

only by continuing to remember and discuss the horrors which befell the Armenian and other peoples that we can hope to achieve a world where genocide is finally relegated to the realm of history books, rather than newspaper headlines. I hope my colleagues and leaders throughout the world will join me in commemorating the anniversary today, and thus ensure that the tragedy of the Armenian genocide will not be forgotten.

DIMINISHING PROSPECTS FOR PEACE IN THE BALKANS—A FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE STAFF REPORT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, during the recess, two members of my Foreign Relations Committee staff traveled to Croatia, Bosnia, and Serbia to examine the wide range of issues related to the conflicts in the region, and their implications for United States policy.

The situation in Bosnia is unraveling quickly, and with the Senate likely to consider legislation concerning Bosnia in the coming weeks, I think it is important for my colleagues to be aware of the staff's findings.

Among other things, the staff found that as the situation in Bosnia deteriorates, the United Nations may be forced to withdraw from Bosnia and Croatia for any number of reasons, including: a worsening security situation, a shortage of world food stocks, a loss of local employees to the draft, or a lifting of the arms embargo.

The United States has pledged to participate in a NATO effort to withdraw U.N. troops. According to the staff report, a NATO operation in Bosnia would be costly, would require a long lead time, and would likely occur under hostile circumstances. The report finds that NATO is not prepared to extract U.N. troops immediately should that become necessary.

The report also raises some serious questions about the federation agreement between Bosnia's Croats and Muslims as well as about Croatia's intentions. It questions the prospects for peace negotiations regarding the Serb-held Krajina region of Croatia.

Finally, the report finds that Serbia is continuing to fuel both the Krajina and Bosnian Serb war machines. Despite this fact, last Friday, the United Nations voted to extend sanctions relief for 75 days. The report recommends that the United Nations resist further sanctions relief until Serbia ends all assistance to the Bosnian and Krajina Serbs.

Mr. President, as I mentioned, we may be asked next month to vote to lift the arms embargo against the Bosnian Government. I believe that the staff report may be a useful resource as we move into the debate. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the key findings of the report be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, April 24, 1995.

Hon. JESSE HELMS,
Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HELMS AND SENATOR PELL: On behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, we travelled to Croatia, Bosnia, and Serbia from April 7 through 15 to examine the wide range of issues related to the conflicts in the region, and their implications for U.S. policy.

In Croatia, we visited Zagreb, Osijek, and in Sector East, Vukovar, the border crossings at Batina Bridge, Lipovac, and other areas. We visited Mostar, the largest city in the part of Bosnia controlled by the Muslim-Croat federation. We were unable to visit Sarajevo as planned due to the closing of the Sarajevo airport as our plane was enroute to the city. The airport remained closed throughout our visit to the region. In Serbia, we visited Belgrade and the Sremska Raca border with Bosnia.

We met with Croatian and Serbian government officials, opposition leaders, religious leaders, foreign and local journalists, academics, local citizens, military and civilian representatives of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), the United Nations High Commissioner on Refugees (UNHCR), NATO, and of international and local non-governmental organizations. We also met representatives of U.S. and foreign embassies, the European Community Monitoring Mission (ECMM), Sanctions Assistance Monitors (SAMs), and monitors of the International Conference on former Yugoslavia (ICFY).

We are grateful to Ambassador Peter W. Galbraith and his staff in Zagreb as well as to Rudolph Perina, the U.S. Chief of Mission and his staff in Belgrade. Their cooperation was instrumental to this report. We would particularly like to thank Foreign Service officers Rick Holtzapfel, Andrew Hamilton, and Madeline Seidenstricker as well as Tim Knight, of the Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART), for their able assistance.

The conclusions in this report are our own, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Committee on Foreign Relations or its Members.

Sincerely,

EDWIN K. HALL,
Minority Staff Director
and *Chief Counsel.*

MICHELLE MAYNARD,
Minority Professional Staff
Member for European Affairs.

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

The situation in Bosnia is unraveling. The Bosnian Serbs are responding to recent limited Bosnian Government military gains with brutal attacks against civilians and U.N. peacekeepers.

The United Nations may be forced to withdraw from Bosnia and Croatia for any number of reasons, including: a deteriorating security situation, a shortage of world food stocks, a loss of local employees to the draft, or a lifting of the arms embargo.

The United States has pledged to participate in a NATO effort to withdraw U.N. troops. A NATO operation in Bosnia would be costly, would require a long lead time, and would likely occur under hostile circumstances. NATO is not prepared to extract U.N. troops immediately should that become necessary.

Croatia is supporting a federation between Bosnian Croats and Muslims as a means to retake Serb-controlled territory by force and to annex Hercegovina.

Croatia's military strategy, if continued, will make impossible the successful conclu-

sion of peace negotiations and lead to full scale war in the Serb-held Krajina region of Croatia.

The agreement bringing an end to fighting between Bosnian Muslims and Croats was a tremendous achievement for U.S. diplomacy. That being said, however, Croats and Muslims have made no progress in implementing a political and economic alliance. Despite significant U.S. and European financial and political support for the Bosnian federation, prospects for such an alliance appear dim.

Serbia is continuing to fuel both the Krajina and Bosnian Serb war machines. The land border between Serbia and Bosnia may be "effectively closed" as called for by U.N. Security Council Resolutions 943 (1994) and 970 (1995) but oil, military equipment, and other sensitive material pass daily from Serbia through Croatia's Sector East and into other parts of Serb-held Croatia and Bosnia. The United Nations recently voted to extend sanctions relief for 75 days. It should resist further sanctions relief until Serbia ends all assistance to the Bosnian and Krajina Serbs.

International sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro are not working. Belgrade is awash in consumer goods; gasoline costs less than it does in Germany; and Serbia's basic infrastructure continues to function.

Sanctions against Serbia appear to have strengthened rather than weakened President Slobodan Milosevic, who effectively uses the state-controlled media to blame Serbia's economic conditions on the West. Even if sanctions are not having their desired impact, Serbia should not be rewarded with a lifting of sanctions unless it recognizes the borders of all the states of the former Yugoslavia and ends its support for the Bosnian and Krajina Serbs.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been noted. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

COMMONSENSE PRODUCT LIABILITY AND LEGAL REFORM ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is considering the Product Liability Fairness Act this week. The time for legal reform is long overdue. I am anxious, as one Senator, to get this debate underway. I particularly want to congratulate the bill's chief sponsors, Senator GORTON and Senator ROCKEFELLER, for guiding the bill swiftly through the Commerce Committee, and I applaud Senator DOLE's leadership in bringing the issue promptly to the floor.

I might say, having been involved in this issue for now 11 years, going back to a prior period of Republican majority as chairman of the Court Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, we listened to lots of hearings and

lots of talk, and I am glad we may finally have a realistic shot at civil litigation reform in this country.

Mr. President, while I am a cosponsor of S. 565, I also support the effort that will be made this week to broaden the scope of this bill. The American people are frustrated with our legal system. Everywhere I turn, I read and hear about terrible experiences people have when they find themselves inside the liability maze. People with real injuries too often do not get fairly treated. Meanwhile, too many frivolous cases clog the courts. The truth is the litigation system is like a day in Las Vegas or Atlantic City: Sometimes you can win big, but more often the house—that is the system, the lawyers and the courts—win the biggest profits. And the money that goes to the lawyers and the court system is significantly more than the money received by the injured parties. According to the Rand Corp., a full 57 cents of every dollar spent in the liability system is eaten up by the system itself. The injured get less than half, only 43 cents, Mr. President, of every dollar.

What does this mean for the American people? It means they pay more for the goods and services they buy in the economy, and it also means that businesses develop fewer new products, pursue less innovation and create fewer jobs.

The tort tax, Mr. President, is real, and reforming our legal system would mean a real tax break for the American people, a tax cut that will not require an offset and will not risk the Social Security System trust fund. One firm, Tillinghast, estimates that the litigation system costs every individual in our Nation \$1,200 annually.

In a recent study, the Rand Corp. looked at the overuse and abuse of our health care system which is driven by the litigation system. In examining only the auto tort system—just for automobiles, Mr. President—Rand found that excess medical claiming, driven by the prospect of reaping a windfall from the legal system, consumed \$4 billion worth of health care resources in 1993 alone. That is the same year Mrs. Clinton's task force proposed a restructuring of our health care system. Evidently, the real answer is right here in our legal system. That same Rand study estimated consumers paid in 1993, \$13 billion to \$18 billion in excess auto insurance premiums because of the litigation craze.

So, make no mistake about it. This debate is about the economy and it is about taxes. If we are serious about tax relief for the middle-class family, let us reform our legal system. Let us cut the cost of an 8-foot ladder by 20 percent or the doctor's fee for a tonsillectomy by 33 percent. We can do it by reforming the legal system.

The American people want us to change our civil justice system. Survey after survey show the frustration of the American people with our legal system. For example, a couple months

ago, U.S. News & World Report wrote that 69 percent of Americans find that lawyers are only sometimes or not often honest. Can you imagine? Honesty in the legal profession is not seen as normative behavior. As a lawyer myself, I have to say that I am horrified that such a huge majority of the American people have reached that conclusion. Yet, the organized bar resists any serious or meaningful changes to the legal system.

Last month, the Luntz Research Group found that an overwhelming 83 percent of the American people think our liability lawsuit system has major problems and needs serious improvement. Sixty-four percent of the people believe the liability system is out of control, costing everyone a lot of money and doing a whole lot of damage to our economy. And 79 percent to 83 percent of Americans support specific reforms, such as reasonable limits on punitive damages, abolishing joint liability for noneconomic damages, and loser pays where the judge finds the case to be completely frivolous.

Two generations ago, lawyers acted as statesmen who moderated their clients' behavior. In that bygone era of the 1950's, there was 1 lawyer for every 695 people. Today, there is 1 lawyer for every 290 people; and since lawyers thrive on conflict, they operate as gladiator-litigators, "ransack[ing] the legal cupboard for nostrums to rectify every wrong, to ward off every risk and to cure every social and economic ill," as Harvard Professor Mary Ann Glendon has written in her new book, "A Nation Under Lawyers: How the Crisis in the Legal Profession Is Transforming American Society."

The result is a sue-happy America, destructive to our democratic culture of debate, persuasion, accommodation, and tolerance.

So, make no mistake about it. We have embarked on a fundamental debate about the nature of American society. The legal system, and law in general, is too pervasive a force in people's lives. The reforms debated this week will be about returning the legal system to its appropriate place and to restoring fairness and certainty to the liability system.

The product liability arena is a good place to start. This bill will give some relief to those who sell goods but have no role in their manufacture.

The injured party will be able to recover, but only from the company that caused the injury, that is, the company that made the product. Sellers will only be liable for those warranties they make, or if they commit some act of negligence regarding the product, or in the rare situation that the manufacturer cannot be sued or has no money to pay the damages.

This bill also relieves defendants of liability where the plaintiff was primarily responsible for his or her own injuries due to the use of alcohol or drugs. And, the manufacturer will have limited liability if the plaintiff has

misused or altered the product. The bill also restores the element of punishment to punitive damages, by linking them to the economic harm caused.

And, it will eliminate the deep pocket lawsuits, where a defendant with a remote connection to the injuring event is held responsible for all the harm caused. For noneconomic damages, the bill provides for several, not joint, liability.

This bill also includes an important title on biomaterials access, an issue championed by Senator LIEBERMAN and one which we included in our medical malpractice reform bill.

Excessive litigation is causing important suppliers of raw materials used in medical devices to withdraw their raw materials from the marketplace. The result is that individuals with rare medical disorders find themselves without access to lifesaving medical implants.

The bill will shield these raw materials suppliers from liability, where they can establish they had no involvement in the design or production of the medical device. Without this reform, the litigation system will bear the responsibility for the death and injuries of countless Americans. We cannot allow our runaway liability system to harm innocent people.

So, this is a good place to start the debate. We will have a number of amendments, including the addition of medical malpractice reform to this bill, as well as amendments to broaden the punitive damages and joint and several liability provisions, and some provisions from a bill I introduced earlier this session with Senator ABRAHAM, on attorneys' fees and an early offer or rapid recovery mechanism.

This will be a watershed debate in the Senate. There will be many accusations thrown at the reformers this week. The opponents will charge that we reformers just want to deprive injured people of fair compensation. Nothing could be further from the truth. The proponents of reform want to give the American people what they deserve: a legal system that is rational and fair, one that is available when they need it to resolve disputes, and that has some predictability and certainty to it, affording the injured in our society fair and adequate compensation, and holding those truly responsible for the injuries properly accountable.

The American people will be watching us and waiting for results.

Again, Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Washington, Senator GORTON, the Senator from West Virginia, Senator ROCKEFELLER, my colleague from Michigan, Senator ABRAHAM, who has also been heavily involved in this issue and thank them for the contributions that they have made and to say I look forward with great anticipation to the week's debate on this most important subject.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, the issue of product liability reform is very well known now to Senators after many years. I look forward to the debate that we begin today and in these coming days, because I believe the bill we are going to be considering, S. 565, Product Liability Fairness Act, builds upon past deliberations of this body to achieve reform in the moderate, bipartisan fashion which has been the nature in which we have approached this problem.

I want to pause for a moment to thank my remarkable colleague and friend, SLADE GORTON, for all of his efforts and counsel in crafting this bill and for setting a feeling about it which is efficient, temperate, wise, unemotional and lends itself to the collection of votes.

In addition, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator DODD, Senator HATCH, Senator MCCONNELL, have played really critical roles in rating this legislation and bringing us to this point in our deliberation. The Senate has considered the topic of product liability reform for over 14 years. And six times the Commerce Committee has reported bills favorably to the floor. Most recently, the committee reported out the current bill, S. 565, by a vote of 13 to 6 on April 6. We have persisted in our efforts to reform the laws governing product liability because we believe that the current system is broken and that we can make changes that will benefit both consumers and makers of products. We have tried and, I think, succeeded, in achieving balance in our effort to streamline the law along these lines. We have simultaneously reduced costs and delays for both plaintiffs and defendants.

In 1985, when I first came to the Senate—that was my first year in the Senate—and joined the Commerce Committee, I in fact voted against a product liability reform measure pending at that time. The committee vote, because of my vote, was tied and the vote, therefore, failed. I felt strongly that the version of the bill then being considered aided manufacturers at the expense of safe products for American consumers. That was my view.

Since then, the product liability effort has changed 180 degrees. The legislation has evolved gradually into an evenhanded, moderate approach that we are considering here today. Senator GORTON and I have worked diligently over recent months to hone the bill that we are looking at today to ensure that it strikes the right balance between the interests of both consumers and business, and we do mean that. Ad-

justments were made to reflect substantive and other concerns which we concluded were obstacles to the enactment of this bill. We believe we have significantly improved the legislation from earlier drafts and have been responsive to the issues which prevented earlier enactment of this legislation.

Let me draw my colleagues' attention to the substantive changes made in this year's bill compared with the version introduced in the last Congress. The most significant change addresses concerns that have been raised about excessive punitive damages, damages that are awarded to punish and to deter wrongdoing. This year's bill establishes a standard for awarding punitive damages that is essentially unchanged from last year's bill. We have, however, added a provision that requires punitive damages to be awarded in proportion to the harm caused, at a ratio of three times the claimant's economic loss, or \$250,000, whichever is greater. I might say that this approach to punitive damages is well within the construct of the law in many areas. Our rationale for this ratio is the goal of bringing to punitive damages some relationship between the size of the harm and the punishment, a goal supported by the American Bar Association, the American College of Trial Lawyers, the American Law Institute and, in fact, the U.S. Supreme Court.

Also concerning punitive damages, we eliminated the Government standards defenses in last year's bill, referred to as the FDA and FAA defenses, which would have prevented punitive damages for instances in which certain classes of products such as drugs, medical devices, or certain types of aircraft had been certified by the Federal Government as safe. While I remain supportive of the concept of a Government standards defense, nevertheless, a number of Senators expressed reservation during last year's debate about this provision, and we have accommodated those concerns by removing the provision.

Another change in this year's legislation concerns the statute of repose which we have slightly modified to include a category of products known as durable goods used in the workplace. Last year's bill was restricted to workplace capital goods, a slightly narrower category. Workplace durable goods are defined as having an economic lifespan of 3 years, or being depreciable under the Tax Code. The workplace distinction, identical to last year's bill, preserves the intent of increasing incentives for employers to maintain the safety of equipment used in the place of employment, rather than shifting that responsibility off to a manufacturer even after the useful life of the product in question has expired. In addition, we have moved the statute of repose period to 20 years. Last year it was 25 years. People will say, well, that is 5 years less. Well, it may be, but it is still longer than any State statute of repose anywhere in the Nation by at

least 5 years. I think the average is around 10 to 12 years. One State has 15 years. Ours is 20 years. We think that is trying to lean a little bit toward the consumer.

The third significant change made prior to introduction of this year's bill concerns the addition of a provision that had been part of last year's House companion bill that requires a reduction of a claimant's award due to unforeseeable misuse or alteration of the product. For example, if someone purchases a hair dryer that has attached to it a large warning label stating "please do not use this in the bath tub," and the purchaser immediately uses the hair dryer in the bath tub with probable adverse consequences, it does not make sense to hold the manufacturer liable for such misuse, and this provision would prevent that.

In addition to the changes made prior to introduction, several substantive changes were made in the Commerce Committee markup of the bill itself. First, we incorporated a bill, S. 303, the Biomaterials Access Assurance Act, introduced by Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator MCCAIN, as title II of our committee-reported product liability bill. This title of the bill is designed to ensure that needed raw materials are available to the manufacturers of medical devices by limiting the liability for firms that supply biomaterials. The title only limits liability for suppliers who have done nothing wrong. The ability of consumers to recover from negligent device manufacturers is preserved.

We made several other substantive changes in the committee markup. We modified our product seller provision to extend protection to blameless rental and leasing companies. This will address the fact that in 11 States car rental companies can be forced to pay for damage caused by people who rent their cars, even though the car rental companies obviously did not make the car and did not do anything wrong. We made a change to the statute of repose that will ensure that manufacturers keep their promise by enabling injured workers to sue for damage caused by products over 20 years old if the manufacturers guaranteed their product's safety for a longer period.

Finally, we modified our alternative dispute resolution provision which gives States an incentive to create pro-plaintiff, voluntary, nonbinding arbitration mechanisms.

This provision contains a penalty for defendants who unreasonably refuse to participate in the arbitration. A criticism was raised during our committee hearings on the bill that greater specificity was needed for the definition of unreasonable refusal, so a set of factors was added to address that concern.

Mr. President, I will have a lot more to say about the substance of the bill as this debate unfolds, but I know there is at least one other Senator who

wishes to speak, so I will keep my remarks brief. Let me conclude by stating the reasons we must pass product liability reform this year after all of these years.

Under our current system, injured consumers often find it impossible to get just and prompt resolution. Just as frequently, blameless manufacturers are forced to spend thousands of dollars on baseless lawsuits. The system frequently allows negligent companies to avoid penalties and even rewards undeserving plaintiffs.

Product liability law should deter wasteful suits and discipline culpable practices, but not foster hours of waste and endless, endless, endless litigation. The adverse effect of having a hodgepodge of rules is severe for everyone. In fact, is a rather major fact in American life, I might add.

Injured persons and those who make products alike face a 55-unit roulette wheel when it comes to determining rights and responsibilities. The results hurt everyone.

Injured persons have testified that they may be unable to obtain needed medical devices for their continued health and well-being, and there is a lot of very powerful testimony on that front. Manufacturers have indicated that good and useful products are not placed on the market. The Brookings Institution has documented many instances where safety improvements were not made because of fears about uncertainties in our legal system, which brings up the sort of fascinating concept that manufacturers will decline to improve a product for fear that that lends the implication that the product that they previously had was somehow insufficient.

It is now a fact of life in many places where they simply, therefore, do not improve the product so as not to make themselves liable to that interpretation, all of which, of course, is absolutely ridiculous. Included in the Brookings discussion were, for example, built-in child seats and air bags.

As I have studied this complex area, I found incentives for preventing accidents are often not in the right place. In formulating our bill, we have striven to place incentive on the person who can best prevent an injury. This is a matter that has not been given adequate attention during past debates, but given the opportunity to carefully study our bill, Senators, I believe, will see that care and thought has been invested to assure that no wrongdoer goes unpunished and that positive prosafety behavior is encouraged.

For all of these reasons I very much look forward to our debate. I welcome the criticisms, the insights, and the suggestions for improvements that I am sure our colleagues will contribute during the process of this debate.

I yield the floor.

TRAGEDY IN OKLAHOMA—THE LESSONS FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to express on my own behalf, and on behalf of the people of the State of Ohio, our deepest sympathy with and for the people of the State of Oklahoma as they cope with the devastating tragedy that took place last Wednesday. Our hearts go out to victims and the victims' families. No one, Mr. President, could watch yesterday's memorial service and see the pictures of the victims, the pictures of the children, without a lump in their throat or having to turn away from the screen.

Mr. President, I want to congratulate the rescue workers and all the volunteers, as well as the police—both the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the local police officers—who have proven to a concerned America that we will, in fact, fight back against terrorism.

Mr. President, when Oklahoma State trooper Charlie Hanger arrested one of the suspects in Oklahoma, he was acting on behalf of all Americans. He did not know at the time, of course, that he was arresting a terrorist. He was simply doing his job, the job that he does day in and day out.

He pulled over a motorist apparently for suspicion of speeding. The motorist said he was driving cross-country—but the officer noticed the driver had not gotten comfortable the way most cross-country drivers do. He still had his jacket on. He did not have any luggage.

Mr. President, noticing details like that is the very heart of good police work. When the motorist leaned over, the policeman saw the bulge of a concealed weapon and at that point arrested him.

Officer Hanger brought in the suspicious motorist. Subsequently, it turned out that the man he arrested for carrying a concealed weapon was one of the most wanted individuals in America. All in a day's work.

That, Mr. President, is really what police work is. It is not glamorous. In fact, many times it is downright laborious, boring. To get that one terrorist, it takes thousands of police chasing down thousands of leads. Most of the leads do not go anywhere, but they all have to be pursued so that ultimately the guilty can be captured. I am sure, Mr. President, in the days since this tragedy occurred, thousands and thousands of police officers thousands of thousands of different times across this country have analyzed what they were doing and tried to identify the composite picture and have done things that they do in their good police work, things that in most cases turn out not to lead anywhere, but they know that they have to do that.

Mr. President, the pursuit of the suspects in the Oklahoma City bombing proves the immense value of hard work and patience in American police work. It also proves the awesome importance of technology in the war against terrorism and other kinds of crime.

Technology and good police work have really been the key to making the progress that has been made thus far in solving the mystery of this horrible tragedy. Federal agents recovered a confidential vehicle identification number from a fragment of a truck found at the bombing scene. This number led the FBI to a Ryder truck rental office in Junction City, KS—and that is where the composite pictures of the suspects were made.

Mr. President, we need to do everything we can at the Federal level to promote the kind of cutting-edge Federal technology that makes this possible. I will be introducing in the near future a comprehensive Federal crime bill that would help hook up all of America's police departments into this Federal information data bank. It will help maintain a national DNA bank to allow the local law enforcement officers to identify and capture sex offenders and other violent criminals. It will be a data base, Mr. President, that deals not only with DNA, but also with fingerprints, also with ballistic comparisons, and also with information about individuals who have been convicted of serious offenses.

Mr. President, as we deal with the aftermath of the bombing in Oklahoma City, I think there are three important tasks ahead for the U.S. Senate.

First, the Senate does need to increase the availability of crime-fighting technology to make this available to every law-enforcement officer in every town and every community in the country.

Second, the Senate needs to take a very close look at how we deal with the entry into the United States of individuals who are affiliated with international terrorist groups. We must look, also, at what we should do when we determine aliens already in this country are members of such groups.

Third, the Senate needs to examine the issue of domestic terrorist groups to figure out the best way to infiltrate these extremist groups and then to keep tabs on their dangerous activities.

Mr. President, over the next few days I will be discussing my own legislation in greater detail. I think that the level of attention the Senate gives these issues in the days to come will be one factor, a major factor, lessening the chance of another tragedy of the kind that took place this past week.

Again, Mr. President, let me offer to the victims, the families of the victims, the loved ones, our deepest sympathy for this horrible and senseless tragedy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks to be recognized?

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, 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.