more than a minimal loss to such enterprise; or

“(iii) results in pecuniary gain or other benefit to such party,

the enterprise or enterprise-affiliated party shall forfeit and pay a civil penalty of not more than \$50,000 for each day during which such violation, practice, or breach continues.

“(3) THIRD TIER.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), any enterprise which, or any enterprise-affiliated party who—

“(A) knowingly—

“(i) commits any violation described in any subparagraph of paragraph (1);

“(ii) engages in any unsafe or unsound practice in conducting the affairs of such enterprise; or

“(iii) breaches any fiduciary duty; and

“(B) knowingly or recklessly causes a substantial loss to such enterprise or a substantial pecuniary gain or other benefit to such party by reason of such violation, practice, or breach,

shall forfeit and pay a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed the applicable maximum amount determined under paragraph (4) for each day during which such violation, practice, or breach continues.

“(4) MAXIMUM AMOUNTS OF PENALTIES FOR ANY VIOLATION DESCRIBED IN PARAGRAPH (3).—The maximum daily amount of any civil penalty which may be assessed pursuant to paragraph (3) for any violation, practice, or breach described in such paragraph is—

“(A) in the case of any person other than an enterprise, an amount not to exceed \$2,000,000; and

“(B) in the case of any enterprise, \$2,000,000.”; and

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “or director” each place such term appears and inserting “director, or enterprise-affiliated party”;

(B) by striking “request the Attorney General of the United States to”;

(C) by inserting “, or the United States district court within the jurisdiction of which the headquarters of the enterprise is located,” after “District of Columbia”; and

(D) by striking “, or may, under the direction and control of the Attorney General, bring such an action”.

SEC. 156. CRIMINAL PENALTY.

Subtitle C of title XIII of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4631 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1377 (as added by this Act) the following:

“SEC. 1378. CRIMINAL PENALTY.

“Whoever, being subject to an order in effect under section 1377, without the prior written approval of the Director, knowingly

participates, directly or indirectly, in any manner (including by engaging in an activity specifically prohibited in such an order) in the conduct of the affairs of any enterprise shall, notwithstanding section 3571 of title 18, be fined not more than \$1,000,000, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.”.

Subtitle D—General Provisions

SEC. 161. CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO 1992 ACT.—Title XIII of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4501 et seq.), as amended this Act, is amended—

(1) in section 1315 (12 U.S.C. 4515)—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “OFFICE PERSONNEL” and inserting “IN GENERAL”; and

(ii) by striking “The” and inserting “Subject to title II of the Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Modernization Act of 2003, the”;

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “HUD” and inserting “DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY”; and

(ii) by striking “Housing and Urban Development” and inserting “the Department of the Treasury”; and

(C) by striking subsection (f);

(2) in section 1319A (12 U.S.C. 4520)—

(A) by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—”; and

(B) by striking subsection (b);

(3) in section 1319F (12 U.S.C. 4525), by striking paragraph (2);

(4) in the section heading for section 1328, by striking “secretary” and inserting “director”;

(5) in section 1361 (12 U.S.C. 4611)—

(A) in subsection (e)(1), by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: “The Director shall establish the risk-based capital test under this section by regulation.”; and

(B) in subsection (f), by striking “the Secretary,”;

(6) in section 1364(c) (12 U.S.C. 4614(c)), by striking the last sentence;

(7) in section 1367(a)(2) (12 U.S.C. 4617(a)(2)), by striking “with the written concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury.”;

(8) by striking section 1383;

(9) by striking “Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs” and inserting “Committee on Financial Services” each place such term appears in sections 1319B, 1319G(c), 1328(a), 1336(b)(3)(C), 1337, and 1369(a)(3); and

(10) by striking “Secretary” and inserting “Director” each place such term appears in—

(A) subpart A of part 2 of subtitle A (except in sections 1322, 1324, and 1325); and

(B) subtitle B (except in section 1361(d)(1) and 1369E).

(b) AMENDMENTS TO TABLE OF CONTENTS OF 1992 ACT.—Section 1(b) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 81 note) is amended—

(1) by striking the matter relating to section 1311 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 1311. Establishment of Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision.”;

(2) by striking the matter relating to section 1313 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 1313. Duties and authorities of director.”;

(3) by inserting after the matter relating to section 1319G the following:

“Sec. 1319H. Prior approval authority for new programs.

“Sec. 1319I. Registration of stock and public disclosures.”;

(4) by striking the matter relating to section 1319 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 1319. Review of enterprises.”;

(5) by striking the matter relating to section 1328 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 1328. Reports by Director.”;

(6) by striking the heading relating to subtitle B of title XIII and inserting the following:

Subtitle B—Required Capital Levels for Enterprises, Special Enforcement Powers, and Nonmortgage-Related Assets”;

(7) by inserting after the matter relating to section 1369D the following:

“Sec. 1369E. Nonmortgage-related assets.”;

(8) by redesignating the matter relating to sections 1373 through 1379B as sections 1379 through 1379D, respectively; and

(9) by inserting after the matter relating to section 1376 the following:

“Sec. 1377. Removal and prohibition authority.

“Sec. 1378. Criminal penalty.”.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO FANNIE MAE CHARTER ACT.—The Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1716 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking “Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight of the Department of Housing and Urban Development” each place such term appears, and inserting “Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury”, in—

(A) section 303(c)(2) (12 U.S.C. 1718(c)(2));

(B) section 309(d)(3)(B) (12 U.S.C. 1723a(d)(3)(B)); and

(C) section 309(k)(1); and

(2) in section 309(n)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury,” after “Senate,”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “Secretary” and inserting “Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury”.

(e) AMENDMENTS TO FREDDIE MAC ACT.—The Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking “Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight of the Department of Housing and Urban Development” each place such term appears, and inserting “Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury”, in—

(A) section 303(b)(2) (12 U.S.C. 1452(b)(2));

(B) section 303(h)(2) (12 U.S.C. 1452(h)(2)); and

(C) section 307(c)(1) (12 U.S.C. 1456(c)(1));

(2) in section 306(i) (12 U.S.C. 1455(i))—

(A) by striking “section 1316(c)” and inserting “section 306(c)”;

(B) by striking “section 106” and inserting “section 1316”; and

(3) in section 307 (12 U.S.C. 1456)—

(A) in subsection (f)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting “the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury,” after “Senate,”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “Secretary” and inserting “Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury”.

(f) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight” and inserting “Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury”.

(g) AMENDMENTS TO FLOOD DISASTER PROTECTION ACT OF 1973.—Section 102(f)(3)(A) of

the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(f)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight of the Department of Housing and Urban Development” and inserting “Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury”.

(h) AMENDMENT TO DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT.—Section 5 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (42 U.S.C. 3534) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(i) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, Department of Housing and Urban Development and inserting the following new item:

“Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision, Department of the Treasury.”.

SEC. 162. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as specifically provided otherwise in this title, the amendments made by this title shall take effect on, and shall apply beginning on, the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS, PERSONNEL, AND PROPERTY

SEC. 201. ABOLISHMENT OF OFHEO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective at the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the positions of the Director and Deputy Director of such Office are abolished.

(b) DISPOSITION OF AFFAIRS.—During the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight shall, solely for the purpose of winding up the affairs of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight—

(1) manage the employees of such Office and provide for the payment of the compensation and benefits of any such employee which accrue before the effective date of any transfer of such employee pursuant to section 203; and

(2) may take any other action necessary for the purpose of winding up the affairs of the Office.

(c) STATUS OF EMPLOYEES AS FEDERAL AGENCY EMPLOYEES.—The amendments made by title I and the abolishment of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight under subsection (a) of this section may not be construed to affect the status of any employee of such Office as employees of an agency of the United States for purposes of any other provision of law during any time such employee is so employed.

(d) USE OF PROPERTY AND SERVICES.—

(1) PROPERTY.—The Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury may use the property of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight to perform functions that have been transferred to the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision for such time as is reasonable to facilitate the orderly transfer of functions under any other provision of this Act, or any amendment made by this Act to any other provision of law.

(2) AGENCY SERVICES.—Any agency, department, or other instrumentality of the United States, and any successor to any such agency, department, or instrumentality, which was providing supporting services to the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight before the expiration of the period under subsection (a) in connection with functions that

are transferred to the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury shall—

(A) continue to provide such services, on a reimbursable basis, until the transfer of such functions is complete; and

(B) consult with any such agency to coordinate and facilitate a prompt and reasonable transition.

(e) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—

(1) EXISTING RIGHTS, DUTIES, AND OBLIGATIONS NOT AFFECTED.—Subsection (a) shall not affect the validity of any right, duty, or obligation of the United States, the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, or any other person, which—

(A) arises under or pursuant to the title XIII of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4501 et seq.), the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1716 et seq.), the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.), or any other provision of law applicable with respect to such Office; and

(B) existed on the day before the abolishment under subsection (a) of this section.

(2) CONTINUATION OF SUITS.—No action or other proceeding commenced by or against the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight shall abate by reason of the enactment of this Act, except that the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury shall be substituted for the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight as a party to any such action or proceeding.

SEC. 202. CONTINUATION AND COORDINATION OF CERTAIN REGULATIONS.

All regulations, orders, determinations, and resolutions that—

(1) were issued, made, prescribed, or allowed to become effective by—

(A) the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight;

(B) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and that relate to the Secretary's authority under—

(i) title XIII of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4501 et seq.);

(ii) the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1716 et seq.), with respect to the Federal National Mortgage Association; or

(iii) the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act (12 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.); or

(C) a court of competent jurisdiction and that relate to functions transferred by this Act; and

(2) are in effect on the date of the abolishment under section 201(a) of this Act,

shall remain in effect according to the terms of such regulations, orders, determinations, and resolutions, and shall be enforceable by or against the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury until modified, terminated, set aside, or superseded in accordance with applicable law by such Board, any court of competent jurisdiction, or operation of law.

SEC. 203. TRANSFER AND RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES OF OFHEO.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER.—The Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury may transfer employees of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight to the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision for employment no later than the date of the abolishment under section 201(a) of this Act, as the Director considers appropriate. This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not be considered to result in the transfer of any function from one

agency to another or the replacement of 1 agency by another, for purposes of section 3505 of title 5, United States Code, except to the extent that the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision specifically provides so.

(b) APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY FOR EXCEPTED AND SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), in the case of employees occupying positions in the excepted service or the Senior Executive Service, any appointment authority established pursuant to law or regulations of the Office of Personnel Management for filling such positions shall be transferred.

(2) DECLINE OF TRANSFER.—The Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury may decline a transfer of authority under paragraph (1) (and the employees appointed pursuant thereto) to the extent that such authority relates to positions excepted from the competitive service because of their confidential, policy-making, policy-determining, or policy-advocating character, and noncareer positions in the Senior Executive Service (within the meaning of section 3132(a)(7) of title 5, United States Code).

(c) REORGANIZATION.—If the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury determines, after the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the abolishment under section 201(a), that a reorganization of the combined work force is required, that reorganization shall be deemed a major reorganization for purposes of affording affected employees retirement under section 8336(d)(2) or 8414(b)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code.

(d) EMPLOYEE BENEFIT PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any employee of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight accepting employment with the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury as a result of a transfer under subsection (a) may retain for 18 months after the date such transfer occurs membership in any employee benefit program of the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury or the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, as applicable, including insurance, to which such employee belongs on the date of the abolishment under section 201(a) if—

(A) the employee does not elect to give up the benefit or membership in the program; and

(B) the benefit or program is continued by the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision.

(2) PAYMENT OF DIFFERENTIAL.—The difference in the costs between the benefits which would have been provided by such agency and those provided by this section shall be paid by the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision. If any employee elects to give up membership in a health insurance program or the health insurance program is not continued by such Director, the employee shall be permitted to select an alternate Federal health insurance program within 30 days of such election or notice, without regard to any other regularly scheduled open season.

SEC. 204. TRANSFER OF PROPERTY AND FACILITIES.

Upon the abolishment under section 201(a), all property of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight shall transfer to the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Supervision of the Department of the Treasury.

S. 1658. A bill to make residents of Puerto Rico eligible for the earned income tax credit, the refundable portion of the child tax credit, and supplemental security income benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has been a territory of the United States since 1898. Since 1917, people born in Puerto Rico have been citizens of the United States under Federal laws applicable in the territory.

One of the interesting, and most misunderstood, aspects of Puerto Rico's unique relationship with the United States, is that the U.S. citizens who reside there are not required to file tax returns and pay income tax on the money they earn on the island. That might lead one to conclude that this is a huge benefit to the majority of people who live on the island. The reality, however, is that well over half—and perhaps as much as three-quarters—of Puerto Rican families would likely owe no U.S. income tax if they were taxed in the same manner as other citizens.

Why? Because Puerto Rico struggles with a high rate of poverty. Fifty-eight percent of Puerto Rican children live below the national poverty level—which is an improvement from 67 percent in the early 1990s. That means that today more than one-half of Puerto Rican children live in a family that earns less than \$17,000 a year. In contrast, the State with the highest child poverty rate, Mississippi, has a child poverty rate of 27 percent.

For over 30 years, U.S. policy toward improving the economic situation on the island has focused on corporate tax incentives. Today, I am introducing legislation that focuses on providing direct stimulus to the part of economy in Puerto Rico that has been neglected—Puerto Rican families and children. Putting money into the hands of the people who will spend it will provide the most direct stimulus for the economy of the island.

This bill puts Puerto Rican families on par with other families in America by extending to them the benefits of our social safety net. Specifically, the bill makes residents of Puerto Rico eligible for the earned income tax credit, the refundable per child tax credit, and the Supplemental Security Income program.

Although Puerto Rican families are not subject to the Federal income tax, they do pay Federal payroll taxes. Just like other working families in America that work hard and play by the rules, low-income employees in Puerto Rico deserve relief from those payroll taxes. The earned income tax credit and the refundable portion of the child tax credit have long been recognized as an effective way to provide such relief. The Puerto Rico Economic Stimulus Act says that families in Puerto Rico should also be able to claim these credits, in the same way, and subject to the

By Mr. DASCHLE (for Mr. GRAHAM of Florida):

same limitations, as families in Florida, Tennessee, Texas, or New York.

Workers in Puerto Rico pay payroll taxes like all other Americans. While some may disagree with the notion of providing refundable credits to offset payroll taxes that is a different debate than whether low-income families in Puerto Rico should be treated the same as low-income families in the 50 States. This is a matter of equity, not tax policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the full 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. 1658

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 “Puerto Rico Economic Stimulus Act of 2003”.

SEC. 2. PUERTO RICO RESIDENTS ELIGIBLE FOR EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to earned income) is amended by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

“(n) RESIDENTS OF PUERTO RICO.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of residents of Puerto Rico, this section shall be applied—

“(A) by substituting ‘United States or Puerto Rico’ for ‘United States’ in subsections (c)(1)(A)(ii)(I) and (c)(3)(E),

“(B) by substituting ‘nonresident alien individual (other than a resident of Puerto Rico)’ for ‘nonresident alien individual’ in subsection (c)(1)(E), and

“(C) by substituting ‘gross income (computed without regard to section 933)’ for ‘gross income’ in subsections (a)(2)(B) and (c)(2)(A)(i).

“(2) PHASE-IN OF CREDIT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The credit allowable under this section by reason of this subsection shall not exceed the applicable percentage of the amount of credit which would otherwise be allowable under this section (without regard to this paragraph).

“(B) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—The applicable percentage shall be determined as follows:

| In the case of any taxable year beginning in— | The applicable percent— |
|---|-------------------------|
| 2004 | 10 |
| 2005 | 20 |
| 2006 | 30 |
| 2007 | 40 |
| 2008 | 50 |
| 2009 | 60 |
| 2010 | 70 |
| 2011 | 80 |
| 2012 | 90 |
| 2013 and thereafter | 100.”. |

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2003.

SEC. 3. REFUNDABLE CHILD TAX CREDIT ALLOWABLE TO RESIDENTS OF PUERTO RICO WITH LESS THAN 3 CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 24(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to portion of credit refundable) is amended by inserting at the end the following new sentence: “For purposes of this paragraph, taxable income shall be computed without regard to section 933.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2003.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any credit allowable by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a) shall not exceed the applicable percentage of the amount of credit which would otherwise be allowable under section 24(d)(1) (without regard to this subsection).

(2) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—The applicable percentage shall be determined as follows:

| In the case of any taxable year beginning in— | The applicable percent— |
|---|-------------------------|
| 2004 | 10 |
| 2005 | 20 |
| 2006 | 30 |
| 2007 | 40 |
| 2008 | 50 |
| 2009 | 60 |
| 2010 | 70 |
| 2011 | 80 |
| 2012 | 90 |
| 2013 and thereafter | 100. |

SEC. 4. SSI TO APPLY TO RESIDENTS OF PUERTO RICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1614(e) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking “and the District of Columbia” and inserting “, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico”.

(b) APPLICATION.—Section 1611 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Limitation on Benefits for Residents of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

“(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, in the case of an individual who is a resident of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico who is eligible to receive a monthly benefit under this title, the monthly benefits payable under this title shall not exceed—

“(1) for each month occurring in 2004, 10 percent of the monthly benefits that would, but for the application of this subsection, be paid to the individual under this title;

“(2) for each month occurring in 2005, 20 percent of the monthly benefits that would, but for the application of this subsection, be paid to the individual under this title;

“(3) for each month occurring in 2006, 30 percent of the monthly benefits that would, but for the application of this subsection, be paid to the individual under this title;

“(4) for each month occurring in 2007, 40 percent of the monthly benefits that would, but for the application of this subsection, be paid to the individual under this title;

“(5) for each month occurring in 2008, 50 percent of the monthly benefits that would, but for the application of this subsection, be paid to the individual under this title;

“(6) for each month occurring in 2009, 60 percent of the monthly benefits that would, but for the application of this subsection, be paid to the individual under this title;

“(7) for each month occurring in 2010, 70 percent of the monthly benefits that would, but for the application of this subsection, be paid to the individual under this title;

“(8) for each month occurring in 2011, 80 percent of the monthly benefits that would, but for the application of this subsection, be paid to the individual under this title; and

“(9) for each month occurring in 2012, 90 percent of the monthly benefits that would, but for the application of this subsection, be paid to the individual under this title.”.

(c) TERMINATION OF OTHER PROGRAMS FOR RESIDENTS OF PUERTO RICO.—

(1) TITLE I.—Title I of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“TERMINATION FOR RESIDENTS OF PUERTO RICO

“SEC. 7. This title shall not apply to residents of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico after 2012.”.

(2) TITLE X.—Title X of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“TERMINATION FOR RESIDENTS OF PUERTO RICO

“SEC. 1007. This title shall not apply to residents of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico after 2012.”.

(3) TITLE XIV.—Title XIV of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“TERMINATION FOR RESIDENTS OF PUERTO RICO

“SEC. 1406. This title shall not apply to residents of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico after 2012.”.

(4) TITLE XVI.—Title XVI of the Social Security Act, as applicable with respect to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall not apply after 2012.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to benefits payable in months beginning on or after January 1, 2004.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. REID):

S. 1660. A bill to improve water quality on abandoned and inactive mine land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Good Samaritan Abandoned and Inactive Mine Reclamation Act of 2003.

I have been involved with efforts to clean up abandoned hardrock mines for a long time. In fact, I was an original cosponsor of a bill in the 106th Congress. The Western Governors Association regarded that the bill as a first step in the right direction, and I am proud to build and improve upon that experience in crafting my own legislation.

Abandoned hardrock mines pose significant environmental and safety hazards to communities across the Western United States. In fact, the Western Governor's Association concluded that there are at least 400,000 such sites across the West, many of which cover our public lands.

The history of abandoned hardrock mines is linked to government policies promoting the westward expansion of our Nation, and Federal policies during times of war. Due to the historic nature of these sites, the party responsible for the environmental problem is not always identifiable or not economically viable to be compelled to clean up the site.

Abandoned mine lands (AMLs) are areas adjacent to or affected by abandoned mines. They often contain unmined mineral deposits, mine dumps, and tailings that contaminate the surrounding watershed and ecosystem. Streams near AML sites—including many in Colorado—may contain metals or be so acidic that fish and aquatic insects cannot live in them. Water too polluted for fish and insects is also water too polluted for people. Further, abandoned mine sites pose very real safety hazards for folks enjoying the West's wild lands.

Although abandoned hardrock mining in the West goes back a hundred years, the Clean Water Act has only been in existence for thirty. The Clean

Water Act was an important and historic piece of legislation that did a lot of good, but it failed to promote the reclamation of abandoned hardrock mine sites. In fact, if an environmental group or county or interested party wanted to clean an abandoned mine site, they would incur liability under the Act.

The Western Governors Association has repeatedly called on Congress to amend the Clean Water Act's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit program. The WGA stated that the NPDES program "has become an overwhelming disincentive for any voluntary cleanup efforts of AMLs because of the liability that can be inherited for any discharges from an abandoned mine site remaining after cleanup, even though the volunteering remediation party had no previous responsibility or liability for the site, and has reduced the water quality impacts from the site by completing a cleanup project."

My bill recognizes that there are a lot of good, responsible folks across our Western communities who recognize the environmental harm that AMLs pose and finally gives them the tools to do something about it. My bill establishes a "Good Samaritan" permit program under the Clean Water Act, administered by the EPA or a State-approved agency allowing an applicant to develop a strategy to remediate an affected area, and be granted a permit to do the work without penalizing them for their good deed.

In order to be granted a Good Samaritan permit, my bill requires an applicant to meet comprehensive standards ensuring that they have the financial and technical resources to get the job done. An applicant must establish remediation and monitoring schedules for the clean up project and identify funding sources to carry out the plan.

My bill's goal is to promote the clean-up of abandoned hardrock mines. Therefore, it allows communities, interest stakeholder groups, and corporations, as coalitions or individually to be "Good Samaritans." The transparent and publicly open permit application process helps to ensure that permit holders are acting in good faith and have the technical and financial wherewithal to get the job done.

Further, if a permit holder is found to have violated the terms of the permit, he or she could lose their liability protection and subject to an enforcement action.

The West's States, communities, and interested parties have been prevented from cleaning up their own communities for far too long. My bill provides a transparent, flexible, and enforceable permit system that removes the unintentional liability associated with abandoned hardrock mine cleanup.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on speedy passage of this important legislation.

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

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

S. 1660

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 "Good Samaritan Abandoned and Inactive Mine Remediation Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal Government has encouraged, through various laws and policies, the development of gold, silver, and other minerals, especially in the West;

(2) development of the resources referred to in paragraph (1) has—

(A) helped create a strong economy; and

(B) provided strategic materials to achieve maximum production of the metals that were essential to victory in World War I and World War II;

(3) during World War I and World War II, the Federal Government actively encouraged mining and milling operations, including the design and placement of mine tailings and waste rock piles, practices—

(A) that were not governed by any Federal or State environmental laws during that period;

(B) the impact of which on the environment and public health were unknown; and

(C) that since that period, have been—

(i) found to be harmful to the environment; and

(ii) made illegal;

(4) the result of the practices is a legacy of abandoned and inactive mine sites, many of which are on Federal land, that—

(A) have been unreclaimed or, based on existing environmental standards, inadequately reclaimed; and

(B) continue to pose environmental and safety hazards;

(5) the cleanup of the abandoned and inactive mine sites is hampered primarily by concerns about the potential liability associated with the cleanup.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to facilitate the cleanup of abandoned and inactive mine sites by limiting the potential liability of persons cleaning up the sites.

SEC. 3. ABANDONED AND INACTIVE MINE REMEDIATION PERMITS.

Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(F) ABANDONED AND INACTIVE MINE REMEDIATION PERMITS.—

"(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

"(A) ABANDONED OR INACTIVE MINE LAND.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'abandoned or inactive mine land' means land—

"(I) that was actively mined for noncoal resources;

"(II) that is not—

"(aa) being actively mined for noncoal resources; or

"(bb) subject to a temporary shutdown; and

"(III) with respect to which there is no identifiable or economically viable owner or operator of record for the mine or mine facilities.

"(ii) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'abandoned or inactive mine land' does not include—

"(I) a site listed on the National Priorities List under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.); or

"(II) a brownfield site (as defined in section 101 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 9601).

"(B) PERMIT.—The term 'permit' means an abandoned or inactive mine remediation permit described in paragraph (2).

"(C) PERMITTING AGENT.—The term 'permitting agent' means—

"(i) the Administrator; or

"(ii) the head of a State program that is authorized by the Administrator to issue and administer permits under this subsection.

"(D) REMEDIATING PARTY.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'remediating party' means any of the following persons or entities that carries out the remediation of an abandoned or inactive mine land:

"(I)(aa) The United States, a State, a political subdivision of a State, or an Indian tribe; or

"(bb) any officer, employee, or contractor of the United States, a State, a political subdivision of a State, or an Indian tribe.

"(II) A corporation.

"(III) Any person or entity acting in cooperation with the permittee with respect to the abandoned or inactive mine land.

"(ii) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'remediating party' does not include a person or entity described in clause (i) that, with respect to the abandoned or inactive mine land that is being remediated, has been determined to be legally responsible or in material noncompliance with section 301(a).

"(E) UNANTICIPATED EVENT OR CONDITION.—The term 'unanticipated event or condition' means an event or condition that was not contemplated by the permit.

"(2) IN GENERAL.—The permitting agent may issue an abandoned or inactive mine remediation permit for the conduct of remediation activities on abandoned or inactive mine land from which there is or may be a discharge of pollutants to bodies of water of the United States.

"(3) APPLICATION FOR PERMIT.—

"(A) COMPONENTS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a permit under this subsection, the remediating party shall submit to the permitting agent an application that includes a remediation plan that—

"(I) identifies—

"(aa) the remediating party;

"(bb) any agents or contractors of the remediating party; and

"(cc) any persons cooperating with the remediating party with respect to the remediation plan;

"(II) describes the reasonable efforts of the remediating party to identify current owners, lessees, and claimants of the abandoned or inactive mine land addressed by the remediation plan;

"(III) certifies that the remediating party qualifies as a remediating party under paragraph (1)(D);

"(IV) identifies that the site addressed by the plan is—

"(aa) abandoned or inactive mine land; and

"(bb) eligible for a permit under this Act;

"(V) identifies the bodies of water of the United States affected by the abandoned or inactive mine land;

"(VI) describes the baseline condition of the bodies of water identified under subclause (V), in accordance with requirements established by the permitting authority, as of the date of the permit application (including any conditions that make numeric monitoring of a baseline preexisting discharge physically or economically infeasible);

"(VII) describes the physical conditions at the site that are causing or believed to be causing adverse water quality impacts;

"(VIII) describes the goals and objectives of remediation, including the pollutant or pollutants to be addressed by the remediation plan;

"(IX)(aa) describes the practices that are proposed to reduce, control, mitigate, or eliminate the impacts of adverse water quality, including the preliminary system design

and construction, operation, and maintenance plans; and

“(bb) includes a schedule and estimated completion date of the practices;

“(X) applies site-specific best available technology, using best professional judgment, to explain how the practices described in subclause (IX) are expected to improve the quality of the bodies of water identified under subclause (V);

“(XI) describes—

“(aa) site-specific monitoring or other forms of assessment to be used to evaluate the success of the practices during and after implementation of the remediation plan in improving the quality of the water identified under subclause (V); and

“(bb) the duration of the monitoring or assessment;

“(XII)(aa) describes any extraction, processing, or removal of minerals for remediation or commercial sale; and

“(bb) states that 100 percent of the net profits generated through the use or commercial sale of minerals under item (aa) that will be—

“(AA) used for future remediation; or

“(BB) deposited in a designated remediation fund;

“(XIII) provides a schedule for periodic reporting on progress in implementing the remediation plan; and

“(XIV)(aa) provides a budget for the remediation plan; and

“(bb) identifies any potential funding sources for carrying out the remediation plan.

“(ii) CERTIFICATION BY CORPORATION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the requirements under clause (i), an application submitted by a corporation shall include a certification in accordance with paragraph (1)(D)(ii) that, based on the knowledge and belief of the officers and directors of the corporation, neither the corporation nor any wholly owned subsidiary of the corporation is legally responsible for or in material non-compliance with section 301(a) or an equivalent State law for the site proposed to be remediated.

“(II) LIMITATION.—If at any time the permitting agent determines that the certification under subclause (I) is incorrect, the corporation—

“(aa) shall not be entitled to the protection under this subsection; and

“(bb) shall be subject to liability under this section or section 301, 302, or 402.

“(B) APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL OF APPLICATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of receipt of an application under subparagraph (A), the permitting agent shall approve or disapprove the application.

“(ii) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—Before approving or disapproving an application under clause (i), the permitting agent shall provide to the public—

“(I) notice of the application; and

“(II) an opportunity for public comment on the application.

“(iii) APPROVAL.—The permitting agent shall approve an application under clause (i) and issue a permit to the remediating party if the permitting agent determines that—

“(I) the remediating party has made a reasonable effort (relative to the resources available to the remediating party for the proposed remediation activity) to identify persons under subparagraph (A)(i)(II);

“(II) the implementation of the remediation plan would improve the quality of the water identified under subparagraph (A)(i)(V); and

“(III) any Indian tribe with jurisdiction over the abandoned or inactive mine land

subject to the permit consents to the issuance of the permit.

“(iv) ACTION FOLLOWING DISAPPROVAL.—

“(I) REVISION.—If the permitting agent disapproves an application under clause (i), the permitting agent shall—

“(aa) notify the applicant of the reasons for disapproval; and

“(bb) allow the applicant 30 days in which to submit a revised application.

“(II) DEADLINE FOR REVISION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a revision is submitted under subclause (I)(bb), the permitting agent shall approve or disapprove the revision.

“(4) CONTENTS OF PERMIT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A permit shall—

“(i) provide for compliance with and implementation of the remediation plan; and

“(ii) establish a schedule for review by the permitting agent of compliance with and implementation of the remediation plan.

“(B) LIMITATION.—A permit shall not—

“(i) require the remediating party to comply with any other subsection or section 301, 302, or 402; or

“(ii) except in a case in which the net profits (as stated under paragraph (3)(A)(i)(XII)(bb)) generated through such use or sale of minerals are used for present or future remediation activities, authorize any discharge associated with the extraction, processing, or removal of minerals for commercial use or sale.

“(5) MODIFICATION OF PERMIT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of receipt of a written request by a permittee to modify a permit, the permitting agent shall approve or disapprove a modification to the permit.

“(B) APPROVAL.—A modification to a permit approved by the permitting agent under this subsection shall—

“(i) be made by agreement of the permittee and the permitting agent and with the concurrence of any applicable State or Indian tribe with jurisdiction over the abandoned or inactive mine land subject to the permit;

“(ii) be made in accordance with subparagraphs (2)(B) and (3); and

“(iii) take effect on approval.

“(6) FAILURE TO COMPLY.—If a remediating party fails to comply with any term or condition of a permit under this subsection, the failure shall be considered to be a violation subject to enforcement under sections 309 and 505, except in a case in which—

“(A)(i) based on information submitted to the permitting agent by the permittee, the permitting agent determines that the non-compliance was the result of an unanticipated event or condition; and

“(ii) not later than 30 days after the date on which a determination is made under clause (i), the permittee establishes, to the satisfaction of the permitting agent, that the permittee is in compliance with the permit; or

“(B)(i) the permitting agent determines that compliance with the permit is infeasible because of reasons not contemplated at the time at which the permit was issued; and

“(ii) the permitting agent and the permittee modify the permit in accordance with paragraph (5).

“(7) TERMINATION OF PERMIT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The permitting agent shall terminate a permit if—

“(i) the remediating party completes the implementation of the remediation plan;

“(ii) the discharges covered by the permit become subject to a permit that is issued—

“(I) under another subsection; and

“(II) for the extraction, processing, or removal of minerals for commercial sale, the net profits of which shall be used for purposes other than the purposes described in paragraph (3)(A)(i)(XII)(bb)—

“(aa) that is not part of the implementation of the remediation plan; and

“(bb) with respect to which the remediating party is not a participant;

“(iii) an unanticipated event or condition is encountered that is beyond the control of the remediating party; or

“(iv) the permitting agent determines that remediation activities conducted under the permit have resulted in surface water quality conditions that are equal to or better than the baseline condition of the water as of the date of the permit application.

“(B) NO ENFORCEMENT LIABILITY.—If a permit is terminated under subparagraph (A), the remediating party shall not be subject to enforcement under section 309 or 505 for any subsequent discharges from the abandoned or inactive mine land subject to the permit.

“(8) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A remediating party issued a permit under this subsection and, for purposes of conducting a preliminary investigation of a site to determine whether to pursue a permit application, a potential applicant for a permit, for a period of not more than 120 days unless otherwise stated by the permitting authority, shall not be considered to be an owner or operator for purposes of—

“(i) this Act;

“(ii) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.); or

“(iii) the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.).

“(B) PRIOR VIOLATIONS.—With respect to violations of this section, or sections 301, 302, and 402 that occur before the date on which a permit is issued under this subsection, nothing in this subsection—

“(i) precludes an action under section 309 or 505 for such violations; or

“(ii) affects the relief available under section 309 or 505.

“(9) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator, in consultation with State, tribal, and local officials and after notice and opportunity for public comment, shall promulgate regulations that—

“(A) establish requirements for remediation plans under this subsection; and

“(B) provide guidance for the development of State programs for the issuance and administration of permits under this subsection.

“(10) FUNDING.—A remediating party that implements a remediation plan under a permit issued under this subsection shall be eligible for grants under section 319(h).

“(11) EFFECT.—Nothing in this subsection—

“(A) limits the liability associated with any mining or processing activities in existence before, on, or after the date of enactment of this subsection; or

“(B) affects any obligation of a State or Indian tribe under section 303.”

By Mrs. DOLE:

S. 1663. A bill to replace certain Coastal Barrier Resources System maps; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the legislation, “To replace certain Coastal Barrier Resources System maps” be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1663

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPLACEMENT OF CERTAIN COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM MAPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The 2 maps subtitled “NC-07P”, relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System unit designated as Coastal Barrier Resources System Cape Fear Unit NC-07P, that are included in the set of maps entitled “Coastal Barrier Resources System” and referred to in section 4(a) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(a)), are hereby replaced by 2 other maps relating to those units entitled “Coastal Barrier Resources System Cape Fear Unit, NC-07P” and dated February 18, 2003.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall keep the maps referred to in subsection (a) on file and available for inspection in accordance with the provisions of section 4(b) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(b)).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 234—HONORING THE DETROIT SHOCK ON WINNING THE WOMEN’S NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. LEVIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 234

Whereas on September 16, 2003, the Detroit Shock won the Women’s National Basketball Association Championship by defeating the 2-time defending champion Los Angeles Sparks, 83 to 78;

Whereas the Shock won a league-best 25 games, a year after losing a league-worst 23, becoming the first team in any major sport since 1890 to finish first in the entire league after finishing last the previous season;

Whereas the enthusiasm and support for the Shock by the people of Detroit and of Michigan was clearly demonstrated by the fact that the final game was attended by a Women’s National Basketball Association (WNBA) record crowd of over 22,000 people;

Whereas the Shock completed an incredible season with the strong performances of Finals Most Valuable Player Ruth Riley’s career-high 27 points, Swin Cash’s 13 points, 12 rebounds and 9 assists, and Deanna Nolan’s 17 points;

Whereas Cheryl Ford, the 2003 WNBA Rookie of the Year, became the first rookie in league history to average more than 10 points and 10 rebounds per game;

Whereas Detroit Shock Head Coach Bill Laimbeer was named 2003 WNBA Coach of the Year after transforming the Shock into the best team in the league in his first year as head coach;

Whereas in honor of the Shock’s championship, the Palace of Auburn Hills is officially changing its address to Three Championship Drive; and

Whereas the Shock have demonstrated great strength, skill, and perseverance during the 2003 season and have made the entire State of Michigan proud: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Detroit Shock on winning the 2003 Women’s National Basketball Association Championship and recognizes all the players, coaches, support staff, and fans who were instrumental in this achievement; and

(2) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Detroit Shock for appropriate display.

SENATE RESOLUTION 235—HONORING THE LIFE OF THE LATE HERB BROOKS AND EXPRESSING THE DEEPEST CONDOLENCES OF THE SENATE TO HIS FAMILY ON HIS DEATH

Mr. DAYTON (for himself and Mr. COLEMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 235

Whereas the Senate has learned with great sadness of the death of Herb Brooks;

Whereas Herb Brooks, born in Saint Paul, Minnesota, greatly distinguished himself by his long commitment to the game of hockey, the players whom he coached, the State of Minnesota, and the United States of America;

Whereas Herb Brooks was a member of the 1964 and 1968 United States Olympic Hockey Teams;

Whereas Herb Brooks coached the 1980 United States Olympic Hockey Team, also known as the “Miracle on Ice”, to a sensational victory against the favored Soviet Union team, providing the United States with an unforgettable moment that highlighted American determination, resilience, and spirit;

Whereas the United States Olympic Team continued victoriously on and won the Gold Medal at the 1980 Olympic Games;

Whereas Herb Brooks coached 3 University of Minnesota hockey teams to NCAA National Championships in 1974, 1976, and 1979;

Whereas Herb Brooks subsequently coached the Minnesota North Stars, the New York Rangers, the New Jersey Devils, and the Pittsburgh Penguins;

Whereas Herb Brooks spearheaded the development of the Division I hockey program at Saint Cloud State University by serving as the first coach of the team, obtaining the funding for a world-class ice arena, and recruiting top-level players to the new program;

Whereas in 1990, Herb Brooks was inducted into the United States Hockey Hall of Fame and in 1999 was inducted into the International Hockey Hall of Fame;

Whereas Herb Brooks was a devoted husband to his wife, Patti, and a loving father to his 2 children, Dan and Kelly; and

Whereas his life was remarkable for its constant pursuit of excellence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) pays tribute to the outstanding career, character, and dedicated work of the great American Herb Brooks;

(2) expresses its deepest condolences to the family of Herb Brooks; and

(3) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of Herb Brooks.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED & PROPOSED

SA 1787. Mrs. FEINSTEIN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1783 proposed by Mr. DEWINE (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU) to the bill H.R. 2765, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of

said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1787. Mrs. FEINSTEIN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1783 proposed by Mr. DEWINE (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU) to the bill H.R. 2765, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 31, strike line 13 and all that follows through page 32, line 2, and insert the following:

(c) STUDENT ASSESSMENTS.—The Secretary may not approve an application from an eligible entity for a grant under this title unless the eligible entity’s application—

(1) ensures that the eligible entity will—

(A) assess the academic achievement of all participating eligible students;

(B) use the same assessments every school year that are used for school year 2003–2004 by the District of Columbia Public Schools to assess the achievement of District of Columbia public school students under section 1111(b)(3)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(3)(A)), to assess participating eligible students in the same grades as such public school students;

(C) provide assessment results and other relevant information to the Secretary or to the entity conducting the evaluation under section 9 so that the Secretary or the entity, respectively, can conduct an evaluation that shall include, but not be limited to, a comparison of the academic achievement of participating eligible students in the assessments described in this subsection to the achievement of—

(i) students in the same grades in the District of Columbia public schools; and

(ii) the eligible students in the same grades in District of Columbia public schools who sought to participate in the scholarship program but were not selected; and

(D) disclose any personally identifiable information only to the parents of the student to whom the information relates; and

(2) describes how the eligible entity will ensure that the parents of each student who applies for a scholarship under this title (regardless of whether the student receives the scholarship), and the parents of each student participating in the scholarship program under this title, agree that the student will participate in the assessments used by the District of Columbia Public Schools to assess the achievement of District of Columbia public school students under section 1111(b)(3)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(3)(A)), for the period for which the student applied for or received the scholarship, respectively.

(d) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—The Secretary and Mayor of the District of Columbia shall jointly select an independent entity to evaluate annually the performance of students who received scholarships under the 5-year pilot program under this title, and shall make the evaluations public. The first evaluation shall be completed and made available not later than 6 months after the entity is selected pursuant to the preceding sentence.

(e) TEACHER QUALITY.—Each teacher who instructs participating eligible students under the scholarship program shall possess a college degree.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 25, 2003, at 9:30 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on ongoing military operations and reconstruction efforts in Iraq.

Witnesses

Ambassador L. Paul Bremer III, Presidential Envoy to Iraq;

General John P. Abizaid, USA, Commander, United States Central Command.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 25, 2003, at 10:00 a.m. to conduct a hearing on "Counterterrorism Initiatives in the Terror Finance Program."

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 25, 2003 at 2:30 p.m. to hold a hearing on European Nominations.

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

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet on Thursday, September 25, 2003, at 10:00 a.m. in Room 562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing on the reauthorization of the Head Start program.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a markup on Thursday, September 25, 2003, at 9:30 a.m. in Dirksen Room 226.

Agenda

I. Nominations

Henry W. Saad to be United States Circuit Judge, for the Sixth Circuit; Mauricio J. Tamargo to be Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States; Carlos T. Bea to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit; Charles H. Pickering, Sr. to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit; Marcia A. Crone to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of

Texas; Philip S. Figa to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado; William Q. Hayes to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California; John A. Houston to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California; Robert Clive Jones to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada; Ronald A. White to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Oklahoma; John F. Bardelli to be United States Marshal for the District of Connecticut.

II. Bills

S. 1451, Runaway, Homeless, and Missing Children Protection Act [Hatch, Leahy];

S. 1293, A bill to criminalize the sending of predatory and abusive e-mail [Leahy, Hatch, DeWine, Edwards, Feinstein, Grassley, Schumer];

S. 1580, Religious Workers of Act of 2003 [Hatch, Kennedy, DeWine];

S. Res. 209, Recognizing and honoring Woodstock, Vermont native Hiram Powers for his extraordinary and enduring contributions to American sculpture [Jeffords, Leahy, DeWine, Feinstein, Grassley, Hatch, Schumer, Specter];

S. Res. 222, Designating October 17, 2003, as National Mammography Day [Biden, Chambliss, DeWine, Edwards, Feinstein, Grassley, Hatch, Kennedy, Leahy, Schumer, Specter];

S. Res. 98, Expressing the Sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week of October 12, 2003, as National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Week [Campbell, Biden, DeWine, Grassley, Specter].

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND SPACE

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space be authorized to meet on Thursday, September 25, 2003, at 2:30 pm on scientific and medical advances in the field of in utero surgery.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

On Tuesday, September 23, 2003, the Senate passed H.R. 2691, as follows:

H.R. 2691

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 2691) entitled "An Act to making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes," do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For necessary expenses for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, acquisition of easements and other interests in lands, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau, and assessment of mineral potential of public lands pursuant to Public Law 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)), \$847,091,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$1,000,000 is for high priority projects, to be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps; \$2,484,000 is for assessment of the mineral potential of public lands in Alaska pursuant to section 1010 of Public Law 96-487; (16 U.S.C. 3150); and of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be derived from the special receipt account established by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a(i)); and of which \$3,000,000 shall be available in fiscal year 2004 subject to a match by at least an equal amount by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation for cost-shared projects supporting conservation of Bureau lands; and such funds shall be advanced to the Foundation as a lump sum grant without regard to when expenses are incurred; in addition, \$32,696,000 is for Mining Law Administration program operations, including the cost of administering the mining claim fee program; to remain available until expended, to be reduced by amounts collected by the Bureau and credited to this appropriation from annual mining claim fees so as to result in a final appropriation estimated at not more than \$847,091,000; and \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended, from communication site rental fees established by the Bureau for the cost of administering communication site activities: Provided, That appropriations herein made shall not be available for the destruction of healthy, unadopted, wild horses and burros in the care of the Bureau.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for fire preparedness, suppression operations, fire science and research, emergency rehabilitation, hazardous fuels reduction, and rural fire assistance by the Department of the Interior, \$698,725,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$12,374,000 shall be for the renovation or construction of fire facilities: Provided, That such funds are also available for repayment of advances to other appropriation accounts from which funds were previously transferred for such purposes: Provided further, That persons hired pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1469 may be furnished subsistence and lodging without cost from funds available from this appropriation: Provided further, That notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 1856d, sums received by a bureau or office of the Department of the Interior for fire protection rendered pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1856 et seq., protection of United States property, may be credited to the appropriation from which funds were expended to provide that protection, and are available without fiscal year limitation: Provided further, That using the amounts designated under this title of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may enter into procurement contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements, for hazardous fuels reduction activities, and for training and monitoring associated with such hazardous fuels reduction activities, on Federal land, or on adjacent non-Federal land for activities that benefit resources on Federal land: Provided further, That notwithstanding requirements of the Competition in Contracting Act, the Secretary, for purposes of hazardous fuels reduction activities, may obtain maximum practicable competition among: (A) local private, nonprofit, or cooperative entities; (B)

Youth Conservation Corps crews or related partnerships with state, local, or non-profit youth groups; (C) small or micro-businesses; or (D) other entities that will hire or train locally a significant percentage, defined as 50 percent or more, of the project workforce to complete such contracts: Provided further, That in implementing this section, the Secretary shall develop written guidance to field units to ensure accountability and consistent application of the authorities provided herein: Provided further, That funds appropriated under this head may be used to reimburse the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service for the costs of carrying out their responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) to consult and conference, as required by section 7 of such Act in connection with wildland fire management activities: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior may use wildland fire appropriations to enter into non-competitive sole source leases of real property with local governments, at or below fair market value, to construct capitalized improvements for fire facilities on such leased properties, including but not limited to fire guard stations, retardant stations, and other initial attack and fire support facilities, and to make advance payments for any such lease or for construction activity associated with the lease.

CENTRAL HAZARDOUS MATERIALS FUND

For necessary expenses of the Department of the Interior and any of its component offices and bureaus for the remedial action, including associated activities, of hazardous waste substances, pollutants, or contaminants pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), \$9,978,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, sums recovered from or paid by a party in advance of or as reimbursement for remedial action or response activities conducted by the Department pursuant to section 107 or 113(f) of such Act, shall be credited to this account, to be available until expended without further appropriation: Provided further, That such sums recovered from or paid by any party are not limited to monetary payments and may include stocks, bonds or other personal or real property, which may be retained, liquidated, or otherwise disposed of by the Secretary and which shall be credited to this account.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of buildings, recreation facilities, roads, trails, and appurtenant facilities, \$12,476,000, to remain available until expended.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out sections 205, 206, and 318(d) of Public Law 94-579, including administrative expenses and acquisition of lands or waters, or interests therein, \$25,600,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For expenses necessary for management, protection, and development of resources and for construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of lands or interests therein, including existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such grant lands; \$106,672,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That 25 percent of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands is hereby made a charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be transferred to the General Fund in the Treasury in accordance

with the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

FOREST ECOSYSTEMS HEALTH AND RECOVERY FUND

(REVOLVING FUND, SPECIAL ACCOUNT)

In addition to the purposes authorized in Public Law 102-381, funds made available in the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund can be used for the purpose of planning, preparing, implementing and monitoring salvage timber sales and forest ecosystem health and recovery activities, such as release from competing vegetation and density control treatments. The Federal share of receipts (defined as the portion of salvage timber receipts not paid to the counties under 43 U.S.C. 1181f and 43 U.S.C. 1181f-1 et seq., and Public Law 106-393) derived from treatments funded by this account shall be deposited into the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For rehabilitation, protection, and acquisition of lands and interests therein, and improvement of Federal rangelands pursuant to section 401 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), notwithstanding any other Act, sums equal to 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year under sections 3 and 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act (43 U.S.C. 315 et seq.) and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees and mineral leasing receipts from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior pursuant to law, but not less than \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed \$600,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

SERVICE CHARGES, DEPOSITS, AND FORFEITURES

For administrative expenses and other costs related to processing application documents and other authorizations for use and disposal of public lands and resources, for costs of providing copies of official public land documents, for monitoring construction, operation, and termination of facilities in conjunction with use authorizations, and for rehabilitation of damaged property, such amounts as may be collected under Public Law 94-579, as amended, and Public Law 93-153, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary of section 305(a) of Public Law 94-579 (43 U.S.C. 1735(a)), any moneys that have been or will be received pursuant to that section, whether as a result of forfeiture, compromise, or settlement, if not appropriate for refund pursuant to section 305(c) of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1735(c)), shall be available and may be expended under the authority of this Act by the Secretary to improve, protect, or rehabilitate any public lands administered through the Bureau of Land Management which have been damaged by the action of a resource developer, purchaser, permittee, or any unauthorized person, without regard to whether all moneys collected from each such action are used on the exact lands damaged which led to the action: Provided further, That any such moneys that are in excess of amounts needed to repair damage to the exact land for which funds were collected may be used to repair other damaged public lands.

MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

In addition to amounts authorized to be expended under existing laws, there is hereby appropriated such amounts as may be contributed under section 307 of the Act of October 21, 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), and such amounts as may be advanced for administrative costs, surveys, appraisals, and costs of making conveyances of omitted lands under section 211(b) of that Act, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase, erection,

and dismantlement of temporary structures, and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title; up to \$100,000 for payments, at the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Bureau; miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on her certificate, not to exceed \$10,000: Provided, That notwithstanding 44 U.S.C. 501, the Bureau may, under cooperative cost-sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the co-operators share the cost of printing either in cash or in services, and the Bureau determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards: Provided further, That section 28 of title 30, United States Code, is amended: (1) in section 28(a), by striking "for years 2002 through 2003" and inserting in lieu thereof "for years 2004 through 2008"; and (2) in section 28g, by striking "and before September 30, 2003" and inserting in lieu thereof "and before September 30, 2008".

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, as authorized by law, and for scientific and economic studies, maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, general administration, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources by direct expenditure, contracts, grants, cooperative agreements and reimbursable agreements with public and private entities, \$942,244,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005, of which \$1,000,000 may be available for the Wildlife Enhancement and Economic Development Program in Starkville, Mississippi: Provided, That \$2,000,000 is for high priority projects, which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps: Provided further, That not to exceed \$12,286,000 shall be used for implementing subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 4 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended, for species that are indigenous to the United States (except for processing petitions, developing and issuing proposed and final regulations, and taking any other steps to implement actions described in subsection (c)(2)(A), (c)(2)(B)(i), or (c)(2)(B)(ii)), of which not to exceed \$8,900,000 shall be used for any activity regarding the designation of critical habitat, pursuant to subsection (a)(3), excluding litigation support, for species already listed pursuant to subsection (a)(1) as of the date of enactment of this Act: Provided further, That of the amount available for law enforcement, up to \$400,000 to remain available until expended, may at the discretion of the Secretary be used for payment for information, rewards, or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Service, and miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activity, authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on her certificate: Provided further, That of the amount provided for environmental contaminants, up to \$1,000,000 may remain available until expended for contaminant sample analyses.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvement, acquisition, or removal of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein; \$53,285,000, to remain available until expended.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition

of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, \$64,689,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated for specific land acquisition projects can be used to pay for any administrative overhead, planning or other management costs.

LANDOWNER INCENTIVE PROGRAM

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for private conservation efforts to be carried out on private lands, \$40,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the amount provided herein is for a Landowner Incentive Program established by the Secretary that provides matching, competitively awarded grants to States, the District of Columbia, Tribes, Puerto Rico, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa, to establish or supplement existing landowner incentive programs that provide technical and financial assistance, including habitat protection and restoration, to private landowners for the protection and management of habitat to benefit federally listed, proposed, candidate or other at-risk species on private lands.

STEWARDSHIP GRANTS

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for private conservation efforts to be carried out on private lands, \$10,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the amount provided herein is for a Stewardship Grants Program established by the Secretary to provide grants and other assistance to individuals and groups engaged in private conservation efforts that benefit federally listed, proposed, candidate, or other at-risk species.

COOPERATIVE ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531-1543), as amended, \$86,614,000, of which \$36,614,000 is to be derived from the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund and \$50,000,000 is to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE FUND

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 17, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 715s), \$14,414,000.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, Public Law 101-233, as amended, \$42,982,000, to remain available until expended.

NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION

For financial assistance for projects to promote the conservation of neotropical migratory birds in accordance with the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act, Public Law 106-247 (16 U.S.C. 6101-6109), \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4201-4203, 4211-4213, 4221-4225, 4241-4245, and 1538), the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-96; 16 U.S.C. 4261-4266), the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 5301-5306), and the Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6301), \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND TRIBAL WILDLIFE GRANTS

For wildlife conservation grants to States and to the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam,

the United States Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and federally recognized Indian tribes under the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, for the development and implementation of programs for the benefit of wildlife and their habitat, including species that are not hunted or fished, \$75,000,000 to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the amount provided herein, \$5,000,000 is for a competitive grant program for Indian tribes not subject to the remaining provisions of this appropriation: Provided further, That the Secretary shall, after deducting said \$5,000,000 and administrative expenses, apportion the amount provided herein in the following manner: (A) to the District of Columbia and to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, each a sum equal to not more than one-half of 1 percent thereof; and (B) to Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, each a sum equal to not more than one-fourth of 1 percent thereof: Provided further, That the Secretary shall apportion the remaining amount in the following manner: (A) one-third of which is based on the ratio to which the land area of such State bears to the total land area of all such States; and (B) two-thirds of which is based on the ratio to which the population of such State bears to the total population of all such States: Provided further, That the amounts apportioned under this paragraph shall be adjusted equitably so that no State shall be apportioned a sum which is less than 1 percent of the amount available for apportionment under this paragraph for any fiscal year or more than 5 percent of such amount: Provided further, That the Federal share of planning grants shall not exceed 75 percent of the total costs of such projects and the Federal share of implementation grants shall not exceed 50 percent of the total costs of such projects: Provided further, That the non-Federal share of such projects may not be derived from Federal grant programs: Provided further, That no State, territory, or other jurisdiction shall receive a grant unless it has developed, or committed to develop by October 1, 2005, a comprehensive wildlife conservation plan, consistent with criteria established by the Secretary of the Interior, that considers the broad range of the State, territory, or other jurisdiction's wildlife and associated habitats, with appropriate priority placed on those species with the greatest conservation need and taking into consideration the relative level of funding available for the conservation of those species: Provided further, That any amount apportioned in 2004 to any State, territory, or other jurisdiction that remains unobligated as of September 30, 2005, shall be reapportioned, together with funds appropriated in 2006, in the manner provided herein: Provided further, That balances from amounts previously appropriated under the heading "State Wildlife Grants" shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That up to 10 percent of the funds received by any State under this heading may be used for wildlife conservation education and outreach efforts that contribute significantly to the conservation of wildlife species or wildlife habitat.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 157 passenger motor vehicles, of which 142 are for replacement only (including 33 for police-type use); repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are consistent with

their primary purpose; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Service and to which the United States has title, and which are used pursuant to law in connection with management, and investigation of fish and wildlife resources: Provided, That notwithstanding 44 U.S.C. 501, the Service may, under cooperative cost sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the cooperators share at least one-half the cost of printing either in cash or services and the Service determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards: Provided further, That the Service may accept donated aircraft as replacements for existing aircraft: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may not spend any of the funds appropriated in this Act for the purchase of lands or interests in lands to be used in the establishment of any new unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System unless the purchase is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in Senate Report 105-56.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

For expenses necessary for the management, operation, and maintenance of areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service (including special road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), and for the general administration of the National Park Service, \$1,636,299,000, of which, in accordance with the cooperative agreement entered into between the National Park Service and the Oklahoma City National Memorial Trust and numbered 1443CAI25002001, \$600,000 may be available for activities of the National Park Service at the Oklahoma City National Memorial and \$1,600,000 may be available to the Oklahoma City National Memorial Trust, of which \$10,887,000 is for planning and inter-agency coordination in support of Everglades restoration and shall remain available until expended; of which \$96,480,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005, is for maintenance, repair or rehabilitation projects for constructed assets, operation of the National Park Service automated facility management software system, and comprehensive facility condition assessments; and of which \$2,000,000 is for the Youth Conservation Corps for high priority projects: Provided further, That the only funds in this account which may be made available to support United States Park Police are those funds approved for emergency law and order incidents pursuant to established National Park Service procedures, those funds needed to maintain and repair United States Park Police administrative facilities, and those funds necessary to reimburse the United States Park Police account for the unbudgeted overtime and travel costs associated with special events for an amount not to exceed \$10,000 per event subject to the review and concurrence of the Washington headquarters office.

UNITED STATES PARK POLICE

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs of the United States Park Police, \$78,349,000.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out recreation programs, natural programs, cultural programs, heritage partnership programs, environmental compliance and review, international park affairs, statutory or contractual aid for other activities, and grant administration, not otherwise provided for, \$60,154,000, of which \$175,000 may be available for activities to commemorate the Louisiana Purchase at the Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve in the State of Louisiana.

URBAN PARK AND RECREATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), \$305,000, to remain available until expended.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary in carrying out the Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470), and the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333), \$75,750,000, to be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2005: Provided, That, of the amount provided herein, \$500,000, to remain available until expended, is for a grant for the perpetual care and maintenance of National Trust Historic Sites, as authorized under 16 U.S.C. 470a(e)(2), to be made available in full upon signing of a grant agreement: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, these funds shall be available for investment with the proceeds to be used for the same purpose as set out herein: Provided further, That of the total amount provided, \$32,000,000 shall be for Save America's Treasures for priority preservation projects, of nationally significant sites, structures, and artifacts: Provided further, That any individual Save America's Treasures grant shall be matched by non-Federal funds: Provided further, That individual projects shall only be eligible for one grant, and all projects to be funded shall be approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities prior to the commitment of grant funds: Provided further, That Save America's Treasures funds allocated for Federal projects, following approval, shall be available by transfer to appropriate accounts of individual agencies.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvements, repair or replacement of physical facilities, including the modifications authorized by section 104 of the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989, \$342,131,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$300,000 for the L.Q.C. Lamar House National Historic Landmark and \$375,000 for the Sun Watch National Historic Landmark shall be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 470a and of which \$600,000 shall be available for the planning and design of the Mesa Verde Cultural Center in the State of Colorado, and of which \$50,000 shall be available for the construction of a statue of Harry S Truman in Union Station in Kansas City, Missouri, and of which \$4,289,000 shall be available for the construction of a security fence for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in the State of Missouri: Provided, That none of the funds in this or any other Act, may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of more than 160 Full Time Equivalent personnel working for the National Park Service's Denver Service Center funded under the construction program management and operations activity: Provided further, That none of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be used to pre-design, plan, or construct any new facility (including visitor centers, curatorial facilities, administrative buildings), for which appropriations have not been specifically provided if the net construction cost of such facility is in excess of \$5,000,000, without prior approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: Provided further, That none of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be used for planning, design, or construction of any underground security screening or visitor contact facility at the Washington Monument until such facility has been approved in writing by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: Provided further, That this restriction applies to all funds available to the National Park Service, including partnership and fee demonstration projects.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

(RESCISSION)

The contract authority provided for fiscal year 2004 by 16 U.S.C. 4601-10a is rescinded.

LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of lands or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with the statutory authority applicable to the National Park Service, \$158,473,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended, of which \$104,000,000 is for the State assistance program including not to exceed \$4,000,000 for the administration of this program: Provided, That none of the funds provided for the State assistance program may be used to establish a contingency fund.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 249 passenger motor vehicles, of which 202 shall be for replacement only, including not to exceed 193 for police-type use, 10 buses, and 8 ambulances: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Park Service may be used to process any grant or contract documents which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Park Service may be used to implement an agreement for the redevelopment of the southern end of Ellis Island until such agreement has been submitted to the Congress and shall not be implemented prior to the expiration of 30 calendar days (not including any day in which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than 3 calendar days to a day certain) from the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of a full and comprehensive report on the development of the southern end of Ellis Island, including the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed project: Provided further, That the National Park Service may make a grant of not to exceed \$70,000 for the construction of a memorial in Cadillac, Michigan in honor of Kris Eggle.

None of the funds in this Act may be spent by the National Park Service for activities taken in direct response to the United Nations Biodiversity Convention.

The National Park Service may distribute to operating units based on the safety record of each unit the costs of programs designed to improve workplace and employee safety, and to encourage employees receiving workers' compensation benefits pursuant to chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to return to appropriate positions for which they are medically able.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in fiscal year 2004, with respect to the administration of the National Park Service park pass program by the National Park Foundation, the Secretary may obligate to the Foundation administrative funds expected to be received in that fiscal year before the revenues are collected, so long as total obligations in the administrative account do not exceed total revenue collected and deposited in that account by the end of the fiscal year.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the United States Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, hydrology, biology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by 43 U.S.C. 31, 1332, and 1340; classify lands as to their mineral and water resources; give engineering supervision to power permittees and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission li-

censees; administer the minerals exploration program (30 U.S.C. 641); and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; and to conduct inquiries into the economic conditions affecting mining and materials processing industries (30 U.S.C. 3, 21a, and 1603; 50 U.S.C. 98g(1)) and related purposes as authorized by law and to publish and disseminate data; \$928,864,000, of which \$64,630,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations; and of which \$15,499,000 shall remain available until expended for conducting inquiries into the economic conditions affecting mining and materials processing industries; and of which \$250,000 may be available to improve seismic monitoring and hazard assessment in the Jackson Hole-Yellowstone area of Wyoming; and of which \$8,000,000 shall remain available until expended for satellite operations; and of which \$23,230,000 shall be available until September 30, 2005, for the operation and maintenance of facilities and deferred maintenance; of which \$169,580,000 shall be available until September 30, 2005, for the biological research activity and the operation of the Cooperative Research Units: Provided, That none of these funds provided for the biological research activity shall be used to conduct new surveys on private property, unless specifically authorized in writing by the property owner: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of topographic mapping or water resources data collection and investigations carried on in cooperation with States and municipalities.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the United States Geological Survey shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 53 passenger motor vehicles, of which 48 are for replacement only; reimbursement to the General Services Administration for security guard services; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gauging stations and observation wells; expenses of the United States National Committee on Geology; and payment of compensation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Survey duly appointed to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts: Provided, That activities funded by appropriations herein made may be accomplished through the use of contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements as defined in 31 U.S.C. 6302 et seq.

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

ROYALTY AND OFFSHORE MINERALS MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for minerals leasing and environmental studies, regulation of industry operations, and collection of royalties, as authorized by law; for enforcing laws and regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other minerals leases, permits, licenses and operating contracts; and for matching grants or cooperative agreements; including the purchase of not to exceed eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$166,016,000, of which \$80,396,000 shall be available for royalty management activities; and an amount not to exceed \$100,230,000, to be credited to this appropriation and to remain available until expended, from additions to receipts resulting from increases to rates in effect on August 5, 1993, from rate increases to fee collections for Outer Continental Shelf administrative activities performed by the Minerals Management Service (MMS) over and above the rates in effect on September 30, 1993, and from additional fees for Outer Continental Shelf administrative activities established after September 30, 1993: Provided, That to the extent \$100,230,000 in additions to receipts are not realized from the

sources of receipts stated above, the amount needed to reach \$100,230,000 shall be credited to this appropriation from receipts resulting from rental rates for Outer Continental Shelf leases in effect before August 5, 1993: Provided further, That \$3,000,000 for computer acquisitions shall remain available until September 30, 2005: Provided further, That funds appropriated under this Act shall be available for the payment of interest in accordance with 30 U.S.C. 1721(b) and (d): Provided further, That not to exceed \$3,000 shall be available for reasonable expenses related to promoting volunteer beach and marine cleanup activities: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$15,000 under this heading shall be available for refunds of overpayments in connection with certain Indian leases in which the Director of MMS concurred with the claimed refund due, to pay amounts owed to Indian allottees or tribes, or to correct prior unrecoverable erroneous payments: Provided further, That MMS may under the royalty-in-kind pilot program, or under its authority to transfer oil to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, use a portion of the revenues from royalty-in-kind sales, without regard to fiscal year limitation, to pay for transportation to wholesale market centers or upstream pooling points, and to process or otherwise dispose of royalty production taken in kind, and to recover MMS transportation costs, salaries, and other administrative costs directly related to filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve: Provided further, That MMS shall analyze and document the expected return in advance of any royalty-in-kind sales to assure to the maximum extent practicable that royalty income under the pilot program is equal to or greater than royalty income recognized under a comparable royalty-in-value program.

OIL SPILL RESEARCH

For necessary expenses to carry out title I, section 1016, title IV, sections 4202 and 4303, title VII, and title VIII, section 8201 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, \$7,105,000, which shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

REGULATION AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95-87, as amended, including the purchase of not to exceed 10 passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; \$106,424,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to regulations, may use directly or through grants to States, moneys collected in fiscal year 2004 for civil penalties assessed under section 518 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1268), to reclaim lands adversely affected by coal mining practices after August 3, 1977, to remain available until expended: Provided further, That appropriations for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement may provide for the travel and per diem expenses of State and tribal personnel attending Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement sponsored training.

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95-87, as amended, including the purchase of not more than 10 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$190,893,000, to be derived from receipts of the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund and to remain available until expended; of which up to \$10,000,000, to be derived from the Federal Expenses Share of the Fund, shall be for supplemental grants to States for the reclamation of abandoned sites with acid mine rock drainage from coal mines, and for associated activities, through the Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative: Provided, That grants to minimum program

States will be \$1,500,000 per State in fiscal year 2004: Provided further, That pursuant to Public Law 97-365, the Department of the Interior is authorized to use up to 20 percent from the recovery of the delinquent debt owed to the United States Government to pay for contracts to collect these debts: Provided further, That funds made available under title IV of Public Law 95-87 may be used for any required non-Federal share of the cost of projects funded by the Federal Government for the purpose of environmental restoration related to treatment or abatement of acid mine drainage from abandoned mines: Provided further, That such projects must be consistent with the purposes and priorities of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act: Provided further, That the State of Maryland may set aside the greater of \$1,000,000 or 10 percent of the total of the grants made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended (30 U.S.C. 1231 et seq.), if the amount set aside is deposited in an acid mine drainage abatement and treatment fund established under a State law, pursuant to which law the amount (together with all interest earned on the amount) is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of its title IV grants are deposited in an acid mine drainage abatement and treatment fund, the State of Maryland must first complete all Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act priority one projects.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary for the operation of Indian programs, as authorized by law, including the Snyder Act of November 2, 1921 (25 U.S.C. 13), the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.), as amended, the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2001-2019), and the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), as amended, \$1,912,178,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005 except as otherwise provided herein, of which not to exceed \$87,925,000 shall be for welfare assistance payments and notwithstanding any other provision of law, including but not limited to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, not to exceed \$135,315,000 shall be available for payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract support costs associated with ongoing contracts, grants, compacts, or annual funding agreements entered into with the Bureau prior to or during fiscal year 2004, as authorized by such Act, except that tribes and tribal organizations may use their tribal priority allocations for unmet indirect costs of ongoing contracts, grants, or compacts, or annual funding agreements and for unmet welfare assistance costs; and of which not to exceed \$458,524,000 for school operations costs of Bureau-funded schools and other education programs shall become available on July 1, 2004, and shall remain available until September 30, 2005; and of which not to exceed \$55,766,000 shall remain available until expended for housing improvement, road maintenance, attorney fees, litigation support, the Indian Self-Determination Fund, land records improvement, and the Navajo-Hopi Settlement Program: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, including but not limited to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, and 25 U.S.C. 2008, not to exceed \$46,182,000 within and only from such amounts made available for school operations shall be available to tribes and tribal organizations for administrative cost grants associated with ongoing grants entered into with the Bureau prior to or during fiscal year 2003 for the operation of Bureau-funded schools, and up to \$3,000,000 within and only from such amounts made available for school operations shall be available for the transitional costs of initial ad-

ministrative cost grants to tribes and tribal organizations that enter into grants for the operation on or after July 1, 2004 of Bureau-operated schools: Provided further, That any forestry funds allocated to a tribe which remain unobligated as of September 30, 2005, may be transferred during fiscal year 2006 to an Indian forest land assistance account established for the benefit of such tribe within the tribe's trust fund account: Provided further, That any such unobligated balances not so transferred shall expire on September 30, 2006: Provided further, That \$48,115,000 shall be for operating grants for Tribally Controlled Community Colleges, and \$34,710,000 shall be for Information Resources Technology.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, repair, improvement, and maintenance of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other facilities, including architectural and engineering services by contract; acquisition of lands, and interests in lands; and preparation of lands for farming, and for construction of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project pursuant to Public Law 87-483, \$351,154,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such amounts as may be available for the construction of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project may be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation: Provided further, That not to exceed 6 percent of contract authority available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs from the Federal Highway Trust Fund may be used to cover the road program management costs of the Bureau: Provided further, That any funds provided for the Safety of Dams program pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 13 shall be made available on a nonreimbursable basis: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2004, in implementing new construction or facilities improvement and repair project grants in excess of \$100,000 that are provided to tribally controlled grant schools under Public Law 100-297, as amended, the Secretary of the Interior shall use the Administrative and Audit Requirements and Cost Principles for Assistance Programs contained in 43 CFR part 12 as the regulatory requirements: Provided further, That such grants shall not be subject to section 12.61 of 43 CFR; the Secretary and the grantee shall negotiate and determine a schedule of payments for the work to be performed: Provided further, That in considering applications, the Secretary shall consider whether the Indian tribe or tribal organization would be deficient in assuring that the construction projects conform to applicable building standards and codes and Federal, tribal, or State health and safety standards as required by 25 U.S.C. 2005(a), with respect to organizational and financial management capabilities: Provided further, That if the Secretary declines an application, the Secretary shall follow the requirements contained in 25 U.S.C. 2505(f): Provided further, That any disputes between the Secretary and any grantee concerning a grant shall be subject to the disputes provision in 25 U.S.C. 2508(e).

INDIAN LAND AND WATER CLAIM SETTLEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS PAYMENTS TO INDIANS

For miscellaneous payments to Indian tribes and individuals and for necessary administrative expenses, \$50,583,000, to remain available until expended; of which \$31,766,000 shall be available for implementation of enacted Indian land and water claim settlements pursuant to Public Laws 101-618, 107-331, and 102-575, and for implementation of other enacted water rights settlements; and of which \$18,817,000 shall be available pursuant to Public Laws 99-264, 100-580, 106-425, and 106-554.

INDIAN GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed and insured loans, \$5,797,000, as authorized by the Indian Financing Act of 1974, as amended: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize

total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$94,568,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed and insured loan programs, \$700,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Bureau of Indian Affairs may carry out the operation of Indian programs by direct expenditure, contracts, cooperative agreements, compacts and grants, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations.

Notwithstanding 25 U.S.C. 15, the Bureau of Indian Affairs may contract for services in support of the management, operation, and maintenance of the Power Division of the San Carlos Irrigation Project.

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans, the Indian loan guarantee and insurance fund, and the Indian Guaranteed Loan Program account) shall be available for expenses of exhibits, and purchase of not to exceed 229 passenger motor vehicles, of which not to exceed 187 shall be for replacement only.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for central office operations or pooled overhead general administration (except facilities operations and maintenance) shall be available for tribal contracts, grants, compacts, or cooperative agreements with the Bureau of Indian Affairs under the provisions of the Indian Self-Determination Act or the Tribal Self-Governance Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-413).

In the event any tribe returns appropriations made available by this Act to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for distribution to other tribes, this action shall not diminish the Federal Government's trust responsibility to that tribe, or the government-to-government relationship between the United States and that tribe, or that tribe's ability to access future appropriations.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds available to the Bureau, other than the amounts provided herein for assistance to public schools under 25 U.S.C. 452 et seq., shall be available to support the operation of any elementary or secondary school in the State of Alaska.

Appropriations made available in this or any other Act for schools funded by the Bureau shall be available only to the schools in the Bureau school system as of September 1, 1996. No funds available to the Bureau shall be used to support expanded grades for any school or dormitory beyond the grade structure in place or approved by the Secretary of the Interior at each school in the Bureau school system as of October 1, 1995. Funds made available under this Act may not be used to establish a charter school at a Bureau-funded school (as that term is defined in section 1146 of the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2026)), except that a charter school that is in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act and that has operated at a Bureau-funded school before September 1, 1999, may continue to operate during that period, but only if the charter school pays to the Bureau a pro rata share of funds to reimburse the Bureau for the use of the real and personal property (including buses and vans), the funds of the charter school are kept separate and apart from Bureau funds, and the Bureau does not assume any obligation for charter school programs of the State in which the school is located if the charter school loses such funding. Employees of Bureau-funded schools sharing a campus with a charter school and performing functions related to the charter school's operation and employees of a charter school shall not be treated as Federal employees for purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code.

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

INSULAR AFFAIRS

ASSISTANCE TO TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for assistance to territories under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, \$71,343,000, of which: (1) \$65,022,000 shall be available until expended for technical assistance, including maintenance assistance, disaster assistance, insular management controls, coral reef initiative activities, and brown tree snake control and research; grants to the judiciary in American Samoa for compensation and expenses, as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1661(c)); grants to the Government of American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for construction and support of governmental functions; grants to the Government of the Virgin Islands as authorized by law; grants to the Government of Guam, as authorized by law; and grants to the Government of the Northern Mariana Islands as authorized by law (Public Law 94-241; 90 Stat. 272); and (2) \$6,321,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses of the Office of Insular Affairs: Provided, That all financial transactions of the territorial and local governments herein provided for, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or used by such governments, may be audited by the General Accounting Office, at its discretion, in accordance with chapter 35 of title 31, United States Code: Provided further, That Northern Mariana Islands Covenant grant funding shall be provided according to those terms of the Agreement of the Special Representatives on Future United States Financial Assistance for the Northern Mariana Islands approved by Public Law 104-134: Provided further, That of the amounts provided for technical assistance, sufficient funding shall be made available for a grant to the Close Up Foundation: Provided further, That the funds for the program of operations and maintenance improvement are appropriated to institutionalize routine operations and maintenance improvement of capital infrastructure with territorial participation and cost sharing to be determined by the Secretary based on the grantee's commitment to timely maintenance of its capital assets: Provided further, That any appropriation for disaster assistance under this heading in this Act or previous appropriations Acts may be used as non-Federal matching funds for the purpose of hazard mitigation grants provided pursuant to section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c).

COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION

For grants and necessary expenses, \$6,125,000, as provided for in sections 221(a)(2), 221(b), and 233 of the Compact of Free Association for the Republic of Palau, section 103(h)(2) of the Compact of Free Association Act of 1985, and section 221(a)(2) of the Amended Compacts of Free Association for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands, to remain available until expended.

For grants and necessary expenses as provided for in sections 211, 212, 213, and 218 of the Amended Compact of Free Association for the Republic of the Marshall Islands and as provided for in sections 211, 212, and 217 of the Amended Compact of Free Association for the Federated States of Micronesia, all sums that are or may be required in this and subsequent years are appropriated, to remain available until expended, and shall be drawn from the Treasury, to become available for obligation only upon enactment of proposed legislation to approve the amended Compacts of Free Association as identified in the President's fiscal year 2004 budget.

For grants and necessary expenses, \$15,000,000, for impact of the Compacts on certain U.S. areas in this and subsequent years are appropriated, to remain available until expended, and shall be drawn from the Treasury,

to become available for obligation only upon enactment of proposed legislation to approve the amended Compacts of Free Association as identified in the President's fiscal year 2004 budget: Provided, That for purposes of assistance as provided pursuant to this appropriation, the effective dates of the amended Compacts of Free Association shall be October 1, 2003.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for management of the Department of the Interior, \$78,433,000, of which not to exceed \$8,500 may be for official reception and representation expenses, and of which up to \$1,000,000 shall be available for workers compensation payments and unemployment compensation payments associated with the orderly closure of the United States Bureau of Mines: Provided, That of this amount, sufficient funds may be available for the Secretary of the Interior, not later than 60 days after the last day of the fiscal year, to submit to Congress a report on the amount of acquisitions made by the Department of the Interior during such fiscal year of articles, materials, or supplies that were manufactured outside the United States. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of any articles, materials, or supplies purchased by the Department of the Interior that were manufactured outside the United States, an itemized list of all waivers under the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.) that were granted with respect to such articles, materials, or supplies, and a summary of total procurement funds spent on goods manufactured in the United States versus funds spent on goods manufactured outside of the United States. The Secretary of the Interior shall make the report publicly available by posting the report on an Internet website.

Of the unobligated balances in the Special Foreign Currency account, \$1,400,000 are hereby canceled.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For the acquisition of a departmental financial and business management system, \$11,700,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That from unobligated balances under this heading, \$11,700,000 are hereby canceled.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 20, 1976, as amended (31 U.S.C. 6901-6907), \$230,000,000, of which not to exceed \$400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: Provided, That no payment shall be made to otherwise eligible units of local government if the computed amount of the payment is less than \$100.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, \$50,179,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, \$37,474,000, of which \$3,812,000 shall be for procurement by contract of independent auditing services to audit the consolidated Department of the Interior annual financial statement and the annual financial statement of the Department of the Interior bureaus and offices funded in this Act.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

For operation of trust programs for Indians by direct expenditure, contracts, cooperative agreements, compacts, and grants, \$219,641,000, of which \$75,000,000 shall be available for historical accounting, to remain available until expended: Provided, That funds for trust management improvements and litigation support may, as needed, be transferred to or merged with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, "Operation of Indian Programs" account; the Office of the Solicitor,

"Salaries and Expenses" account; and the Departmental Management, "Salaries and Expenses" account: Provided further, That funds made available to Tribes and Tribal organizations through contracts or grants obligated during fiscal year 2004, as authorized by the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.), shall remain available until expended by the contractor or grantee: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the statute of limitations shall not commence to run on any claim, including any claim in litigation pending on the date of the enactment of this Act, concerning losses to or mismanagement of trust funds, until the affected tribe or individual Indian has been furnished with an accounting of such funds from which the beneficiary can determine whether there has been a loss: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall not be required to provide a quarterly statement of performance for any Indian trust account that has not had activity for at least 18 months and has a balance of \$1.00 or less: Provided further, That the Secretary shall issue an annual account statement and maintain a record of any such accounts and shall permit the balance in each such account to be withdrawn upon the express written request of the account holder: Provided further, That not to exceed \$50,000 is available for the Secretary to make payments to correct administrative errors of either disbursements from or deposits to Individual Indian Money or Tribal accounts after September 30, 2002: Provided further, That erroneous payments that are recovered shall be credited to and remain available in this account for this purpose.

INDIAN LAND CONSOLIDATION

For consolidation of fractional interests in Indian lands and expenses associated with retermining and redistributing escheated interests in allotted lands, and for necessary expenses to carry out the Indian Land Consolidation Act of 1983, as amended, by direct expenditure or cooperative agreement, \$22,980,000, to remain available until expended.

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT AND RESTORATION

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT FUND

To conduct natural resource damage assessment and restoration activities by the Department of the Interior necessary to carry out the provisions of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-380) (33 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), and Public Law 101-337, as amended (16 U.S.C. 199j et seq.), \$5,633,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

There is hereby authorized for acquisition from available resources within the Working Capital Fund, 15 aircraft, 10 of which shall be for replacement and which may be obtained by donation, purchase or through available excess surplus property: Provided, That existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft: Provided further, That no programs funded with appropriated funds in the "Departmental Management", "Office of the Solicitor", and "Office of Inspector General" may be augmented through the Working Capital Fund.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equip-

ment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: Provided, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted: Provided further, That all funds used pursuant to this section are hereby designated by Congress to be "emergency requirements" pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004, and must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation which must be requested as promptly as possible.

SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer of any no year appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of wildland fires on or threatening lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; for the emergency rehabilitation of burned-over lands under its jurisdiction; for emergency actions related to potential or actual earthquakes, floods, volcanoes, storms, or other unavoidable causes; for contingency planning subsequent to actual oil spills; for response and natural resource damage assessment activities related to actual oil spills; for the prevention, suppression, and control of actual or potential grasshopper and Mormon cricket outbreaks on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, pursuant to the authority in section 1773(b) of Public Law 99-198 (99 Stat. 1658); for emergency reclamation projects under section 410 of Public Law 95-87; and shall transfer, from any no year funds available to the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, such funds as may be necessary to permit assumption of regulatory authority in the event a primacy State is not carrying out the regulatory provisions of the Surface Mining Act: Provided, That appropriations made in this title for wildland fire operations shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for destruction of vehicles, aircraft, or other equipment in connection with their use for wildland fire operations, such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of receipt thereof: Provided further, That for wildland fire operations, no funds shall be made available under this authority until the Secretary determines that funds appropriated for "wildland fire operations" shall be exhausted within 30 days: Provided further, That all funds used pursuant to this section are hereby designated by Congress to be "emergency requirements" pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004, and must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation which must be requested as promptly as possible: Provided further, That such replenishment funds shall be used to reimburse, on a pro rata basis, accounts from which emergency funds were transferred.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by sections 1535 and 1536 of title 31, United States Code: Provided, That reimbursements for costs and supplies, materials, equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 104. Appropriations made to the Department of the Interior in this title shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, when authorized by the Secretary, in total amount not to exceed \$500,000; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences

in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902 and D.C. Code 4-204).

SEC. 106. Annual appropriations made in this title shall be available for obligation in connection with contracts issued for services or rentals for periods not in excess of 12 months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

SEC. 107. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior for the conduct of offshore preleasing, leasing and related activities placed under restriction in the President's moratorium statement of June 12, 1998, in the areas of northern, central, and southern California; the North Atlantic; Washington and Oregon; and the eastern Gulf of Mexico south of 26 degrees north latitude and east of 86 degrees west longitude.

SEC. 108. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior to conduct offshore oil and natural gas preleasing, leasing and related activities in the eastern Gulf of Mexico planning area for any lands located outside Sale 181, as identified in the final Outer Continental Shelf 5-Year Oil and Gas Leasing Program, 1997-2002.

SEC. 109. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior to conduct oil and natural gas preleasing, leasing and related activities in the Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic planning areas.

SEC. 110. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the National Park Service shall not develop or implement a reduced entrance fee program to accommodate non-local travel through a unit. The Secretary may provide for and regulate local non-recreational passage through units of the National Park System, allowing each unit to develop guidelines and permits for such activity appropriate to that unit.

SEC. 111. Advance payments made under this title to Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and tribal consortia pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) or the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) may be invested by the Indian tribe, tribal organization, or consortium before such funds are expended for the purposes of the grant, compact, or annual funding agreement so long as such funds are—

(1) invested by the Indian tribe, tribal organization, or consortium only in obligations of the United States, or in obligations or securities that are guaranteed or insured by the United States, or mutual (or other) funds registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission and which only invest in obligations of the United States or securities that are guaranteed or insured by the United States; or

(2) deposited only into accounts that are insured by an agency or instrumentality of the United States, or are fully collateralized to ensure protection of the funds, even in the event of a bank failure.

SEC. 112. Appropriations made in this Act under the headings Bureau of Indian Affairs and Office of Special Trustee for American Indians and any available unobligated balances from prior appropriations Acts made under the same headings, shall be available for expenditure or transfer for Indian trust management and reform activities.

SEC. 113. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of reducing the backlog of Indian probate cases in the Department of the Interior, the hearing requirements of chapter 10 of title 25, United States Code, are deemed satisfied by a proceeding conducted by an Indian probate judge, appointed by the Secretary

without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing the appointments in the competitive service, for such period of time as the Secretary determines necessary: Provided, That the basic pay of an Indian probate judge so appointed may be fixed by the Secretary without regard to the provisions of chapter 51, and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, governing the classification and pay of General Schedule employees, except that no such Indian probate judge may be paid at a level which exceeds the maximum rate payable for the highest grade of the General Schedule, including locality pay.

SEC. 114. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to redistribute any Tribal Priority Allocation funds, including tribal base funds, to alleviate tribal funding inequities by transferring funds to address identified, unmet needs, dual enrollment, overlapping service areas or inaccurate distribution methodologies. No tribe shall receive a reduction in Tribal Priority Allocation funds of more than 10 percent in fiscal year 2004. Under circumstances of dual enrollment, overlapping service areas or inaccurate distribution methodologies, the 10 percent limitation does not apply.

SEC. 115. Funds appropriated for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for postsecondary schools for fiscal year 2004 shall be allocated among the schools proportionate to the unmet need of the schools as determined by the Postsecondary Funding Formula adopted by the Office of Indian Education Programs.

SEC. 116. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall hereafter take such action as may be necessary to ensure that the lands comprising the Huron Cemetery in Kansas City, Kansas (as described in section 123 of Public Law 106-291) are used only in accordance with this section.

(b) The lands of the Huron Cemetery shall be used only: (1) for religious and cultural uses that are compatible with the use of the lands as a cemetery; and (2) as a burial ground.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in conveying the Twin Cities Research Center under the authority provided by Public Law 104-134, as amended by Public Law 104-208, the Secretary may accept and retain land and other forms of reimbursement: Provided, That the Secretary may retain and use any such reimbursement until expended and without further appropriation: (1) for the benefit of the National Wildlife Refuge System within the State of Minnesota; and (2) for all activities authorized by Public Law 100-696; 16 U.S.C. 4602z.

SEC. 118. Notwithstanding other provisions of law, the National Park Service may authorize, through cooperative agreement, the Golden Gate National Parks Association to provide fee-based education, interpretive and visitor service functions within the Crissy Field and Fort Point areas of the Presidio.

SEC. 119. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302(b), sums received by the Bureau of Land Management for the sale of seeds or seedlings including those collected in fiscal year 2003, may be credited to the appropriation from which funds were expended to acquire or grow the seeds or seedlings and are available without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 120. Subject to the terms and conditions of section 126 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Act, 2002, the Administrator of General Services shall sell all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the improvements and equipment of the White River Oil Shale Mine.

SEC. 121. The Secretary of the Interior may use or contract for the use of helicopters or motor vehicles on the Sheldon and Hart National Wildlife Refuges for the purpose of capturing and transporting horses and burros. The provisions of subsection (a) of the Act of September 8, 1959 (18 U.S.C. 47(a)) shall not be applicable to such use. Such use shall be in accordance with humane procedures prescribed by the Secretary.

SEC. 122. Of the funds made available under the heading "Bureau of Land Management, Land Acquisition" in title I of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 2002 (115 Stat. 420), the Secretary of the Interior shall grant \$500,000 to the City of St. George, Utah, for the purchase of the land as provided in the Virgin River Dinosaur Footprint Preserve Act (116 Stat. 2896), with any surplus funds available after the purchase to be available for the purpose of the preservation of the land and the paleontological resources on the land.

SEC. 123. Funds provided in this Act for Federal land acquisition by the National Park Service for the Ice Age National Scenic Trail may be used for a grant to a State, a local government, or any other governmental land management entity for the acquisition of lands without regard to any restriction on the use of Federal land acquisition funds provided through the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 as amended.

SEC. 124. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended by the National Park Service to enter into or implement a concession contract which permits or requires the removal of the underground lunchroom at the Carlsbad Caverns National Park.

SEC. 125. The Secretary of the Interior may use discretionary funds to pay private attorneys fees and costs for employees and former employees of the Department of the Interior reasonably incurred in connection with *Cobell v. Norton* to the extent that such fees and costs are not paid by the Department of Justice or by private insurance. In no case shall the Secretary make payments under this section that would result in payment of hourly fees in excess of the highest hourly rate approved by the District Court for the District of Columbia for counsel in *Cobell v. Norton*.

SEC. 126. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall, in carrying out its responsibilities to protect threatened and endangered species of salmon, implement a system of mass marking of salmonid stocks, intended for harvest, that are released from Federally operated or Federally financed hatcheries including but not limited to fish releases of coho, chinook, and steelhead species. Marked fish must have a visible mark that can be readily identified by commercial and recreational fishers.

SEC. 127. Section 134 of Public Law 107-63 (115 Stat. 442-443) is amended by striking the proviso thereto and inserting the following: "Provided, That nothing in this section affects the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit in *Sac and Fox Nation v. Norton*, 240 F.3d 1250 (2001): Provided further, That nothing in this section permits the conduct of gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) on land described in section 123 of Public Law 106-291 (114 Stat. 944-945), or land that is contiguous to that land, regardless of whether the land or contiguous land has been taken into trust by the Secretary of the Interior."

SEC. 128. No funds appropriated for the Department of the Interior by this Act or any other Act shall be used to study or implement any plan to drain Lake Powell or to reduce the water level of the lake below the range of water levels required for the operation of the Glen Canyon Dam.

SEC. 129. Notwithstanding the limitation in subparagraph (2)(B) of section 18(a) of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2717(a)), the total amount of all fees imposed by the National Indian Gaming Commission for fiscal year 2005 shall not exceed \$12,000,000.

SEC. 130. None of the funds in this Act may be used to fund Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Units in the State of Alaska.

SEC. 131. The State of Utah's contribution requirement pursuant to Public Law 105-363 shall be deemed to have been satisfied and within thirty days of enactment of this Act, the Sec-

retary of the Interior shall transfer to the State of Utah all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Wilcox Ranch lands acquired under section 2(b) of Public Law 105-363, for management by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources for wildlife habitat and public access.

SEC. 132. Upon enactment of this Act, the Congaree Swamp National Monument shall be designated the Congaree National Park.

SEC. 133. The Secretary shall have no more than one hundred and eighty days from October 1, 2003, to prepare and submit to the Congress, in a manner otherwise consistent with the Indian Tribal Judgment Funds Use or Distribution Act (25 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), plans for the use and distribution of the Mescalero Apache Tribe's Judgment Funds from Docket 92-403L, the Pueblo of Isleta's Judgment Funds from Docket 98-166L, and the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Reservation's Judgment Funds in Docket No. 773-87-L of the United States Court of Federal Claims; each plan shall become effective upon the expiration of a sixty day period beginning on the day each plan is submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 134. Notwithstanding any implementation of the Department of the Interior's trust reorganization plan within fiscal years 2003 or 2004, funds appropriated for fiscal year 2004 shall be available to the tribes within the California Tribal Trust Reform Consortium and to the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community, the Confederated Salish-Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation and the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boys Reservation and the Bureau of Indian Affairs Regional offices that serve them, on the same basis as funds were distributed in fiscal year 2003. The Demonstration Project shall operate separate and apart from the Department of the Interior's trust reform reorganization, and the Department shall not impose its trust management infrastructure upon or alter the existing trust resource management systems of the California Trust Reform Consortium and any other participating tribe having a self-governance compact and operating in accordance with the Tribal Self-Governance Program set forth in 25 U.S.C. Sections 458aa-458hh.

SEC. 135. Not later than December 31 of each year, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to Congress a report on the competitive sourcing activities on the list required under the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-270; 31 U.S.C. 501 note) that were performed for the Department of the Interior during the previous fiscal year by Federal Government sources. The report shall include—

(1) the total number of competitions completed;

(2) the total number of competitions announced, together with a list of the activities covered by such competitions;

(3) the total number of full-time equivalent Federal employees studied under completed competitions;

(4) the total number of full-time equivalent Federal employees being—studied under competitions announced, but not completed;

(5) the incremental cost directly attributable to conducting the competitions identified under paragraphs (1) and (2), including costs attributable to paying outside consultants and contractors;

(6) an estimate of the total anticipated savings, or a quantifiable—description of improvements in service or performance, derived from completed competitions;

(7) actual savings, or a quantifiable description of improvements in—service or performance, derived from the implementation of competitions completed after May 29, 2003;

(8) the total projected number of full time equivalent Federal employees covered by competitions scheduled to be announced in the fiscal year covered by the next report required under this section; and

(9) a general description of how the competitive sourcing decisionmaking processes of the Department of the Interior are aligned with the strategic workforce plan of that department.

SEC. 136. (a) PAYMENT TO THE HARRIET TUBMAN HOME, AUBURN, NEW YORK, AUTHORIZED.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior may, using amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this title, make a payment to the Harriet Tubman Home in Auburn, New York, in the amount of \$11,750.

(2) The amount specified in paragraph (1) is the amount of widow's pension that Harriet Tubman should have received from January 1899 to March 1913 under various laws authorizing pension for the death of her husband, Nelson Davis, a deceased veteran of the Civil War, but did not receive, adjusted for inflation since March 1913.

(b) USE OF AMOUNTS.—The Harriet Tubman Home shall use amounts paid under subsection (a) for the purposes of—

(1) preserving and maintaining the Harriet Tubman Home; and

(2) honoring the memory of Harriet Tubman.

SEC. 137. Nonrenewable grazing permits authorized in the Jarbidge Field Office, Bureau of Land Management within the past seven years shall be renewed under section 402 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1752) and under section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315b). The terms and conditions contained in the most recently expired nonrenewable grazing permit shall continue in effect under the renewed permit. Upon completion of any required analysis or documentation, the permit may be canceled, suspended or modified, in whole or in part, to meet the requirements of applicable laws and regulations. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to extend the nonrenewable permits beyond the standard one-year term.

SEC. 138. INTERIM COMPENSATION PAYMENTS. Section 2303(b) of Public Law 106-246 (114 Stat. 549) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, unless the amount of the interim compensation exceeds the amount of the final compensation”.

SEC. 139. APPLICATIONS FOR WAIVERS OF MAINTENANCE FEES. Section 10101(d)(3) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (30 U.S.C. 28f(d)(3)) is amended by inserting after “reason” the following: “(including, with respect to any application filed on or after January 1, 1999, the filing of the application after the statutory deadline)”.

SEC. 140. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act, hereafter enacted, may be used to permit the use of the National Mall for a special event, unless the permit expressly prohibits the erection, placement, or use of structures and signs bearing commercial advertising. The Secretary may allow for recognition of sponsors of special events: Provided, That the size and form of the recognition shall be consistent with the special nature and sanctity of the Mall and any lettering or design identifying the sponsor shall be no larger than one-third the size of the lettering or design identifying the special event. In approving special events, the Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that public use of, and access to the Mall is not restricted. For purposes of this section, the term “special event” shall have the meaning given to it by section 7.96(g)(1)(ii) of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOREST SERVICE

FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses of forest and rangeland research as authorized by law, \$266,180,000, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

For necessary expenses of cooperating with and providing technical and financial assist-

ance to States, territories, possessions, and others, and for forest health management, including treatments of pests, pathogens, and invasive or noxious plants, and for restoring and rehabilitating forests damaged by pests or invasive plants, cooperative forestry, and education and land conservation activities and conducting an international program as authorized, \$295,349,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$84,716,000 is to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund: Provided, That each forest legacy grant shall be for a specific project or set of specific tasks: Provided further, That grants for acquisition of lands or conservation easements shall require that the State demonstrates that 25 percent of the total value of the project is comprised of a non-Federal cost share: Provided further, That up to \$2,000,000 may be used by the Secretary solely for: (1) rapid response to new introductions of non-native or invasive pests or pathogens in which no previous federal funding has been identified to address, or (2) for a limited number of instances in which any pest populations increase at over 150 percent of levels monitored for that species in the immediately preceding fiscal year and failure to suppress those populations would lead to a 10-percent increase of annual forest or stand mortality over ambient mortality levels.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, for management, protection, improvement, and utilization of the National Forest System, \$1,370,731,000, to remain available until expended, which shall include 50 percent of all moneys received during prior fiscal years as fees collected under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, in accordance with section 4 of the Act (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a(i)), of which \$200,000 may be for necessary expenses related to a land exchange between the State of Montana and the Lolo National Forest: Provided, That unobligated balances available at the start of fiscal year 2004 shall be displayed by budget line item in the fiscal year 2005 budget justification: Provided further, That the Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer of such sums as necessary to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, for removal, preparation, and adoption of excess wild horses and burros, and for the performance of cadastral surveys to designate the boundaries of such lands from National Forest System lands: Provided further, That of the funds provided under this heading for Forest Products, \$5,000,000 shall be allocated to the Alaska Region, in addition to its normal allocation for the purposes of preparing additional timber for sale, to establish a 3-year timber supply and such funds may be transferred to other appropriations accounts as necessary to maximize accomplishment: Provided further, That of the funds provided under this heading, \$3,150,000 is for expenses required to implement title I of Public Law 106-248, to be segregated in a separate fund established by the Secretary of Agriculture: Provided further, That within funds available for the purpose of implementing the Valles Caldera Preservation Act, notwithstanding the limitations of section 107(e)(2) of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (Public Law 106-248), for fiscal year 2004, the Chair of the Board of Trustees of the Valles Caldera Trust may receive, upon request, compensation for each day (including travel time) that the Chair is engaged in the performance of the functions of the Board, except that compensation shall not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate in effect for members of the Senior Executive Service at the ES-1 level, and shall be in addition to any reimbursement for travel, subsistence and other necessary expenses incurred by the Chair in the performance of the Chair's duties.

For an additional amount to reimburse the Judgment Fund as required by 41 U.S.C. 612(c)

for judgment liabilities previously incurred, \$188,405,000.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for forest fire presuppression activities on National Forest System lands, for emergency fire suppression on or adjacent to such lands or other lands under fire protection agreement, hazardous fuels reduction on or adjacent to such lands, and for emergency rehabilitation of burned-over National Forest System lands and water, \$1,543,072,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such funds including unobligated balances under this head, are available for repayment of advances from other appropriations accounts previously transferred for such purposes: Provided further, That such funds may be available to reimburse State and other cooperating entities for services provided in response to wildfire and other emergencies or disasters: Provided further, That not less than 50 percent of any unobligated balances remaining (exclusive of amounts for hazardous fuels reduction) at the end of fiscal year 2003 shall be transferred, as repayment for past advances that have not been repaid, to the fund established pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 71-319 (16 U.S.C. 576 et seq.): Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$8,000,000 of funds appropriated under this appropriation shall be used for Fire Science Research in support of the Joint Fire Science Program: Provided further, That all authorities for the use of funds, including the use of contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements, available to execute the Forest and Rangeland Research appropriation, are also available in the utilization of these funds for Fire Science Research: Provided further, That funds provided shall be available for emergency rehabilitation and restoration, hazardous fuels reduction activities in the urban-wildland interface, support to Federal emergency response, and wildfire suppression activities of the Forest Service: Provided further, That of the funds provided, \$231,392,000 is for hazardous fuels reduction activities, \$21,427,000 is for research activities and to make competitive research grants pursuant to the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1641 et seq.), \$47,752,000 is for State fire assistance, \$8,240,000 is for volunteer fire assistance, and \$11,934,000 is for forest health activities on State, private, and Federal lands: Provided further, That amounts in this paragraph may be transferred to the “State and Private Forestry”, “National Forest System”, and “Forest and Rangeland Research” accounts to fund State fire assistance, volunteer fire assistance, forest health management, forest and rangeland research, vegetation and watershed management, heritage site rehabilitation, wildlife and fish habitat management, and restoration: Provided further, That transfers of any amounts in excess of those authorized in this paragraph shall require approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with reprogramming procedures contained in House Report No. 105-163: Provided further, That the costs of implementing any cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and any non-Federal entity may be shared, as mutually agreed on by the affected parties: Provided further, That in addition to funds provided for State Fire Assistance programs, and subject to all authorities available to the Forest Service under the State and Private Forestry Appropriations, up to \$15,000,000 may be used on adjacent non-Federal lands for the purpose of protecting communities when hazard reduction activities are planned on national forest lands that have the potential to place such communities at risk: Provided further, That included in funding for hazardous fuel reduction is \$5,000,000 for implementing the Community Forest Restoration Act, Public Law 106-393, title VI, and any portion of such funds shall be available for use on non-Federal lands

in accordance with authorities available to the Forest Service under the State and Private Forestry Appropriation: Provided further, That in using the funds provided in this Act for hazardous fuels reduction activities, the Secretary of Agriculture may conduct fuel reduction treatments on Federal lands using all contracting and hiring authorities available to the Secretary applicable to hazardous fuel reduction activities under the wildland fire management accounts: Provided further, That notwithstanding Federal Government procurement and contracting laws, the Secretaries may conduct fuel reduction treatments, rehabilitation and restoration, and other activities authorized under this heading on and adjacent to Federal lands using grants and cooperative agreements: Provided further, That notwithstanding Federal Government procurement and contracting laws, in order to provide employment and training opportunities to people in rural communities, the Secretaries may award contracts, including contracts for monitoring activities, to local private, non-profit, or cooperative entities; Youth Conservation Corps crews or related partnerships, with State, local and non-profit youth groups; small or micro-businesses; or other entities that will hire or train a significant percentage of local people to complete such contracts: Provided further, That the authorities described above relating to contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements are available until all funds provided in this title for hazardous fuels reduction activities in the urban wildland interface are obligated: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the transfer of funds appropriated for wildland fire management, in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$12,000,000, between the Departments when such transfers would facilitate and expedite jointly funded wildland fire management programs and projects.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, \$532,406,000, to remain available until expended for construction, reconstruction, maintenance and acquisition of buildings and other facilities, and for construction, reconstruction, repair and maintenance of forest roads and trails by the Forest Service as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 532–538 and 23 U.S.C. 101 and 205, of which \$500,000 may be for improvements at Fernwood Park on the Wasatch-Cache National Forest: Provided, That up to \$15,000,000 of the funds provided herein for road maintenance shall be available for the decommissioning of roads, including unauthorized roads not part of the transportation system, which are no longer needed: Provided further, That no funds shall be expended to decommission any system road until notice and an opportunity for public comment has been provided on each decommissioning project.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601–4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the Forest Service, \$76,440,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended, of which \$5,400,000 shall be available for the Beaver Brook Watershed in the State of Colorado: Provided, That notwithstanding any limitations of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (16 U.S.C. 4601–9), the Secretary of Agriculture is henceforth authorized to utilize any funds appropriated from the Land and Water Conservation Fund to acquire Mental Health Trust lands in Alaska and, upon Federal acquisition, the boundaries of the Tongass National Forest shall be deemed modified to include such lands.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS SPECIAL ACTS

For acquisition of lands within the exterior boundaries of the Cache, Uinta, and Wasatch National Forests, Utah; the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada; and the Angeles, San Bernardino, Sequoia, and Cleveland National Forests, California, as authorized by law, \$1,069,000, to be derived from forest receipts.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES

For acquisition of lands, such sums, to be derived from funds deposited by State, county, or municipal governments, public school districts, or other public school authorities, and for authorized expenditures from funds deposited by non-federal parties pursuant to Land Sale and Exchange Acts, pursuant to the Act of December 4, 1967, as amended (16 U.S.C. 484a), to remain available until expended.

RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of range rehabilitation, protection, and improvement, 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year, as fees for grazing domestic livestock on lands in National Forests in the 16 Western States, pursuant to section 401(b)(1) of Public Law 94–579, as amended, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed 6 percent shall be available for administrative expenses associated with on-the-ground range rehabilitation, protection, and improvements.

GIFTS, DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS FOR FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For expenses authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1643(b), \$92,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the fund established pursuant to the above Act.

MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS FOR SUBSISTENCE USES

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service to manage federal lands in Alaska for subsistence uses under title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96–487), \$5,535,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$100,000 per annum may be used to reimburse the Office of General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, for salaries and related expenses incurred in providing legal services in relation to subsistence management.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for: (1) purchase of not to exceed 124 passenger motor vehicles of which 21 will be used primarily for law enforcement purposes and of which 124 shall be for replacement; acquisition of 25 passenger motor vehicles from excess sources, and hire of such vehicles; operation and maintenance of aircraft to maintain the operable fleet at 195 aircraft for use in Forest Service wildland fire programs and other Forest Service programs; notwithstanding other provisions of law, existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft; (2) services pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2225, and not to exceed \$100,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; (3) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (7 U.S.C. 2250); (4) acquisition of land, waters, and interests therein pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 428a; (5) for expenses pursuant to the Volunteers in the National Forest Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 558a, 558d, and 558a note); (6) the cost of uniforms as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; and (7) for debt collection contracts in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3718(c).

None of the funds made available under this Act shall be obligated or expended to abolish any region, to move or close any regional office for National Forest System administration of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture without the consent of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be transferred to the Wildland Fire Management appropriation for forest firefighting, emergency rehabilitation of burned-over or damaged lands or waters under its jurisdiction, and fire preparedness due to severe burning conditions if and only if all previously appropriated emergency contingent funds under the heading “Wildland Fire Management” have been released by the President and apportioned and all wildfire suppression funds under the heading “Wildland Fire Management” are obligated.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for assistance to or through the Agency for International Development and the Foreign Agricultural Service in connection with forest and rangeland research, technical information, and assistance in foreign countries, and shall be available to support forestry and related natural resource activities outside the United States and its territories and possessions, including technical assistance, education and training, and cooperation with United States and international organizations.

None of the funds made available to the Forest Service under this Act shall be subject to transfer under the provisions of section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2257) or 7 U.S.C. 147b unless the proposed transfer is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in House Report No. 105–163.

None of the funds available to the Forest Service may be reprogrammed without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the procedures contained in House Report No. 105–163.

No funds available to the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund of the Department of Agriculture that exceed the total amount transferred during fiscal year 2000 for such purposes without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Funds available to the Forest Service shall be available to conduct a program of not less than \$2,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, \$2,500 is available to the Chief of the Forest Service for official reception and representation expenses.

Pursuant to sections 405(b) and 410(b) of Public Law 101–593, of the funds available to the Forest Service, up to \$3,000,000 may be advanced in a lump sum as Federal financial assistance to the National Forest Foundation, without regard to when the Foundation incurs expenses, for administrative expenses or projects on or benefiting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: Provided, That of the Federal funds made available to the Foundation, no more than \$400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: Provided further, That the Foundation shall obtain, by the end of the period of Federal financial assistance, private contributions to match on at least one-for-one basis funds made available by the Forest Service: Provided further, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to a non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds: Provided further, That authorized investments of Federal funds held by the Foundation may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

Pursuant to section 2(b)(2) of Public Law 98–244, \$2,650,000 of the funds available to the Forest Service shall be available for matching funds to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 3701–3709, and may

be advanced in a lump sum, without regard to when expenses are incurred, for projects on or benefitting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: Provided, That the Foundation shall obtain private contributions to match on at least one-for-one basis funds advanced by the Forest Service: Provided further, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to a Federal or non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for interactions with and providing technical assistance to rural communities for sustainable rural development purposes.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, 80 percent of the funds appropriated to the Forest Service in the "National Forest System" and "Capital Improvement and Maintenance" accounts and planned to be allocated to activities under the "Jobs in the Woods" program for projects on National Forest land in the State of Washington may be granted directly to the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife for accomplishment of planned projects. Twenty percent of said funds shall be retained by the Forest Service for planning and administering projects. Project selection and prioritization shall be accomplished by the Forest Service with such consultation with the State of Washington as the Forest Service deems appropriate.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for payments to counties within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, pursuant to sections 14(c)(1) and (2), and section 16(a)(2) of Public Law 99-663.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service not to exceed \$500,000 may be used to reimburse the Office of the General Counsel (OGC), Department of Agriculture, for travel and related expenses incurred as a result of OGC assistance or participation requested by the Forest Service at meetings, training sessions, management reviews, land purchase negotiations and similar non-litigation related matters. Future budget justifications for both the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture should clearly display the sums previously transferred and the requested funding transfers.

Any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be used for necessary expenses in the event of law enforcement emergencies as necessary to protect natural resources and public or employee safety: Provided, That such amounts shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

From funds available to the Forest Service in this Act for payment of costs in accordance with subsection 413(d) of Title IV, Public Law 108-7, \$3,000,000 shall be transferred by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Treasury to make reimbursement payments as provided in such subsection.

The Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the sale of excess buildings, facilities, and other properties owned by the Forest Service and located on the Green Mountain National Forest, the revenues of which shall be retained by the Forest Service and available to the Secretary without further appropriation and until expended for maintenance and rehabilitation activities on the Green Mountain National Forest.

The Secretary of Agriculture may transfer or reimburse funds available to the Forest Service, not to exceed \$15,000,000, to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce to expedite conferencing and consultations as required under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. 1536. The amount of the transfer or reimbursement shall be as mutually agreed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior or Secretary of Commerce, as applicable, or their designees. The amount shall in no case exceed the actual costs of consultation and conferencing.

Beginning on June 30, 2001 and concluding on December 31, 2004, an eligible individual who is

employed in any project funded under Title V of the Older American Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056 et seq.) and administered by the Forest Service shall be considered to be a Federal employee for purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code.

Any funds appropriated to the Forest Service may be used to meet the non-Federal share requirement in section 502(c) of the Older American Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056(c)(2)).

None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used by the Forest Service to initiate or continue competitive sourcing studies until such time as the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations have been given a detailed competitive sourcing proposal (including the number of positions to be studied, the amount of funding needed, and the accounts and activities from which the funding will be reprogrammed), and have approved in writing such proposal.

The Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the sale of excess buildings, facilities, and other properties owned by the Forest Service and located on the Wasatch-Cache National Forest, the revenues of which may be retained by the Forest Service and available to the Secretary without further appropriation and until expended for acquisition and construction of administrative sites on the Wasatch-Cache National Forest.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

(DEFERRAL)

Of the funds made available under this heading for obligation in prior years, \$97,000,000 shall not be available until October 1, 2004: Provided, That funds made available in previous appropriations Acts shall be available for any ongoing project regardless of the separate request for proposal under which the project was selected: Provided further, That within 30 days of enactment of this Act, the Secretary is directed to provide the House Committee on Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Appropriations with a plan detailing the proposed expenditure of un-obligated or de-obligated funds from terminated Clean Coal Technology projects in support of the FutureGen project: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, within fiscal year 2004 up to \$9,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading for obligation in prior years, of funds not obligated or committed to existing Clean Coal Technology projects, and funds committed or obligated to a project that is or may be terminated, may be used for the development of technologies and research facilities that support the production of electricity and hydrogen from coal including sequestration of associated carbon dioxide: Provided further, That the Secretary may enter into a lease or other agreement, not subject to the conditions or requirements established for Clean Coal Technology projects under any prior law, for a cost-shared public-private partnership with a non-Federal entity representing the coal industry and coal-fueled utilities: Provided further, That the Secretary shall ensure that the entity provides opportunities for participation by technology vendors, States, universities, and other stakeholders.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in carrying out fossil energy research and development activities, under the authority of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), including the acquisition of interest, including de-feasible and equitable interests in any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition or expansion, and for conducting inquiries, technological investigations and research concerning the extraction, processing, use, and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs (30 U.S.C. 3, 1602, and 1603), \$593,514,000, to remain

available until expended, of which \$4,000,000 is to continue a multi-year project for construction, renovation, furnishing, and demolition or removal of buildings at National Energy Technology Laboratory facilities in Morgantown, West Virginia and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; of which not to exceed \$536,000 may be utilized for travel and travel-related expenses incurred by the headquarters staff of the Office of Fossil Energy; and of which \$130,000,000 are to be made available, after coordination with the private sector, for a request for proposals for a Clean Coal Power Initiative providing for competitively-awarded research, development, and demonstration projects to reduce the barriers to continued and expanded coal use: Provided, That no project may be selected for which sufficient funding is not available to provide for the total project: Provided further, That funds shall be expended in accordance with the provisions governing the use of funds contained under the heading "Clean Coal Technology" in 42 U.S.C. 5903d: Provided further, That the Department may include provisions for repayment of Government contributions to individual projects in an amount up to the Government contribution to the project on terms and conditions that are acceptable to the Department including repayments from sale and licensing of technologies from both domestic and foreign transactions: Provided further, That such repayments shall be retained by the Department for future coal-related research, development and demonstration projects: Provided further, That any technology selected under this program shall be considered a Clean Coal Technology, and any project selected under this program shall be considered a Clean Coal Technology Project, for the purposes of 42 U.S.C. 7651n, and Chapters 51, 52, and 60 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations: Provided further, That no part of the sum herein made available shall be used for the field testing of nuclear explosives in the recovery of oil and gas: Provided further, That up to 4 percent of program direction funds available to the National Energy Technology Laboratory may be used to support Department of Energy activities not included in this account.

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

For expenses necessary to carry out naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities, \$17,947,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, unobligated funds remaining from prior years shall be available for all naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities.

ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUND

For necessary expenses in fulfilling installment payments under the Settlement Agreement entered into by the United States and the State of California on October 11, 1996, as authorized by section 3415 of Public Law 104-106, \$36,000,000, to become available on October 1, 2004 for payment to the State of California for the State Teachers' Retirement Fund from the Elk Hills School Lands Fund.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out energy conservation activities, \$861,645,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$1,500,000 is for DES applications integration: Provided, That \$274,000,000 shall be for use in energy conservation grant programs as defined in section 3008(3) of Public Law 99-509 (15 U.S.C. 4507): Provided further, That notwithstanding section 3003(d)(2) of Public Law 99-509, such sums shall be allocated to the eligible programs as follows: \$230,000,000 for weatherization assistance grants and \$44,000,000 for State energy program grants.

ECONOMIC REGULATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, \$1,047,000, to remain available until expended.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

For necessary expenses for Strategic Petroleum Reserve facility development and operations and program management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), \$173,081,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Department of Energy shall develop, with an opportunity for public comment, procedures to obtain oil for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in a manner that maximizes the overall domestic supply of crude oil (including amounts stored in private sector inventories) and minimizes the costs to the Department of the Interior and the Department of Energy of acquiring such oil (including foregone revenues to the Treasury when oil for the Reserve is obtained through the Royalty-in-Kind program), consistent with national security. Such procedures shall include procedures and criteria for the review of requests for the deferrals of scheduled deliveries. No later than 120 days following the enactment of this Act the Department shall propose and no later than 180 days following the enactment of this Act the Department shall publish and follow such procedures when acquiring oil for the Reserve.

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

For necessary expenses for Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve storage, operations, and management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 2000, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities of the Energy Information Administration, \$80,111,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Appropriations under this Act for the current fiscal year shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; and reimbursement to the General Services Administration for security guard services.

From appropriations under this Act, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of work for which the appropriation is made.

None of the funds made available to the Department of Energy under this Act shall be used to implement or finance authorized price support or loan guarantee programs unless specific provision is made for such programs in an appropriations Act.

The Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, private or foreign: Provided, That revenues and other moneys received by or for the account of the Department of Energy or otherwise generated by sale of products in connection with projects of the Department appropriated under this Act may be retained by the Secretary of Energy, to be available until expended, and used only for plant construction, operation, costs, and payments to cost-sharing entities as provided in appropriate cost-sharing contracts or agreements: Provided further, That the remainder of revenues after the making of such payments shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: Provided further, That any contract, agreement, or provision thereof entered into by the Secretary pursuant to this authority shall not be executed prior to the expiration of 30 calendar days (not including any day in which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than 3 calendar days to a day certain) from the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of a full comprehensive report on such project, including the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed project.

No funds provided in this Act may be expended by the Department of Energy to prepare, issue, or process procurement documents for programs or projects for which appropriations have not been made.

In addition to other authorities set forth in this Act, the Secretary may accept fees and contributions from public and private sources, to be deposited in a contributed funds account, and prosecute projects using such fees and contributions in cooperation with other Federal, State or private agencies or concerns.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry out the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), the Indian Self-Determination Act, the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Indian Health Service, \$2,546,524,000, together with payments received during the fiscal year pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 238(b) for services furnished by the Indian Health Service: Provided, That funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through contracts, grant agreements, or any other agreements or compacts authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), shall be deemed to be obligated at the time of the grant or contract award and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: Provided further, That up to \$18,000,000 shall remain available until expended, for the Indian Catastrophic Health Emergency Fund: Provided further, That \$472,022,000 for contract medical care shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005: Provided further, That of the funds provided, up to \$27,000,000 to remain available until expended, shall be used to carry out the loan repayment program under section 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act: Provided further, That funds provided in this Act may be used for one-year contracts and grants which are to be performed in two fiscal years, so long as the total obligation is recorded in the year for which the funds are appropriated: Provided further, That the amounts collected by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under the authority of title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall remain available until expended for the purpose of achieving compliance with the applicable conditions and requirements of titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act (exclusive of planning, design, or construction of new facilities): Provided further, That funding contained herein, and in any earlier appropriations Acts for scholarship programs under the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1613) shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That amounts received by tribes and tribal organizations under title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall be reported and accounted for and available to the receiving tribes and tribal organizations until expended: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amounts provided herein, not to exceed \$268,974,000 shall be for payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract or grant support costs associated with contracts, grants, self-governance compacts or annual funding agreements between the Indian Health Service and a tribe or tribal organization pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, prior to or during fiscal year 2004, of which not to exceed \$2,500,000 may be used for contract support costs associated with new or expanded self-determination contracts, grants, self-governance compacts or annual funding agreements: Provided further, That funds available for the Indian Health Care Improvement Fund may be used, as needed, to carry out activities typically funded under the Indian Health Facilities account: Provided further,

That of the amounts provided to the Indian Health Service, \$15,000,000 is provided for alcohol control, enforcement, prevention, treatment, sobriety and wellness, and education in Alaska to be distributed as direct lump sum payments as follows: (a) \$2,000,000 to the State of Alaska for regional distribution to hire and equip additional Village Public Safety Officers to engage primarily in bootlegging prevention and enforcement activities; (b) \$10,000,000 to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, which shall be allocated for (1) substance abuse treatment including residential treatment, (2) substance abuse and behavioral health counselors through the Counselor in Every Village program, and (3) comprehensive substance abuse training programs for counselors and others delivering substance abuse services; (c) \$1,000,000 to the State of Alaska for a school peer counseling and education program; and (d) \$2,000,000 for the Alaska Federation of Natives sobriety and wellness program for competitive merit-based grants: Provided further, That none of the funds may be used for tribal courts or tribal ordinance programs or any program that is not directly related to alcohol control, enforcement, prevention, treatment, or sobriety: Provided further, That no more than 10 percent may be used by any entity receiving funding for administrative overhead including indirect costs: Provided further, That the State of Alaska, Alaska Native non-profit corporations, and the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium must each maintain its existing level of effort and must use these funds to enhance or expand existing efforts or initiate new projects or programs and may not use such funds to supplant existing programs.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

For construction, repair, maintenance, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites, purchase and erection of modular buildings, and purchases of trailers; and for provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a), the Indian Self-Determination Act, and the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and for expenses necessary to carry out such Acts and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health and facilities support activities of the Indian Health Service, \$391,188,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for the planning, design, construction or renovation of health facilities for the benefit of an Indian tribe or tribes may be used to purchase land for sites to construct, improve, or enlarge health or related facilities: Provided further, That from the funds appropriated herein, \$5,043,000 shall be designated by the Indian Health Service as a contribution to the Yukon-Kuskokwim Health Corporation (YKHC) to complete a priority project for the acquisition of land, planning, design and construction of 79 staff quarters in the Bethel service area, pursuant to the negotiated project agreement between the YKHC and the Indian Health Service: Provided further, That this project shall not be subject to the construction provisions of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act and shall be removed from the Indian Health Service priority list upon completion: Provided further, That the Federal Government shall not be liable for any property damages or other construction claims that may arise from YKHC undertaking this project: Provided further, That the land shall be owned or leased by the YKHC and title to quarters shall remain vested with the YKHC: Provided further, That not to exceed \$500,000 shall be used by the Indian Health Service to purchase TRANSAM equipment from the Department of Defense for distribution to the Indian Health Service and tribal facilities: Provided

further, That none of the funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service may be used for sanitation facilities construction for new homes funded with grants by the housing programs of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development: Provided further, That not to exceed \$1,000,000 from this account and the "Indian Health Services" account shall be used by the Indian Health Service to obtain ambulances for the Indian Health Service and tribal facilities in conjunction with an existing inter-agency agreement between the Indian Health Service and the General Services Administration: Provided further, That not to exceed \$500,000 shall be placed in a Demolition Fund and remain available until expended, to be used by the Indian Health Service for demolition of Federal buildings.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations in this Act to the Indian Health Service shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior-level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of medical equipment; purchase of reprints; purchase, renovation and erection of modular buildings and renovation of existing facilities; payments for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; and for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities.

In accordance with the provisions of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, non-Indian patients may be extended health care at all tribally administered or Indian Health Service facilities, subject to charges, and the proceeds along with funds recovered under the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651-2653) shall be credited to the account of the facility providing the service and shall be available without fiscal year limitation. Notwithstanding any other law or regulation, funds transferred from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Indian Health Service shall be administered under Public Law 86-121 (the Indian Sanitation Facilities Act) and Public Law 93-638, as amended.

Funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service in this Act, except those used for administrative and program direction purposes, shall not be subject to limitations directed at curtailing Federal travel and transportation.

None of the funds made available to the Indian Health Service in this Act shall be used for any Department of Health and Human Services-wide consolidation, restructuring, or realignment of functions or for any assessments or charges associated with any such consolidation, restructuring or realignment, except for purposes for which funds are specifically provided in this Act.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds previously or herein made available to a tribe or tribal organization through a contract, grant, or agreement authorized by title I or title III of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), may be deobligated and reobligated to a self-determination contract under title I, or a self-governance agreement under title III of such Act and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation.

None of the funds made available to the Indian Health Service in this Act shall be used to implement the final rule published in the Federal Register on September 16, 1987, by the Department of Health and Human Services, relat-

ing to the eligibility for the health care services of the Indian Health Service until the Indian Health Service has submitted a budget request reflecting the increased costs associated with the proposed final rule, and such request has been included in an appropriations Act and enacted into law.

With respect to functions transferred by the Indian Health Service to tribes or tribal organizations, the Indian Health Service is authorized to provide goods and services to those entities, on a reimbursable basis, including payment in advance with subsequent adjustment. The reimbursements received therefrom, along with the funds received from those entities pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act, may be credited to the same or subsequent appropriation account which provided the funding. Such amounts shall remain available until expended.

Reimbursements for training, technical assistance, or services provided by the Indian Health Service will contain total costs, including direct, administrative, and overhead associated with the provision of goods, services, or technical assistance.

The appropriation structure for the Indian Health Service may not be altered without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation as authorized by Public Law 93-531, \$13,532,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That funds provided in this or any other appropriations Act are to be used to relocate eligible individuals and groups including evictees from District 6, Hopi-partitioned lands residents, those in significantly substandard housing, and all others certified as eligible and not included in the preceding categories: Provided further, That none of the funds contained in this or any other Act may be used by the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation to evict any single Navajo or Navajo family who, as of November 30, 1985, was physically domiciled on the lands partitioned to the Hopi Tribe unless a new or replacement home is provided for such household: Provided further, That no relocatee will be provided with more than one new or replacement home: Provided further, That the Office shall relocate any certified eligible relocatees who have selected and received an approved homesite on the Navajo reservation or selected a replacement residence off the Navajo reservation or on the land acquired pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 640d-10.

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

PAYMENT TO THE INSTITUTE

For payment to the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development, as authorized by title XV of Public Law 99-498, as amended (20 U.S.C. 56 part A), \$6,250,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall remain available until expended to assist with the Institute's efforts to develop a Continuing Education Lifelong Learning Center.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by law, including research in the fields of art, science, and history; development, preservation, and documentation of the National Collections; presentation of public exhibits and performances; collection, preparation, dissemination, and exchange of information and publications; conduct of education, training, and museum assistance programs; maintenance, alteration, operation, lease (for terms not to exceed 30 years), and protection of buildings, facilities, and approaches; not to exceed \$100,000 for services as authorized by 5

U.S.C. 3109; up to five replacement passenger vehicles; purchase, rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for employees, \$487,989,000, of which not to exceed \$46,903,000 for the instrumentation program, collections acquisition, exhibition reinstallation, the National Museum of the American Indian, and the repatriation of skeletal remains program shall remain available until expended; and of which \$828,000 for fellowships and scholarly awards shall remain available until September 30, 2005; and including such funds as may be necessary to support American overseas research centers and a total of \$125,000 for the Council of American Overseas Research Centers: Provided, That funds appropriated herein are available for advance payments to independent contractors performing research services or participating in official Smithsonian presentations: Provided further, That the Smithsonian Institution may expend Federal appropriations designated in this Act for lease or rent payments for long term and swing space, as rent payable to the Smithsonian Institution, and such rent payments may be deposited into the general trust funds of the Institution to the extent that federally supported activities are housed in the 900 H Street, N.W. building in the District of Columbia: Provided further, That this use of Federal appropriations shall not be construed as debt service, a Federal guarantee of, a transfer of risk to, or an obligation of, the Federal Government: Provided further, That no appropriated funds may be used to service debt which is incurred to finance the costs of acquiring the 900 H Street building or of planning, designing, and constructing improvements to such building.

FACILITIES CAPITAL

For necessary expenses of maintenance, repair, revitalization, and alteration of facilities owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institution, by contract or otherwise, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623), and for construction, including necessary personnel, \$89,970,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$10,000 is for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: Provided, That contracts awarded for environmental systems, protection systems, and repair or restoration of facilities of the Smithsonian Institution may be negotiated with selected contractors and awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price: Provided further, That balances from amounts previously appropriated under the headings "Repair, Restoration and Alteration of Facilities" and "Construction" shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation and shall remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

None of the funds in this or any other Act may be used to make any changes to the existing Smithsonian science programs including closure of facilities, relocation of staff or redirection of functions and programs without approval from the Board of Regents of recommendations received from the Science Commission.

None of the funds in this or any other Act may be used to initiate the design for any proposed expansion of current space or new facility without consultation with the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

None of the funds in this or any other Act may be used for the Holt House located at the National Zoological Park in Washington, D.C., unless identified as repairs to minimize water damage, monitor structure movement, or provide interim structural support.

None of the funds available to the Smithsonian may be reprogrammed without the advance written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the procedures contained in House Report No. 105-163.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the upkeep and operations of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards, and uniforms, or allowances therefor, for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); purchase or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance, alteration, improvement, and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and purchase of services for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper, \$85,650,000, of which not to exceed \$3,026,000 for the special exhibition program shall remain available until expended.

REPAIR, RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF
BUILDINGS

For necessary expenses of repair, restoration and renovation of buildings, grounds and facilities owned or occupied by the National Gallery of Art, by contract or otherwise, as authorized, \$11,600,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That contracts awarded for environmental systems, protection systems, and exterior repair or renovation of buildings of the National Gallery of Art may be negotiated with selected contractors and awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING
ARTS

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses for the operation, maintenance and security of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, \$16,560,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for capital repair and restoration of the existing features of the building and site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, \$16,000,000, to remain available until expended.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR
SCHOLARS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 1356) including hire of passenger vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$8,604,000.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE
HUMANITIES

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS
GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, \$117,480,000, shall be available to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects and productions in the arts through assistance to organizations and individuals pursuant to sections 5(c) and 5(g) of the Act, including \$17,000,000 for support of arts education and public outreach activities through the Challenge America program, for program support, and for administering the functions of the Act, to remain available until expended: Provided, That funds previously appropriated to the National Endowment for the Arts "Matching Grants" account and "Chal-

lenge America" account may be transferred to and merged with this account.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, \$125,878,000, shall be available to the National Endowment for the Humanities for support of activities in the humanities, pursuant to section 7(c) of the Act, and for administering the functions of the Act, to remain available until expended.

MATCHING GRANTS

To carry out the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, \$16,122,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$10,436,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Humanities for the purposes of section 7(h): Provided, That this appropriation shall be available for obligation only in such amounts as may be equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property accepted by the chairman or by grantees of the Endowment under the provisions of subsections 11(a)(2)(B) and 11(a)(3)(B) during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

None of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used to process any grant or contract documents which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That funds from nonappropriated sources may be used as necessary for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts may approve grants up to \$10,000, if in the aggregate this amount does not exceed 5 percent of the sums appropriated for grant-making purposes per year: Provided further, That such small grant actions are taken pursuant to the terms of an expressed and direct delegation of authority from the National Council on the Arts to the Chairperson.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), \$1,422,000: Provided, That the Commission is authorized to charge fees to cover the full costs of its publications, and such fees shall be credited to this account as an offsetting collection, to remain available until expended without further appropriation.

NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses as authorized by Public Law 99-190 (20 U.S.C. 956(a)), as amended, \$6,000,000.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Public Law 89-665, as amended), \$4,000,000: Provided, That none of these funds shall be available for compensation of level V of the Executive Schedule or higher positions.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71-71i), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$8,030,000: Provided, That for fiscal year 2004 and thereafter, all appointed members of the Commission will be compensated at a rate not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of pay for positions at level IV of the Executive Schedule for each day such

member is engaged in the actual performance of duties.

UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM
HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

For expenses of the Holocaust Memorial Museum, as authorized by Public Law 106-292 (36 U.S.C. 2301-2310), \$39,997,000, of which \$1,900,000 for the museum's repair and rehabilitation program and \$1,264,000 for the museum's exhibitions program shall remain available until expended.

PRESIDIO TRUST

PRESIDIO TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out title I of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996, \$20,700,000 shall be available to the Presidio Trust, to remain available until expended.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive Order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for any activity or the publication or distribution of literature that in any way tends to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal on which congressional action is not complete.

SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 304. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of such department or agency except as otherwise provided by law.

SEC. 305. No assessments may be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity, or project funded by this Act unless notice of such assessments and the basis therefor are presented to the Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such committees.

SEC. 306. None of the funds in this Act may be used to plan, prepare, or offer for sale timber from trees classified as giant sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*) which are located on National Forest System or Bureau of Land Management lands in a manner different than such sales were conducted in fiscal year 2003.

SEC. 307. (a) LIMITATION OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to accept or process applications for a patent for any mining or mill site claim located under the general mining laws.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of the Interior determines that, for the claim concerned: (1) a patent application was filed with the Secretary on or before September 30, 1994; and (2) all requirements established under sections 2325 and 2326 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 29 and 30) for vein or lode claims and sections 2329, 2330, 2331, and 2333 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 35, 36, and 37) for placer claims, and section 2337 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 42) for mill site claims, as the case may be, were fully complied with by the applicant by that date.

(c) REPORT.—On September 30, 2004, the Secretary of the Interior shall file with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on actions taken by the Department under the plan submitted pursuant to section 314(c) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104-208).

(d) **MINERAL EXAMINATIONS.**—In order to process patent applications in a timely and responsible manner, upon the request of a patent applicant, the Secretary of the Interior shall allow the applicant to fund a qualified third-party contractor to be selected by the Bureau of Land Management to conduct a mineral examination of the mining claims or mill sites contained in a patent application as set forth in subsection (b). The Bureau of Land Management shall have the sole responsibility to choose and pay the third-party contractor in accordance with the standard procedures employed by the Bureau of Land Management in the retention of third-party contractors.

SEC. 308. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts appropriated to or earmarked in committee reports for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service by Public Laws 103-138, 103-332, 104-134, 104-208, 105-83, 105-277, 106-113, 106-291, and 107-63, for payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract support costs associated with self-determination or self-governance contracts, grants, compacts, or annual funding agreements with the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the Indian Health Service as funded by such Acts, are the total amounts available for fiscal years 1994 through 2003 for such purposes, except that, for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, tribes and tribal organizations may use their tribal priority allocations for unmet indirect costs of ongoing contracts, grants, self-governance compacts or annual funding agreements.

SEC. 309. Of the funds provided to the National Endowment for the Arts—

(1) The Chairperson shall only award a grant to an individual if such grant is awarded to such individual for a literature fellowship, National Heritage Fellowship, or American Jazz Masters Fellowship.

(2) The Chairperson shall establish procedures to ensure that no funding provided through a grant, except a grant made to a State or local arts agency, or regional group, may be used to make a grant to any other organization or individual to conduct activity independent of the direct grant recipient. Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit payments made in exchange for goods and services.

(3) No grant shall be used for seasonal support to a group, unless the application is specific to the contents of the season, including identified programs and/or projects.

SEC. 310. The National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities are authorized to solicit, accept, receive, and invest in the name of the United States, gifts, bequests, or devises of money and other property or services and to use such in furtherance of the functions of the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Any proceeds from such gifts, bequests, or devises, after acceptance by the National Endowment for the Arts or the National Endowment for the Humanities, shall be paid by the donor or the representative of the donor to the Chairman. The Chairman shall enter the proceeds in a special interest-bearing account to the credit of the appropriate endowment for the purposes specified in each case.

SEC. 311. (a) In providing services or awarding financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 from funds appropriated under this Act, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts shall ensure that priority is given to providing services or awarding financial assistance for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that serve underserved populations.

(b) In this section:

(1) The term “underserved population” means a population of individuals, including urban minorities, who have historically been outside the purview of arts and humanities programs due to factors such as a high incidence of income below the poverty line or to geographic isolation.

(2) The term “poverty line” means the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management

and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) (applicable to a family of the size involved).

(c) In providing services and awarding financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 with funds appropriated by this Act, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts shall ensure that priority is given to providing services or awarding financial assistance for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that will encourage public knowledge, education, understanding, and appreciation of the arts.

(d) With funds appropriated by this Act to carry out section 5 of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965—

(1) the Chairperson shall establish a grant category for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that are of national impact or availability or are able to tour several States;

(2) the Chairperson shall not make grants exceeding 15 percent, in the aggregate, of such funds to any single State, excluding grants made under the authority of paragraph (1);

(3) the Chairperson shall report to the Congress annually and by State, on grants awarded by the Chairperson in each grant category under section 5 of such Act; and

(4) the Chairperson shall encourage the use of grants to improve and support community-based music performance and education.

SEC. 312. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be expended or obligated to complete and issue the 5-year program under the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act.

SEC. 313. None of the funds in this Act may be used to support Government-wide administrative functions unless such functions are justified in the budget process and funding is approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 314. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds in this Act may be used for GSA Telecommunication Centers.

SEC. 315. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2004 the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior are authorized to limit competition for watershed restoration project contracts as part of the “Jobs in the Woods” Program established in Region 10 of the Forest Service to individuals and entities in historically timber-dependent areas in the States of Washington, Oregon, northern California, Idaho, Montana, and Alaska that have been affected by reduced timber harvesting on Federal lands. The Secretaries shall consider the benefits to the local economy in evaluating bids and designing procurements which create economic opportunities for local contractors.

SEC. 316. Amounts deposited during fiscal year 2003 in the roads and trails fund provided for in the 14th paragraph under the heading “FOREST SERVICE” of the Act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 843; 16 U.S.C. 501), shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture, without regard to the State in which the amounts were derived, to repair or reconstruct roads, bridges, and trails on National Forest System lands or to carry out and administer projects to improve forest health conditions, which may include the repair or reconstruction of roads, bridges, and trails on National Forest System lands in the wildland-community interface where there is an abnormally high risk of fire. The projects shall emphasize reducing risks to human safety and public health and property and enhancing ecological functions, long-term forest productivity, and biological integrity. The projects may be completed in a subsequent fiscal year. Funds shall not be expended under this section to replace funds which would otherwise appropriately be expended from the timber salvage sale fund. Nothing in this section shall be construed to exempt any project from any environmental law.

SEC. 317. Other than in emergency situations, none of the funds in this Act may be used to op-

erate telephone answering machines during core business hours unless such answering machines include an option that enables callers to reach promptly an individual on-duty with the agency being contacted.

SEC. 318. No timber sale in Region 10 shall be advertised if the indicated rate is deficit when appraised using a residual value approach that assigns domestic Alaska values for western redcedar. Program accomplishments shall be based on volume sold. Should Region 10 sell, in fiscal year 2003, the annual average portion of the decadal allowable sale quantity called for in the current Tongass Land Management Plan in sales which are not deficit when appraised using a residual value approach that assigns domestic Alaska values for western redcedar, all of the western redcedar timber from those sales which is surplus to the needs of domestic processors in Alaska, shall be made available to domestic processors in the contiguous 48 United States at prevailing domestic prices. Should Region 10 sell, in fiscal year 2003, less than the annual average portion of the decadal allowable sale quantity called for in the Tongass Land Management Plan in sales which are not deficit when appraised using a residual value approach that assigns domestic Alaska values for western redcedar, the volume of western redcedar timber available to domestic processors at prevailing domestic prices in the contiguous 48 United States shall be that volume: (i) which is surplus to the needs of domestic processors in Alaska, and (ii) is that percent of the surplus western redcedar volume determined by calculating the ratio of the total timber volume which has been sold on the Tongass to the annual average portion of the decadal allowable sale quantity called for in the current Tongass Land Management Plan. The percentage shall be calculated by Region 10 on a rolling basis as each sale is sold (for purposes of this amendment, a “rolling basis” shall mean that the determination of how much western redcedar is eligible for sale to various markets shall be made at the time each sale is awarded). Western redcedar shall be deemed “surplus to the needs of domestic processors in Alaska” when the timber sale holder has presented to the Forest Service documentation of the inability to sell western redcedar logs from a given sale to domestic Alaska processors at a price equal to or greater than the log selling value stated in the contract. All additional western redcedar volume not sold to Alaska or contiguous 48 United States domestic processors may be exported to foreign markets at the election of the timber sale holder. All Alaska yellow cedar may be sold at prevailing export prices at the election of the timber sale holder.

SEC. 319. A project undertaken by the Forest Service under the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program as authorized by section 315 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1996, as amended, shall not result in—

(1) displacement of the holder of an authorization to provide commercial recreation services on Federal lands. Prior to initiating any project, the Secretary shall consult with potentially affected holders to determine what impacts the project may have on the holders. Any modifications to the authorization shall be made within the terms and conditions of the authorization and authorities of the impacted agency;

(2) the return of a commercial recreation service to the Secretary for operation when such services have been provided in the past by a private sector provider, except when—

(A) the private sector provider fails to bid on such opportunities;

(B) the private sector provider terminates its relationship with the agency; or

(C) the agency revokes the permit for non-compliance with the terms and conditions of the authorization.

In such cases, the agency may use the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program to provide for

operations until a subsequent operator can be found through the offering of a new prospectus.

SEC. 320. Prior to October 1, 2004, the Secretary of Agriculture shall not be considered to be in violation of subparagraph 6(f)(5)(A) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604(f)(5)(A)) solely because more than 15 years have passed without revision of the plan for a unit of the National Forest System. Nothing in this section exempts the Secretary from any other requirement of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.) or any other law: Provided, That if the Secretary is not acting expeditiously and in good faith, within the funding available, to revise a plan for a unit of the National Forest System, this section shall be void with respect to such plan and a court of proper jurisdiction may order completion of the plan on an accelerated basis.

SEC. 321. No funds provided in this Act may be expended to conduct preleasing, leasing and related activities under either the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) within the boundaries of a National Monument established pursuant to the Act of June 8, 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) as such boundary existed on January 20, 2001, except where such activities are allowed under the Presidential proclamation establishing such monument.

SEC. 322. Employees of the foundations established by Acts of Congress to solicit private sector funds on behalf of Federal land management agencies shall, in fiscal year 2005, qualify for General Service Administration contract airfares.

SEC. 323. In entering into agreements with foreign countries pursuant to the Wildfire Suppression Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 1856m) the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior are authorized to enter into reciprocal agreements in which the individuals furnished under said agreements to provide wildfire services are considered, for purposes of tort liability, employees of the country receiving said services when the individuals are engaged in fire suppression: Provided, That the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior shall not enter into any agreement under this provision unless the foreign country (either directly or through its fire organization) agrees to assume any and all liability for the acts or omissions of American firefighters engaged in firefighting in a foreign country: Provided further, That when an agreement is reached for furnishing fire fighting services, the only remedies for acts or omissions committed while fighting fires shall be those provided under the laws of the host country, and those remedies shall be the exclusive remedies for any claim arising out of fighting fires in a foreign country: Provided further, That neither the sending country nor any legal organization associated with the firefighter shall be subject to any legal action whatsoever pertaining to or arising out of the firefighter's role in fire suppression.

SEC. 324. A grazing permit or lease issued by the Secretary of the Interior or a grazing permit issued by the Secretary of Agriculture where National Forest System lands are involved that expires, is transferred, or waived during fiscal years 2004–2008 shall be renewed under section 402 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1752), section 19 of the Granger-Thye Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 5801), title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1010 et seq.), or, if applicable, section 510 of the California Desert Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 410aaa–50). The terms and conditions contained in the expired, transferred, or waived permit or lease shall continue in effect under the renewed permit or lease until such time as the Secretary of the Interior or Secretary of Agriculture as appropriate completes processing of such permit or lease in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, at

which time such permit or lease may be canceled, suspended or modified, in whole or in part, to meet the requirements of such applicable laws and regulations. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to alter the statutory authority of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture: Provided, That where National Forest System lands are involved and the Secretary of Agriculture has renewed an expired or waived grazing permit prior to or during fiscal year 2004, the terms and conditions of the renewed grazing permit shall remain in effect until such time as the Secretary of Agriculture completes processing of the renewed permit in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations or until the expiration of the renewed permit, whichever comes first. Upon completion of the processing, the permit may be canceled, suspended or modified, in whole or in part, to meet the requirements of applicable laws and regulations: Provided further, That beginning in November 2004, and every year thereafter, the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture shall report to Congress the extent to which they are completing analysis required under applicable laws prior to the expiration of grazing permits, and beginning in May 2004, and two years thereafter, the Secretaries shall provide Congress recommendations for legislative provisions necessary to ensure all permit renewals are completed in a timely manner. The legislative recommendations provided shall be consistent with the funding levels requested in the Secretaries' budget proposals: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 504 of the Rescissions Act (109 Stat. 212), the Secretaries in their sole discretion determine the priority and timing for completing required environmental analysis of grazing allotments based on the environmental significance of the allotments and funding available to the Secretaries for this purpose.

SEC. 325. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, to promote the more efficient use of the health care funding allocation for fiscal year 2004, the Eagle Butte Service Unit of the Indian Health Service, at the request of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, may pay base salary rates to health professionals up to the highest grade and step available to a physician, pharmacist, or other health professional and may pay a recruitment or retention bonus of up to 25 percent above the base pay rate.

SEC. 326. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 327. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the planning, design, or construction of improvements to Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House without the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 328. In awarding a Federal Contract with funds made available by this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior (the "Secretaries") may, in evaluating bids and proposals, give consideration to local contractors who are from, and who provide employment and training for, dislocated and displaced workers in an economically disadvantaged rural community, including those historically timber-dependent areas that have been affected by reduced timber harvesting on Federal lands and other forest-dependent rural communities isolated from significant alternative employment opportunities: Provided, That the Secretaries may award grants or cooperative agreements to local non-profit entities, Youth Conservation Corps or related partnerships with State, local or non-profit youth groups, or small or disadvantaged business: Provided further, That the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement is for forest hazardous fuels reduction, watershed or water quality monitoring or restoration, wildlife or fish population monitoring, or habitat restoration or management: Provided further, That

the terms "rural community" and "economically disadvantaged" shall have the same meanings as in section 2374 of Public Law 101–624: Provided further, That the Secretaries shall develop guidance to implement this section: Provided further, That nothing in this section shall be construed as relieving the Secretaries of any duty under applicable procurement laws, except as provided in this section.

SEC. 329. LOCAL EXEMPTIONS FROM FOREST SERVICE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FEES. Section 6906 of Title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before "Necessary"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) LOCAL EXEMPTIONS FROM DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FEES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Each unit of general local government that lies in whole or in part within the White Mountain National Forest and persons residing within the boundaries of that unit of general local government shall be exempt during that fiscal year from any requirement to pay a Demonstration Program Fee (parking permit or passport) imposed by the Secretary of Agriculture for access to the Forest.

"(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall establish a method of identifying persons who are exempt from paying user fees under paragraph (1). This method may include valid form of identification including a drivers license."

SEC. 330. IMPLEMENTATION OF GALLATIN LAND CONSOLIDATION ACT OF 1998. (a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) "Gallatin Land Consolidation Act of 1998" means Public Law 105–267 (112 Stat. 2371).

(2) "Option Agreement" has the same meaning as defined in section 3(6) of the Gallatin Land Consolidation Act of 1998.

(3) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) "Excess receipts" means National Forest Fund receipts from the National Forests in Montana, which are identified and adjusted by the Forest Service within the fiscal year, and which are in excess of funds retained for: the Salvage Sale Fund; the Knutson-Vandenberg Fund; the Purchaser Road/Specified Road Credits; the Twenty-Five Percent Fund, as amended; the Ten Percent Road and Trail Fund; the Timber Sale Pipeline Restoration Fund; the Fifty Percent Grazing Class A Receipts Fund; and the Land and Water Conservation Fund Recreation User Fees Receipts—Class A Fund.

(5) "Special Account" means the special account referenced in section 4(c)(2) of the Gallatin Land Consolidation Act of 1998.

(6) "Eastside National Forests" has the same meaning as in section 3(4) of the Gallatin Land Consolidation Act of 1998.

(b) SPECIAL ACCOUNT.—

(1) The Secretary is authorized and directed, without further appropriation or reprogramming of funds, to transfer to the Special Account these enumerated funds and receipts in the following order:

(A) timber sale receipts from the Gallatin National Forest and other Eastside National Forests, as such receipts are referenced in section 4(a)(2)(C) of the Gallatin Land Consolidation Act of 1998;

(B) any available funds heretofore appropriated for the acquisition of lands for National Forest purposes in the State of Montana through fiscal year 2003;

(C) net receipts from the conveyance of lands on the Gallatin National Forest as authorized by subsection (c); and,

(D) excess receipts for fiscal years 2003 through 2008.

(2) All funds in the Special Account shall be available to the Secretary until expended, without further appropriation, and will be expended prior to the end of fiscal year 2008 for the following purposes:

(A) the completion of the land acquisitions authorized by the Gallatin Land Consolidation

Act of 1998 and fulfillment of the Option Agreement, as may be amended from time to time; and,

(B) the acquisition of lands for which acquisition funds were transferred to the Special Account pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(B).

(3) The Special Account shall be closed at the end of fiscal year 2008 and any monies remaining in the Special Account shall be transferred to the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the "Sisk Act", 16 U.S.C. §484a) to remain available, until expended, for the acquisition of lands for National Forest purposes in the State of Montana.

(4) Funds deposited in the Special Account or eligible for deposit shall not be subject to transfer or reprogramming for wildland fire management or any other emergency purposes.

(c) LAND CONVEYANCES WITHIN THE GALLATIN NATIONAL FOREST.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—The Secretary is authorized, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe and without requirements for further administrative or environmental analyses or examination, to sell or exchange any or all rights, title, and interests of the United States in the following lands within the Gallatin National Forest in the State of Montana:

(A) SMC East Boulder Mine Portal Tract: Principal Meridian, T.3S., R.11E., Section 4, lots 3 to 4 inclusive, W¹/₂SE¹/₄NW¹/₄, containing 76.27 acres more or less.

(B) Forest Service West Yellowstone Administrative Site: U.S. Forest Service Administrative Site located within the NE¹/₄ of Block 17 of the Townsite of West Yellowstone which is situated in the N¹/₂ of Section 34, T.13S., R.5E., Principal Meridian, Gallatin County, Montana, containing 1.04 acres more or less.

(C) Mill Fork Mission Creek Tract: Principal Meridian, T.13S., R.5E., Section 34, NW¹/₄SW¹/₄, containing 40 acres more or less.

(D) West Yellowstone Town Expansion Tract #1: Principal Meridian, T.13S., R.5E., Section 33, E¹/₂E¹/₂NE¹/₄, containing 40 acres more or less.

(E) West Yellowstone Town Expansion Tract #2: Principal Meridian, T.13S., R.5E., Section 33, NE¹/₄SE¹/₄, containing 40 acres more or less.

(2) DESCRIPTIONS.—The Secretary may modify the descriptions in subsection (c)(1) to correct errors or to reconfigure the properties in order to facilitate a conveyance.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration for a sale or exchange of land under this subsection may include cash, land, or a combination of both.

(4) VALUATION.—Any appraisals of land deemed necessary or desirable by the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this section shall conform to the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions.

(5) CASH EQUALIZATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may accept a cash equalization payment in excess of 25 percent of the value of any land exchanged under this subsection.

(6) SOLICITATIONS OF OFFERS.—The Secretary may:

(A) solicit offers for sale or exchange of land under this subsection on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, or

(B) reject any offer made under this subsection if the Secretary determines that the offer is not adequate or not in the public interest.

(7) METHODS OF SALE.—The Secretary may sell land at public or private sale, including competitive sale by auction, bid, or otherwise, in accordance with such terms, conditions, and procedures as the Secretary determines will be in the best interests of the United States.

(8) BROKERS.—The Secretary may utilize brokers or other third parties in the disposition of the land authorized by this subsection and, from the proceeds of the sale, may pay reasonable commissions or fees on the sale or sales.

(9) RECEIPTS FROM SALE OR EXCHANGE.—The Secretary shall deposit the net receipts of a sale or exchange under this subsection in the Special Account.

(d) MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.—

(1) Receipts from any sale or exchange pursuant to subsection (c) of this section:

(A) shall not be deemed excess receipts for purposes of this section;

(B) shall not be paid or distributed to the State or counties under any provision of law, or otherwise deemed as moneys received from the National Forest for purposes of the Act of May 23, 1908 or the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U.S.C. §500, as amended), or the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. §501, as amended).

(2) As of the date of enactment of this section, any public land order withdrawing land described in subsection (c)(1) from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws is revoked with respect to any portion of the land conveyed by the Secretary under this section.

(3) Subject to valid existing rights, all lands described in section (c)(1) are withdrawn from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws of the United States.

(4) The Agriculture Property Management Regulations shall not apply to any action taken pursuant to this section.

(e) OPTION AGREEMENT AMENDMENT.—The Amendment No. 1 to the Option Agreement is hereby ratified as a matter of Federal law and the parties to it are authorized to effect the terms and conditions thereof.

SEC. 331. TRANSFER OF FOREST LEGACY PROGRAM LAND. Section 7(l) of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103c(l)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) TRANSFER OF FOREST LEGACY PROGRAM LAND.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to any terms and conditions that the Secretary may require (including the requirements described in subparagraph (B)), the Secretary may, at the request of a participating State, convey to the State, by quitclaim deed, without consideration, any land or interest in land acquired in the State under the Forest Legacy Program.

"(B) REQUIREMENTS.—In conveying land or an interest in land under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may require that—

"(i) the deed conveying the land or interest in land include requirements for the management of the land in a manner that—

"(I) conserves the land or interest in land; and

"(II) is consistent with any other Forest Legacy Program purposes for which the land or interest in land was acquired;

"(ii) if the land or interest in land is subsequently sold, exchanged, or otherwise disposed of by the State, the State shall—

"(I) reimburse the Secretary in an amount that is based on the current market value of the land or interest in land in proportion to the amount of consideration paid by the United States for the land or interest in land; or

"(II) convey to the Secretary land or an interest in land that is equal in value to the land or interest in land conveyed.

"(C) DISPOSITION OF FUNDS.—Amounts received by the Secretary under subparagraph (B)(ii) shall be credited to the Forest Legacy Program account, to remain available until expended."

SEC. 332. Notwithstanding section 9(b) of Public Law 106-506, funds hereinafter appropriated under Public Law 106-506 shall require matching funds from non-Federal sources on the basis of aggregate contribution to the Environmental Improvement Program, as defined in Public Law 106-506, rather than on a project-by-project basis, except for those activities provided under section 9(c) of that Act, to which this amendment shall not apply.

SEC. 333. Any application for judicial review of a Record of Decision for any timber sale in Region 10 of the Forest Service that had a Notice of Intent prepared on or before January 1, 2003 shall—

(1) be filed in the Alaska District of the Federal District Court within 30 days after exhaus-

tion of the Forest Service administrative appeals process (36 C.F.R. 215) or within 30 days of enactment of this Act if the administrative appeals process has been exhausted prior to enactment of this Act, and the Forest Service shall strictly comply with the schedule for completion of administrative action;

(2) be completed and a decision rendered by the court not later than 180 days from the date such request for review is filed; if a decision is not rendered by the court within 180 days as required by this subsection, the Secretary of Agriculture shall petition the court to proceed with the action.

SEC. 334. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture may cancel, with the consent of the timber purchaser, any contract for the sale of timber in Alaska if—

(1) the Secretary determines, in the Secretary's sole discretion, that the sale is uneconomical to perform; and

(2) the timber purchaser agrees to—

(A) terminate its rights under the contract; and

(B) release the United States from all liability, including further consideration or compensation resulting from such cancellation.

(b) EFFECT OF CANCELLATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States shall not surrender any claim against a timber purchaser that arose under a contract before cancellation under this section not in connection with the cancellation.

(2) LIMITATION.—Cancellation of a contract under this section shall release the timber purchaser from liability for any damages resulting from cancellation of such contract.

(c) TIMBER AVAILABLE FOR RESALE.—Timber included in a contract cancelled under this section shall be available for resale by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 335. Funds appropriated for the Green Mountain National Forest previously or in this Act may be used for the acquisition of lands in the Blueberry Lake area.

SEC. 336. ELECTRIC THERMAL STORAGE TECHNOLOGY. Section 412(9) of the Energy Conservation in Existing Buildings Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6862(9)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (K); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following:

"(J) electric thermal storage technology; and".

SEC. 337. ZORTMAN/LANDUSKY MINE RECLAMATION TRUST FUND. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the "Zortman/Landusky Mine Reclamation Trust Fund" (referred to in this section as the "Fund").

(b) DEPOSIT.—For the fiscal year during which this Act is enacted and each fiscal year thereafter until the aggregate amount deposited in the Fund under this subsection is equal to at least \$22,500,000, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit \$2,250,000 in the Fund.

(c) INVESTMENTS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest the amounts deposited under subsection (b) only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed by the United States as to both principal and interest.

(d) PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All amounts credited as interest under subsection (c) may be available, without fiscal year limitation, to the State of Montana for use in accordance with paragraph (3) after the Fund has been fully capitalized.

(2) WITHDRAWAL AND TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall withdraw amounts credited as interest under paragraph (1) and transfer the amounts to the State of Montana for use as State funds in accordance with paragraph (3) after the Fund has been fully capitalized.

(3) **USE OF TRANSFERRED FUNDS.**—The State of Montana shall use the amounts transferred under paragraph (2) only to supplement funding available from the State Administered "Zortman/Landusky Long-Term Water Treatment Trust Fund" to fund annual operation and maintenance costs for water treatment related to the Zortman/Landusky mine site and reclamation areas.

(e) **TRANSFERS AND WITHDRAWALS.**—The Secretary of the Treasury may not transfer or withdraw any amount deposited under subsection (b).

(f) **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as are necessary to pay the administrative expenses of the Fund.

SEC. 338. **LAKE TAHOE RESTORATION PROJECTS.** Section 4(e)(3)(A) of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 2346; 116 Stat. 2007) is amended—

(1) in clause (v), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) by redesignating clause (vi) as clause (vii); and

(3) by inserting after clause (v) the following:

"(vi) environmental restoration projects under sections 6 and 7 of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (114 Stat. 2354) and environmental improvement payments under section 2(g) of Public Law 96-586 (94 Stat. 3382), in an amount equal to the cumulative amounts authorized to be appropriated for such projects under those Acts and in accordance with a revision to the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 Implementation Agreement to implement this section, which shall include a mechanism to ensure appropriate stakeholders from the States of California and Nevada participate in the process to recommend projects for funding; and".

SEC. 339. **ACQUISITION OF LAND IN NYE COUNTY, NEVADA.** (a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") may acquire by donation all right, title, and interest in and to the parcel of land (including improvements to the land) described in subsection (b).

(b) **DESCRIPTION OF LAND.**—The land referred to in subsection (a) is the parcel of land in Nye County, Nevada—

(1) consisting of not more than 15 acres;

(2) comprising a portion of Tract 37 located north of the center line of Nevada State Highway 374; and

(3) located in the E¹/₂NW¹/₄, NW¹/₄NE¹/₄ sec. 22, T. 12 S., R. 46 E., Mount Diablo Base and Meridian.

(c) **CONDITIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall not accept for donation under subsection (a) any land or structure if the Secretary determines that the land or structure, or a portion of the land or structure, has or may be contaminated with—

(A) hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants, as defined in section 101 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601); or

(B) any petroleum substance, fraction, or derivative.

(2) **CERTIFICATION.**—Before accepting a donation of land under subsection (a), the Secretary shall certify that any structures on the land to be donated—

(A) meet all applicable building code requirements, as determined by an independent contractor; and

(B) are in good condition, as determined by the Director of the National Park Service.

(d) **USE OF LAND.**—The parcel of land acquired under subsection (a) shall be used by the Secretary for the development, operation, and maintenance of administrative and visitor facilities for Death Valley National Park.

SEC. 340. Section 301 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13211) is amended—

(1) by striking "or a dual fueled vehicle" at the end of subparagraph (3) and inserting "a dual fueled vehicle, or a neighborhood electric vehicle";

(2) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (13);

(3) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (14) and inserting "and"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(15) the term 'neighborhood electric vehicle' means a motor vehicle that qualifies as both—

"(A) a low-speed vehicle, as such term is defined in section 571.3(b) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations; and

"(B) a zero-emission vehicle, as such term is defined in section 86.1702-99 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.".

SEC. 341. **CONVEYANCE TO THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA.** Section 705(b) of the Clark County Conservation of Public Land and Natural Resources Act of 2002 (116 Stat. 2015) is amended by striking "parcels of land" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: "parcel of land identified as 'Tract C' on the map and the approximately 10 acres of land in Clark County, Nevada, described as follows: in the NW¹/₄ SE¹/₄ SW¹/₄ of section 28, T. 20 S., R. 60 E., Mount Diablo Base and Meridian.".

SEC. 342. **NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE REPORT.** Not later than December 1, 2003, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) describes—

(A) the various scenarios under which the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve may be used; and

(B) the underlying assumptions for each of the scenarios; and

(2) includes recommendations for alternative formulas to determine supply disruption.

SEC. 343. **CONGAREE SWAMP NATIONAL MONUMENT BOUNDARY REVISION.** The first section of Public Law 94-545 (90 Stat. 2517; 102 Stat. 2607) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking the last sentence; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(c) **ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may acquire by donation, by purchase from a willing seller with donated or appropriated funds, by transfer, or by exchange, land or an interest in land described in paragraph (2) for inclusion in the monument.

"(2) **DESCRIPTION OF LAND.**—The land referred to in paragraph (1) is the approximately 4,576 acres of land adjacent to the Monument, as depicted on the map entitled "Congaree National Park Boundary Map", numbered 178/80015, and dated August 2003.

"(3) **AVAILABILITY OF MAP.**—The map referred to in paragraph (2) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

"(4) **BOUNDARY REVISION.**—On acquisition of the land or an interest in land under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall revise the boundary of the monument to reflect the acquisition.

"(5) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Any land acquired by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be administered by the Secretary as part of the monument.

"(6) **EFFECT.**—Nothing in this section—

"(A) affects the use of private land adjacent to the monument;

"(B) preempts the authority of the State with respect to the regulation of hunting, fishing, boating, and wildlife management on private land or water outside the boundaries of the monument; or

"(C) negatively affects the economic development of the areas surrounding the monument.

"(d) **ACREAGE LIMITATION.**—The total acreage of the monument shall not exceed 26,776 acres.".

SEC. 344. Section 104 (16 U.S.C. 1374) is amended in subsection (c)(5)(D) by striking "the date of the enactment of the Marine Mammal Protection Act Amendments of 1994" and inserting "February 18, 1997".

SEC. 345. The business size restrictions for the rural business enterprise grants for Oakridge, Oregon do not apply.

TITLE IV—WILDLAND FIRE EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses to repay advances from other appropriations transferred in fiscal year 2003 for emergency rehabilitation and wild-fire suppression activities of the Department of the Interior, \$75,000,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of House Concurrent Resolution 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004: Provided further, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$75,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of \$75,000,000 as an emergency requirement as defined in House Concurrent Resolution 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

RELATED AGENCY

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses to repay advances from other appropriations transferred in fiscal year 2003 for wildfire suppression and emergency rehabilitation activities of the Forest Service, \$325,000,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of House Concurrent Resolution 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004: Provided further, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$325,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of \$325,000,000 as an emergency requirement as defined in House Concurrent Resolution 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

TITLE V—THE FLATHEAD AND KOOTENAI NATIONAL FOREST REHABILITATION ACT

SEC. 501. **SHORT TITLE.** This title may be cited as the "Flathead and Kootenai National Forest Rehabilitation Act of 2003".

SEC. 502. **FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.** (a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the Robert Fire and Wedge Fire of 2003 caused extensive resource damage in the Flathead National Forest;

(2) the fires of 2000 caused extensive resource damage on the Kootenai National Forest and implementation of rehabilitation and recovery projects developed by the agency for the Forest is critical;

(3) the environmental planning and analysis to restore areas affected by the Robert Fire and Wedge Fire will be completed through a collaborative community process;

(4) the rehabilitation of burned areas needs to be completed in a timely manner in order to reduce the long-term environmental impacts; and

(5) wildlife and watershed resource values will be maintained in areas affected by the Robert Fire and Wedge Fire while exempting the rehabilitation effort from certain applications of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Clean Water Act (CWA).

(b) The purpose of this title is to accomplish in a collaborative environment, the planning and rehabilitation of the Robert Fire and Wedge Fire and to ensure timely implementation of recovery and rehabilitation projects on the Kootenai National Forest.

SEC. 503. **REHABILITATION PROJECTS.** (a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Agriculture (in this

title referred to as the "Secretary") may conduct projects that the Secretary determines are necessary to rehabilitate and restore, and may conduct salvage harvests on, National Forest System lands in the North Fork drainage on the Flathead National Forest, as generally depicted on a map entitled "North Fork Drainage" which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of Chief, Forest Service, Washington, D.C.

(b) **PROCEDURE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided by this title, the Secretary shall conduct projects under this title in accordance with—

(A) the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(B) other applicable laws.

(2) **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OR IMPACT STATEMENT.**—If an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement (pursuant to section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2))) is required for a project under this title, the Secretary shall not be required to study, develop, or describe any alternative to the proposed agency action in the environmental assessment or the environmental impact statement.

(3) **PUBLIC COLLABORATION.**—To encourage meaningful participation during preparation of a project under this title, the Secretary shall facilitate collaboration among the State of Montana, local governments, and Indian tribes, and participation of interested persons, during the preparation of each project in a manner consistent with the Implementation Plan for the 10-year Comprehensive Strategy of a Collaborative Approach for Reducing Wildland Fire Risks to Communities and the Environment, dated May 2002, which was developed pursuant to the conference report for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (House Report 106-646).

(4) **COMPLIANCE WITH CLEAN WATER ACT.**—Consistent with the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) and Montana Code 75-5-703(10)(b), the Secretary is not prohibited from implementing projects under this title due to the lack of a Total Maximum Daily Load as provided for under section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(d)), except that the Secretary shall comply with any best management practices required by the State of Montana.

(5) **ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT CONSULTATION.**—If a consultation is required under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1536) for a project under this title, the Secretary of the Interior shall expedite and give precedence to such consultation over any similar requests for consultation by the Secretary.

(6) **ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.**—Section 322 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102-381; 16 U.S.C. 1612 note) and section 215 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations shall apply to projects under this title, except that—

(A) to be eligible to file an appeal, an individual or organization shall submit specific and substantive written comments during the comment period; and

(B) a determination that an emergency situation exists pursuant to section 215.10 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be made where it is determined that implementation of all or part of a decision for a project under this title is necessary for relief from—

(i) adverse effects on soil stability and water quality resulting from vegetation loss; or

(ii) loss of fish and wildlife habitat.

SEC. 504. CONTRACTING AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS. (a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary may enter into contract or cooperative agreements to carry out a project under this title.

(b) **EXEMPTION.**—Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary may limit competition for a contract or a cooperative agreement under subsection (a).

SEC. 505. MONITORING REQUIREMENTS. (a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish a multiparty monitoring group consisting of a representative number of interested parties, as determined by the Secretary, to monitor the performance and effectiveness of projects conducted under this title.

(b) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—The multiparty monitoring group shall prepare annually a report to the Secretary on the progress of the projects conducted under this title in rehabilitating and restoring the North Fork drainage. The Secretary shall submit the report to the Senate Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

SEC. 506. SUNSET. The authority for the Secretary to issue a decision to carry out a project under this title shall expire 5 years from the date of enactment.

SEC. 507. IMPLEMENTATION OF RECORDS OF DECISION. The Secretary of Agriculture shall publish new information regarding forest wide estimates of old growth from volume 103 of the administrative record in the case captioned *Ecology Center v. Castaneda*, CV-02-200-M-DWM (D. Mont.) for public comment for a 30-day period. The Secretary shall review any comments received during the comment period and decide whether to modify the Records of Decision (hereinafter referred to as the "ROD's") for the Pinkham, White Pine, Kelsey-Beaver, Gold/Boulder/Sullivan, and Pink Stone projects on the Kootenai National Forest. The ROD's, whether modified or not, shall not be deemed arbitrary and capricious under the NFMA, NEPA or other applicable law as long as each project area retains 10 percent designated old growth in the project area.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2004".

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1657

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I understand that S. 1657, which was introduced earlier today, is at the desk. I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1657) to amend section 44921 of title 49, United States Code, to provide for arming of cargo pilots against terrorism.

Mr. DEWINE. I now ask for its second reading and object to its second reading on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will have its second reading on the next legislative day.

TO REDESIGNATE THE FACILITY OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE LOCATED AT 48 SOUTH BROADWAY, NYACK, NEW YORK, AS THE "EDWARD O'GRADY, WAVERLY BROWN, PETER PAIGE POST OFFICE BUILDING"

Mr. DEWINE. I ask unanimous consent that the Governmental Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1591, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1591) to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at

48 South Broadway, Nyack, New York, as the "Edward O'Grady, Waverly Brown, Peter Paige Post Office Building."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DEWINE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to this bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1591) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1591

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF BUILDING.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 48 South Broadway, Nyack, New York, and known as the "Nyack Post Office" shall be known as the "Edward O'Grady, Waverly Brown, Peter Paige Post Office Building".

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Edward O'Grady, Waverly Brown, Peter Paige Post Office Building".

VIDEO VOYEURISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2003

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 228, S. 1301.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1301) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit video voyeurism in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

[Strike the part shown in black brackets and insert the part shown in italic.]

S. 1301

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 "Video Voyeurism Prevention Act of 2003".]

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION OF VIDEO VOYEURISM.

[(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 87 the following new chapter:

["CHAPTER 88—PRIVACY

["Sec.

["1801. Video voyeurism.

["§ 1801. Video voyeurism

["(a) Whoever, in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, having the intent to capture an improper image of an individual, knowingly does so under circumstances violating the privacy of that individual, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

["(b) In this section—

["(1) the term 'captures', with respect to an image, means videotapes, photographs, films, or records by any electronic means;

["(2) the term 'improper image', with respect to an individual, means an image, captured without the consent of that individual, of the naked or undergarment clad genitals, pubic area, buttocks, or female breast of that individual; and

["(3) the term 'under circumstances violating the privacy of that individual' means under circumstances in which the individual exhibits an expectation that the improper image would not be made, in a situation in which a reasonable person would be justified in that expectation."]

[(b) AMENDMENT TO PART ANALYSIS.—The table of chapters at the beginning of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 87 the following new item:

["88. Privacy 1801".]
SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Video Voyeurism Prevention Act of 2003".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION OF VIDEO VOYEURISM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 87 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 88—VIDEO VOYEURISM

"Sec.

"1801. Video voyeurism.

"§ 1801. Video voyeurism

"(a) Whoever, in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, having the intent to capture an improper image of an individual, knowingly does so and that individual's naked or undergarment clad genitals, pubic area, buttocks, or female breast is depicted in the improper image under circumstances in which that individual has a reasonable expectation of privacy regarding such body part or parts, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(b) In this section—

"(1) the term 'captures', with respect to an image, means videotapes, photographs, films, or records by any means or broadcasts;

"(2) the term 'female breast' means any portion of the female breast below the top of the areola;

"(3) the term 'improper image', with respect to an individual, means an image, captured without the consent of that individual, of the naked or undergarment clad genitals, pubic area, buttocks, or female breast of that individual; and

"(4) the term 'under circumstances in which that individual has a reasonable expectation of privacy' means—

"(A) circumstances in which a reasonable person would believe that he or she could disrobe in privacy, without being concerned that his or her image was being videotaped, photographed, filmed, broadcast, or otherwise recorded by any means; or

"(B) circumstances in which a reasonable person would believe that his or her naked or undergarment-clad pubic area, buttocks, genitals, or female breast would not be visible to the public, regardless of whether that person is in a public or private area.

"(c) This section shall not apply to any person engaged in lawful law enforcement or intelligence activities."

(b) AMENDMENT TO PART ANALYSIS.—The table of chapters at the beginning of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 87 the following new item:

"88. Video Voyeurism 1801".

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is passing S. 1301, the DeWine-Schumer-Leahy Video Voyeurism Prevention Act of 2003. This

bill targets the pernicious practice of invading a person's privacy through the surreptitious use of hidden surveillance equipment. Specifically, the bill makes it a crime to capture an improper, naked or near-naked image of a person without his or her consent, and in such a way as to violate his or her privacy. Any person found guilty of video voyeurism as outlined in the bill may be fined or imprisoned for up to one year, or both.

In recent years, the explosion of micro-camera technology has fed the growing phenomenon of video voyeurism. Hidden cameras have been discovered in bedrooms, bathrooms, public showers, changing rooms, locker rooms, and tanning salons, all aimed at filming unsuspecting victims in various states of undress. Often, the invasion of privacy is exacerbated when captured images are posted on the Internet for all the world to see.

I commend Senators DEWINE and SCHUMER for bringing this invasive practice to the attention of the Judiciary Committee, and for crafting a bill that addresses it in a thoughtful and measured manner. In addition, I thank them for addressing a concern I raised during the Committee's consideration of the bill. As introduced, the bill did not expressly prohibit "cyber-peeping"—a particularly offensive form of video voyeurism involving the contemporaneous transmission of improper images of a non-consenting person over the Internet through Web cameras and other means. As reported by the Judiciary Committee, the "cyber-peeping" loophole has been closed: The bill we pass today covers the simultaneous Web casting of images or any other transmissions that may not be recorded, so that defendants who use this means of violating people's privacy cannot escape punishment.

The National Center for Victims of Crime has dubbed video voyeurism "the new frontier of stalking." The States are already responding to this "new frontier" in many different ways. Some have passed video voyeurism laws; others have addressed the conduct within the context of their laws against stalking. The Video Voyeurism Prevention Act brings the Federal criminal laws to bear on those who commit this offense within the special maritime or territorial jurisdiction of the United States. It should be enacted without delay.

Mr. DEWINE. I ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill as amended be read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1301), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

**FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION
AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2003**

Mr. DEWINE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 245, S. 1244.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1244) to authorize appropriations for the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal years 2004 and 2005.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with amendments, as follows:

[Strike the part shown in black brackets and insert the part shown in italic.]

S. 1244

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 "Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act of 2003".

**SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS
FOR FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION.**

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Maritime Commission—

- (1) for fiscal year 2004, \$18,471,000; [and]
 - (2) for fiscal year 2005, [\$19,500,000].
- \$19,500,000;*
- (3) for fiscal year 2006, \$20,750,000;
 - (4) for fiscal year 2007, \$21,500,000; and
 - (5) for fiscal year 2008, \$22,575,000."

**SEC. 3. CHAIRMAN DESIGNATED WITH SENATE
CONFIRMATION.**

Section 102(b) of the Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961 (5 U.S.C. 903 nt) is amended by striking "President" and inserting "President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,".

SEC. 4. REPORT ON OCEAN SHIPPING INFORMATION GATHERING EFFORTS.

The Federal Maritime Commission shall transmit to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure a report within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the status of any agreements, or ongoing discussions with, other Federal, State, or local government agencies concerning the sharing of ocean shipping information for the purpose of assisting law enforcement or anti-terrorism efforts. The Commission shall include in the report recommendations on how the Commission's ocean shipping information could be better utilized by it and other Federal agencies to improve port security.

Amend the title so as to read "A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal years 2004 through 2008."

Mr. DEWINE. I ask unanimous consent that the committee reported amendments be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read the third time and passed, the title amendment be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 1244), as amended, was considered read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1244

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 "Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act of 2003".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Maritime Commission—

- (1) for fiscal year 2004, \$18,471,000; [and]
- (2) for fiscal year 2005, \$19,500,000; \$19,500,000;
- (3) for fiscal year 2006, \$20,750,000;
- (4) for fiscal year 2007, \$21,500,000; and
- (5) for fiscal year 2008, \$22,575,000."

SEC. 3. CHAIRMAN DESIGNATED WITH SENATE CONFIRMATION.

Section 102(b) of the Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961 (5 U.S.C. 903 nt) is amended by striking "President" and inserting "President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,".

SEC. 4. REPORT ON OCEAN SHIPPING INFORMATION GATHERING EFFORTS.

The Federal Maritime Commission shall transmit to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure a report within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the status of any agreements, or ongoing discussions with, other Federal, State, or local government agencies concerning the sharing of ocean shipping information for the purpose of assisting law enforcement or anti-terrorism efforts. The Commission shall include in the report recommendations on how the Commission's ocean shipping information could be better utilized by it and other Federal agencies to improve port security.

Amend the title so as to read "A bill To authorize appropriations for the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal years 2004 through 2008.".

The title amendment was agreed to.

NATIONAL CYSTIC FIBROSIS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar 290, S. Res. 98.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 98) expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week of October 12, 2003, through October 18, 2003, as "National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Week".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, as follows:

[Omit the part in black brackets].

S. RES. 98

Whereas cystic fibrosis, characterized by digestive disorders and chronic lung infections, is a fatal lung disease;

Whereas cystic fibrosis is one of the most common fatal genetic diseases in the United States and one for which there is no known cure;

Whereas more than 10,000,000 Americans are unknowing carriers of the cystic fibrosis gene;

Whereas 1 out of every 3,500 babies born in the United States is born with cystic fibrosis;

Whereas approximately 30,000 people in the United States, many of whom are children, have cystic fibrosis;

Whereas the average life expectancy of an individual with cystic fibrosis is 33 years;

Whereas prompt, aggressive treatment of the symptoms of cystic fibrosis can extend the lives of those who have this disease;

Whereas recent advances in cystic fibrosis research have produced promising leads in gene, protein, and drug therapies beneficial to persons afflicted with the disease;

Whereas this innovative research is progressing faster and is being conducted more aggressively than ever before, due in part to the establishment of a model clinical trials network by the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation; and

Whereas education of the public on cystic fibrosis, including the symptoms of the disease, increases knowledge and understanding of cystic fibrosis and promotes early diagnoses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. NATIONAL CYSTIC FIBROSIS AWARENESS.

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week of October 12, 2003, through October 18, 2003, as "National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Week".

(b) PROCLAMATION.—The Senate requests the President to issue a proclamation—

(1) designating the week of October 12, 2003 through October 18, 2003, as "National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Week"; and

(2) calling on the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

[(c) ADDITIONAL ACTION.—The Senate commits to increasing the quality of life for individuals with cystic fibrosis by promoting public knowledge and understanding in a manner that will result in earlier diagnoses, more fund-raising efforts for research, and increased levels of support for those with cystic fibrosis and their families.]

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the amendment to the resolution be agreed to, the resolution, as amended, be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 98), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 98

Whereas cystic fibrosis, characterized by digestive disorders and chronic lung infections, is a fatal lung disease;

Whereas cystic fibrosis is one of the most common fatal genetic diseases in the United States and one for which there is no known cure;

Whereas more than 10,000,000 Americans are unknowing carriers of the cystic fibrosis gene;

Whereas 1 out of every 3,500 babies born in the United States is born with cystic fibrosis;

Whereas approximately 30,000 people in the United States, many of whom are children, have cystic fibrosis;

Whereas the average life expectancy of an individual with cystic fibrosis is 33 years;

Whereas prompt, aggressive treatment of the symptoms of cystic fibrosis can extend the lives of those who have this disease;

Whereas recent advances in cystic fibrosis research have produced promising leads in

gene, protein, and drug therapies beneficial to persons afflicted with the disease;

Whereas this innovative research is progressing faster and is being conducted more aggressively than ever before, due in part to the establishment of a model clinical trials network by the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation; and

Whereas education of the public on cystic fibrosis, including the symptoms of the disease, increases knowledge and understanding of cystic fibrosis and promotes early diagnoses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. NATIONAL CYSTIC FIBROSIS AWARENESS.

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week of October 12, 2003, through October 18, 2003, as "National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Week".

(b) PROCLAMATION.—The Senate requests the President to issue a proclamation—

(1) designating the week of October 12, 2003 through October 18, 2003, as "National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Week"; and

(2) calling on the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

HONORING WOODSTOCK, VERMONT NATIVE HIRAM POWERS

NATIONAL MAMMOGRAPHY DAY

Mr. DEWINE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar Nos. 291 and 292, en bloc.

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

Mr. DEWINE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to en bloc, the preambles be agreed to en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc; further that any statements relating to these resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolutions (S. Res. 209 and S. Res. 222) were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

The resolutions, with their preambles, are as follows:

S. RES. 209

Whereas Hiram Powers is one of the pre-eminent artists in American sculpture;

Whereas Hiram Powers, in the words of the director and curator of the Houston Museum of Fine Arts, was the artist who "put American sculpture on the map," gaining international fame and providing unprecedented support for the notion of the United States as a country capable of producing artists equal to or better than their international counterparts;

Whereas Powers' 1844 sculpture "Greek Slave" became, in the words of Powers biographer Richard Wunder, "a telling symbol" of freedom for Americans in the pre-Civil War years and remains unequaled in popularity among American sculptures;

Whereas Powers' bust of President Andrew Jackson is widely considered the finest portrait ever sculpted of the president, as well as one of the noblest examples of portraiture ever created by an American sculptor;

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in recognition of Powers' extraordinary talents, awarded him commissions to execute

the statues of John Marshall, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson that stand today in the United States Capitol;

Whereas Powers preserved through his sculpture the memory of numerous other great Americans, including George Washington, John Quincy Adams, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Martin Van Buren, and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow;

Whereas Powers was born in 1805 in Woodstock, Vermont, and happily spent his early years in that town;

Whereas throughout his life, Powers held sacred the memories of his childhood in Woodstock and drew upon these memories as inspiration for his work, saying, "dreams often take me back to Woodstock and set me down upon the green hills"; and

Whereas the citizens of Woodstock, Vermont, are preparing to celebrate the bicentennial of Hiram Powers' birth with exhibits, symposiums, and other commemorative activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes and honors Woodstock, Vermont, native Hiram Powers for his extraordinary and enduring contributions to American sculpture.

S. RES. 222

Whereas according to the American Cancer Society, in 2003, 211,300 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer and 39,800 women will die from this disease;

Whereas it is estimated that about 2,000,000 women were diagnosed with breast cancer in the 1990s, and that in nearly 500,000 of those cases, the cancer resulted in death;

Whereas African-American women suffer a 30 percent greater mortality from breast cancer than White women and more than a 100 percent greater mortality from breast cancer than women from Hispanic, Asian, and American Indian populations;

Whereas the risk of breast cancer increases with age, with a woman at age 70 years having twice as much of a chance of developing the disease as a woman at age 50 years;

Whereas at least 80 percent of the women who get breast cancer have no family history of the disease;

Whereas mammograms, when operated professionally at a certified facility, can provide safe screening and early detection of breast cancer in many women;

Whereas mammography is an excellent method for early detection of localized breast cancer, which has a 5-year survival rate of more than 97 percent;

Whereas the National Cancer Institute and the American Cancer Society continue to recommend periodic mammograms; and

Whereas the National Breast Cancer Coalition recommends that each woman and her health care provider make an individual decision about mammography: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 17, 2003, as "National Mammography Day"; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate programs and activities.

HONORING DETROIT SHOCK ON WINNING WOMEN'S NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 234 submitted earlier today by Senators STABENOW and LEVIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 234) honoring the Detroit Shock on winning the Women's National Basketball Association Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I offer a resolution congratulating the Detroit Shock for winning the Women's National Basketball Association Championship.

In a remarkable display of talent, hard work and tenacity, the Shock captured the championship in the very next year after placing last in their league. Over the last 100 years, not a single other team in any major sport has been able to accomplish this feat.

Last Tuesday, in front of a WNBA record crowd of 22,000 people at the Palace in Auburn Hills, the Detroit Shock defeated the two-time defending champion Los Angeles Sparks to win Detroit's first WNBA title. Ruth Riley, the game's Most Valuable Player, led the Shock by playing the best game of her career. She scored 27 points and guarded another all-star center. This season's Rookie of the Year, Cheryl Ford, also played a great game. Ms. Ford is the only WNBA rookie ever to average more than 10 points and 10 rebounds a game.

Bill Laimbeer, in his first season as a coach, led the Shock during this remarkable season. Mr. Laimbeer has also brought two back-to-back championship titles to Detroit with the NBA's Detroit Pistons. Soon, the address of the Palace at Auburn Hills will be renamed "Three Championship Drive" to honor these accomplishments.

I would like to congratulate all of the players, coaches and support staff that have made this championship possible. This was truly a great victory for fans in Detroit and across the state of Michigan. And next year, we are hoping for a repeat.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, it is my great pleasure to congratulate the Detroit Shock on their victory of the Women's National Basketball Association, WNBA, Championship. Last week, the Detroit Shock defeated the two-time defending WNBA champion Los Angeles Sparks, 83-78. The Detroit Shock victory is the first professional basketball championship for the city of Detroit since the Detroit Pistons won back-to-back championships in 1988 and 1989.

The Detroit Shock's exceptional season broke several WNBA records. I am proud to say that the Shock is the first team in American professional sports since 1890 to go from the worst in their league to the best the following year. The Detroit Shock finished the year with the best record in the league at 25-9. Also, Game 3 of the finals was the highest scoring WNBA finals game in the history of the league, as well as the highest attended game in the league's

7-year history. The Palace of Auburn Hills hosted the sellout crowd of 22,076 fans.

In the final game of the best of three series, Ruth Riley, the 6-foot 5-inch center for the Shock, dominated the court. She scored a career-high 27 points and was named the final's Most Valuable Player. Deanna Nolan from Flint, MI scored 17 points, including a three-point shot with less than a minute left, giving the Shock a 75-73 lead. Swin Cash, the Shock's starting forward, added 13 points, 12 rebounds, and nine assists. The league's rebounds leader and Rookie of the Year, Cheryl Ford, contributed 10 points and 12 rebounds for the Shock. The WNBA Champions were led by their head coach, Bill Laimbeer, himself an instrumental player in the Detroit Pistons' Championship. The finishing touch was added to the season when Coach Laimbeer was named the Coach of the Year.

Detroit Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick declared September 18, 2003 as Detroit Shock Day and the Palace of Auburn Hills has officially changed its address to Three Championship Drive. I am pleased to join Senator STABENOW and my colleagues in the Senate in offering my heartiest congratulations to the Detroit Shock as the players, coaches, staff, and fans celebrate their first Women's National Basketball Association Championship. I look forward to another successful season next year. And, we in Detroit hope that the Shock's worst-to-first season will serve as an inspiration to the Detroit Tigers next year.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD, without intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 234) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 234), with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 234

Whereas on September 16, 2003, the Detroit Shock won the Women's National Basketball Association Championship by defeating the 2-time defending champion Los Angeles Sparks, 83 to 78;

Whereas the Shock won a league-best 25 games, a year after losing a league-worst 23, becoming the first team in any major sport since 1890 to finish first in the entire league after finishing last the previous season;

Whereas the enthusiasm and support for the Shock by the people of Detroit and of Michigan was clearly demonstrated by the fact that the final game was attended by a Women's National Basketball Association (WNBA) record crowd of over 22,000 people;

Whereas the Shock completed an incredible season with the strong performances of Finals Most Valuable Player Ruth Riley's career-high 27 points, Swin Cash's 13 points, 12 rebounds and 9 assists, and Deanna Nolan's 17 points;

Whereas Cheryl Ford, the 2003 WNBA Rookie of the Year, became the first rookie in league history to average more than 10 points and 10 rebounds per game;

Whereas Detroit Shock Head Coach Bill Laimbeer was named 2003 WNBA Coach of the Year after transforming the Shock into the best team in the league in his first year as head coach;

Whereas in honor of the Shock's championship, the Palace of Auburn Hills is officially changing its address to Three Championship Drive; and

Whereas the Shock have demonstrated great strength, skill, and perseverance during the 2003 season and have made the entire State of Michigan proud: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Detroit Shock on winning the 2003 Women's National Basketball Association Championship and recognizes all the players, coaches, support staff, and fans who were instrumental in this achievement; and

(2) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Detroit Shock for appropriate display.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2003

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Friday, September 26. I further ask unanimous consent that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be

approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 2765, the District of Columbia appropriations bill.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, tomorrow the Senate will resume consideration of the District of Columbia appropriations bill. The two managers will be here tomorrow, and Senators are encouraged to come to the floor to offer and debate their amendments. There will be no rolcall votes tomorrow. Any votes ordered during tomorrow's session will be stacked to occur on Monday at approximately 5:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:26 p.m., adjourned until Friday, September 26, 2003, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 25, 2003:

THE JUDICIARY

GREGORY E. JACKSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE MILDRED M. EDWARDS, RETIRED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOSEPH L. YAKOVAC JR.,
0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL A. MANSUETO, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203, 12212 AND 1552:

To be colonel

RONALD C. DANIELSON, 0000

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 25, 2003:

THE JUDICIARY

DANA MAKOTO SABRAW, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

MICHAEL W. MOSMAN, OF OREGON, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON.