

SCHOOLBUSES.—Not later than September 1, 1999, the Secretary shall develop and implement a program to notify dealers and distributors in the United States that subsection (a) prohibits the sale or delivery of any vehicle for use as a schoolbus (as that term is defined in section 30125(a)(1) of this title) that does not meet the standards prescribed under section 30125(b) of this title.”.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BOND, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. FRIST, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HOLLINS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KYL, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. THURMOND and Mr. WARNER):

S.J. Res. 14. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### FLAG PROTECTION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is with great honor and reverence that I rise today with my friend and colleague, Senator CLELAND, to introduce a bipartisan constitutional amendment to permit Congress to enact legislation prohibiting the physical desecration of the American flag.

The American flag serves as a symbol of our great nation. The flag represents our country in a way nothing else can; it represents the common bond shared by an otherwise diverse people. Whatever our differences of party, race, religion, or socio-economic status, the flag reminds us that we are very much one people, united in a shared destiny, bonded in a common faith in our nation.

Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens reminded us of the significance of our unique emblem when he wrote:

A country's flag is a symbol of more than nationhood and national unity. It also signifies the ideas that characterize the society that has chosen that emblem as well as the special history that has animated the growth and power of those ideas. . . . So it is with the American flag. It is more than a proud

symbol of the courage, the determination, and the gifts of a nation that transformed 13 fledgling colonies into a world power. It is a symbol of freedom, of equal opportunity, of religious tolerance, and of goodwill for other peoples who share our aspirations.

Throughout our history, the flag has captured the hearts and minds of school teachers, construction workers, police officers, grandmothers, and public servants. Who can forget the image of Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin planting the American flag on the moon? At that moment, the flag stood not only for the triumph of American know-how and the courage of Americans to explore the unknown, but also for freedom. It was a statement that whatever Americans do, we do to promote liberty, equality, and justice.

And, what of those children who recite the “Pledge of Allegiance” every morning in classrooms all across America? They are pledging to be good citizens, honest and loyal and just. In pledging allegiance to the flag, they are affirming their belief in “liberty and justice for all.”

And, throughout our history, men and women in uniform have drawn courage from our flag and gave their lives for the values it symbolizes. No matter the era, no matter the color of uniform—whether Army green, Air Force blue, or Navy white—no matter the theater of battle—whether at Gettysburg, San Juan Hill, Iwo Jima, Korea, Da Nang, or the Persian Gulf—our men and women had one common bond: the American flag.

Consider the example of Army Corporal Joseph Quintero, a prisoner of the Japanese during World War II. Quintero secretly led a group of POWs in obtaining red, white, and blue material to make an American flag. The flag lifted the hearts of the Americans who were suffering from malnutrition, overwork, and physical abuse. When American planes started to attack the prison camp, Quintero waived Old Glory and the planes stopped the attack and saved numerous American lives. Even in the worst of conditions, Joseph Quintero knew the value of the American flag.

From my home State of Utah, there is the courageous example of Lt. William E. Hall, whose fearless actions in the Battle of the Coral Sea earned him the Congressional Medal of Honor. Lieutenant Hall attacked a Japanese aircraft carrier and then Japanese planes in a series of highly dangerous engagements. Though seriously wounded, Lt. Hall guided his plane back to a landing strip marked by the American flag.

General Schwarzkopf in a speech before Congress thanked the American people for their support of our troops in Operation Desert Storm, stating: “The profits of doom, the naysayers, the protesters and the flag-burners all said that you wouldn't stick by us, but

we knew better. We knew you'd never let us down. By golly, you didn't.”

We respect the sacrifices of our men and women in uniform because we respect what they died for. They did not give their lives for ground, prestige, wealth, or a monarch. They sacrificed their lives for freedom, opportunity, and justice—all represented by our nation's flag of 50 stars and thirteen stripes. Through the American flags at Arlington National Cemetery, on the Iwo Jima Memorial, and at every school yard, we honor those sacrifices. But there are those who do not.

In 1984, Greg Johnson led a group of radicals in a protest march. He doused an American flag with kerosene and set it on fire as his fellow protesters chanted: “America, the red, white, and blue, we spit on you.” While traditional First Amendment jurisprudence would protect Johnson's ability to speak and write about the flag, it did not protect his ability to physically destroy the flag.

But, in 1989, the Supreme Court abandoned the history and intent of the First Amendment by creating a new standard that made no distinction between oral and written speech about the flag and disrespectful conduct toward the flag. In *Texas v. Johnson*, five members of the Court, for the first time ever, overturned a conviction based solely on physical conduct toward the American flag. The majority argued that the First Amendment had somehow changed and that it now prevented a state from protecting the American flag from acts of physical desecration. When Congress responded with a federal flag protection statute, the Supreme Court, in *United States v. Eichman*, used its new and changed interpretation of the First Amendment to strike it down by a 5-4 vote.

Under this new interpretation of the First Amendment, it is assumed that the people, their elected legislators, and the courts can no longer distinguish between speech and conduct. Because of this assumed inability to make such distinctions, there are those who argue that our freedom to express political ideas is wholly dependent on treating Greg Johnson's burning of the American flag exactly like oral and written speech.

This ill-advised argument fails because its basic premise—that legislatures and courts cannot distinguish between oral and written expression and disrespectful physical conduct—is so obviously false. It is precisely this distinction that legislatures and courts did make for almost 200 years. Just as judges have distinguished which laws and actions comply with the constitutional command to provide “equal protection of the laws” and “due process of law,” so too have judges distinguished between free speech and destructive conduct, and have limited the latter.

Destructive conduct, such as breaking down the doors of the State Department, may be a way of expressing one's

dissatisfaction with the nation's foreign policy objectives. Laws, however, can be enacted preventing such actions in large part because there are alternatives that can be equally powerful. I should also note that right here in the United States Senate, we prohibit speeches or demonstrations of any kind, even the silent display of signs or banners, in the public galleries.

Moreover, the people themselves did not elevate the act of flag desecration to a constitutionally protected status, which the Supreme Court did in *Johnson and Eichman*. Such an extreme view was never drafted by the Congress or ratified by the people. Indeed, such a protection is contradicted by the original and historic intent of the First Amendment. Thus, in this Senator's view, the Supreme Court erred in *Johnson and Eichman*.

It has also been argued that another flag protection statute could pass constitutional muster under the "fighting words" doctrine. In *R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul*, however, the Supreme Court expanded the newly created, so-called "right" to burn the flag by stating that any statute that specifically targeted the American flag for protection was unconstitutional, regardless of the "fighting words" doctrine. Thus, a constitutional amendment is the only means left to protect the flag.

It has been argued that a constitutional amendment to protect the flag should be "content neutral" and prohibit not only disrespectful destructions of the flag, but all destructions of the flag. Such an amendment would sweep too broadly by prohibiting the ceremonial disposal of a flag and the traditional printing of regimental names on the flag. In short, a "content neutral" amendment misses the point. It is the traditional constitutional protection for the dignity of the flag that must be restored, not a new broad ban on any conduct with a flag that should be created. Only a narrowly tailored amendment can accomplish this honorable purpose.

The amendment that Senator CLELAND and I propose affects only the most radical and disrespectful forms of conduct towards the American flag. The amendment will leave untouched the current constitutional protections for Americans to speak their sentiments at a rally, to write their sentiments to their newspaper, and to vote their sentiments at the ballot box. The amendment simply restores the traditional and historic power of the people's elected representatives to prohibit the disrespectful physical destruction of the flag.

Further, it is clear that restoring legal protection to the American flag will not place us on a slippery slope to limit other freedoms. No other symbol of our bipartisan national ideals has flown over so many of our battlefields, cemeteries, school yards, and homes. No other symbol has been paid for with so much of our countrymen's blood. No other symbol has encouraged so many

ordinary men and women to seek liberty and justice for all.

In recent months, my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle have called for a new bipartisan spirit in Congress. This amendment fits the bill. Restoring legal protection to the American flag is not, nor should it be, a partisan issue. Including Senator CLELAND and myself, 57 senators, both Republicans and Democrats, have joined as original cosponsors of this amendment.

Over 70 percent of the American people want the opportunity to vote to protect their flag. Numerous organizations, including the Medal of Honor Recipients for the Flag, the American Legion, the American War Mothers, the American G.I. Forum, and the African-American Women's Clergy Association all support the flag protection amendment. Forty-nine state legislatures have passed resolutions calling for constitutional protection for the flag. Last Congress, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed this amendment by a vote of 310-114, and will pass it again this year.

Mr. President, I am very honored to be a cosponsor with my dear friend from Georgia, Senator CLELAND. I appreciate the efforts he has put forth in this battle. Having served in the military as he has done with such distinction and with courage, he has earned the right to speak for the protection of the flag.

I am, therefore, proud to rise today and introduce a constitutional amendment that will restore to the people's elected representatives the right to protect one unique national symbol, the American flag, from acts of physical desecration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the proposed amendment be included in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES. 14

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years after the date of its submission for ratification:*

"ARTICLE —

"The Congress shall have power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States."

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I want to first thank my dear friend and colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH. His dedicated leadership on this important matter is unparalleled and, without it, we would not have been able to gain all of the support we have for this important legislation. I am proud to say that the resolution regarding the flag protection amendment Senator HATCH and I are introducing today has 57 original co-sponsors, and I

am hopeful that we will be able to bring this important matter to a final vote in the Senate this year.

As I have stated many times before, I am a strong supporter of a Constitutional amendment to prohibit the physical desecration of the United States flag. The amendment we are proposing is simple. It simply vests Congress with the authority to protect the flag through statute. We need not fear that the states will create a hodgepodge of flag protection statutes. Instead, Congress can create one uniform statute for the entire nation.

I understand the concerns that others have about the impact on the First Amendment that this bill might have, and as a veteran who risked his life in Vietnam to protect the principles of freedoms that Americans hold sacred, I am a strong supporter of the First Amendment. However, I believe that an amendment to protect the flag is an acceptable limitation in order to protect the most sacred of American symbols. I strongly believe that the societal interest in preserving the symbolic value of the flag outweighs the interest in an individual choosing to physically desecrate the flag. The flag unites Americans as no symbol can. The flag is sacred. Those who would desecrate the flag would desecrate America and the freedoms that we hold inviolate.

I cannot presume to know the importance of the American flag for each individual American. But I can say without doubt, that it is the only unifying symbol that the vast diversity of this great nation has. No matter one's age, religion, culture, ethnicity, race, or gender—every American is represented by the United States flag and the flag undoubtedly bonds Americans together.

The tradition of the flag goes back to this country's birth. Indeed, it even inspired our national anthem. Until the Supreme Court struck down a state flag protection law in *Texas versus Johnson* in 1989, there have always been state and federal laws protecting the flag from acts of physical desecration. In fact, flag protection can be traced back to our founding fathers who strongly supported the government's protection of the flag. James Madison and Thomas Jefferson, who were instrumental in framing the Constitution, recognized that protecting the flag and preserving the First Amendment were consistent. They often spoke out against desecration of the flag and sought to protect the sovereignty interest in the flag. Both Madison and Jefferson considered that a defacement of the flag should be a violation of the law. In fact, Jefferson believed that such a violation should invoke a "systematic and severe" course of punishment for persons who violated the flag.

I do not profess to be a constitutional scholar. But I, like many Americans, do not agree with the Supreme Court's ruling in *Texas v. Johnson*, and *United States v. Eichman* which struck down

statutes protecting the United States flag as unconstitutional violations of the First Amendment right to free speech. I respect the wisdom of the Justices of the Supreme Court, yet I was saddened that we no longer were able to rely upon statutory authority to protect the flag.

I was especially saddened in light of the views expressed by some of the most learned scholars in American jurisprudence. Several Supreme Court Justices over the years have issued opinions recognizing the importance of protection of the flag, including Justices Harlan, Warren, Fortas, Black, White, Rehnquist, Blackmun, Stevens, and O'Connor. These Justices have each supported the view that nothing in the Constitution prohibits the states or the federal government from protecting the flag. Perhaps Chief Justice Rehnquist explained it best in his dissent in *Texas versus Johnson* which was joined by Justices O'Connor and White, when he said:

[t]he American flag . . . throughout more than 200 years of our history, has come to be the visible symbol embodying our Nation. It does not represent the views of any particular political party, and it does not represent any particular political philosophy. The flag is not simply another 'idea' or 'point of view' competing for recognition in the marketplace of ideas. Millions and millions of Americans regard it with an almost mystical reverence regardless of what sort of social, political, or philosophical beliefs they may have. I cannot agree that the First Amendment invalidates the Act of Congress, and the laws of 48 of the 50 States, which make criminal the public burning of the flag.

Nonetheless, the current Supreme Court view stands. That is what brings us here today. In an attempt to protect the flag, Congress has been forced to enact a constitutional amendment. The House has twice overwhelmingly passed resolutions that would begin the formal process of amending the Constitution to protect the flag. Unfortunately, it has been the Senate that has blocked these efforts. However, the vote has always been close in the Senate and I am hopeful that we will succeed this year.

The will of the people in this matter is clear. The polls continue to show that more than 80 percent of the American people believe that Congress should act to protect the flag and that it is worth amending the Constitution to do so. The Supreme Court decision in *Texas versus Johnson* in effect invalidated the laws in 48 states and the District of Columbia that prohibited flag desecration. Since the Supreme Court's decision, 49 of the 50 State legislatures have adopted resolutions asking Congress to send the flag protection amendment to the States for ratification. I believe we ought to let the American people decide. Therefore, I lend my full support to efforts to send this initiative back to the States and American people for ratification.

Although support for government action to protect the United States flag comes from all sectors of the American

public, I have been particularly moved by the voices of our veterans who have fought and died to defend the freedoms guaranteed to all Americans in the Constitution. The U.S. flag is a manifestation of those freedoms and holds particular significance to those who have risked their lives to protect this country and the flag which embodies them. In fact, in many cases the U.S. has presented the Medal of Honor to veterans for their uncommon valor in protecting the flag in times of war. As Justice Stevens said in his dissenting opinion in *Texas versus Johnson*:

The freedom and ideals of liberty and ideals of liberty, equality and tolerance that the flag symbolizes and embodies have motivated our nation's leaders, soldiers, and activists to pledge their lives, their liberty and their honor in defense of their country. Because our history has demonstrated that these values and ideals are worth fighting for, the flag which uniquely symbolizes their power is itself worthy of protection from physical desecration.

The military has always used the flag to honor those who fought and died to protect our freedoms. We honor the members of our armed forces by draping a flag over the coffin of a slain soldier, placing a flag near a soldier's grave, or displaying a flag on Memorial Day and Veterans' Day. To permit people to physically desecrate the flag diminishes the honor we bestow upon them and tarnishes its value and the brave service of those individuals who fought to defend it.

As Chief Justice Harlan once said, "love both of the common country and of the State will diminish in proportion as respect for the flag is weakened." Perhaps my colleagues who do not agree with me upon this issue will believe that I have overly dramatized the meaning of the flag, but for me personally, who fought to defend the principles of freedom we hold sacred, the protection of the flag which represents them cannot be ignored. I believe we must use this opportunity to show the world that we reaffirm our commitment to the ideals the flag stands for and what so many Americans fought for.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the proposed amendment to the United States Constitution to prevent desecration of our great national symbol. I want to thank Chairman HATCH for his continuing dedication to this issue, and I want to applaud him for reintroducing the flag amendment today. I believe that our nation's symbol is a unique and important part of our heritage and culture, and worthy of respect and protection. In 1995, I was an original co-sponsor of an amendment to the Constitution designed to protect the symbol of our nation and its ideals. When that resolution was defeated narrowly, we vowed that this issue would not go away and it has not. I stand here, again, today to declare the necessity of protecting the Flag of the United States of America and what it represents.

Throughout our history, the Flag has held a special place in the hearts and

minds of Americans. As the appearance of the Flag has changed with the addition of stars as the nation has grown, its core meaning to the American people has remained constant. It symbolizes an ideal, not just for Americans, but for all those who honor the great American experiment. It represents a shared ideal of freedom, sacrifice, morality, history, unity, patriotism, loved ones lost, the American way of life and even America itself. The Flag stands in this chamber and in our court rooms; it is draped over our honored dead; it flies at half-mast to mourn those we wish to respect; and it is the subject of our National Anthem, our National March and our Pledge of Allegiance. America's inability to demand a modicum of respect for the flag leads not only to the desecration of our nation's symbol, but of the important values upon which this nation was founded. As the Chief Justice noted in his dissent in *Texas versus Johnson* (1989), "[t]he American flag, then, throughout more than 200 years of our history, has come to be the visible symbol embodying our nation. . . . Millions and millions of Americans regard it with an almost mystical reverence regardless of what sort of social, political, or philosophical beliefs they may have."

There can be little doubt that the people of this country fully support preserving and protecting the American Flag. During a recent hearing that I chaired on "The Tradition and Importance of Protecting the United States Flag" held by the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Federalism, and Property Rights, the witnesses noted that an unprecedented 80% of the American people supported a constitutional amendment to protect the flag. The people's elected representatives reflected that vast public support by enacting Flag protection statutes at both the State and Federal levels. In fact, 49 State Legislatures have passed resolutions asking Congress to send a constitutional amendment to the States for ratification. Regrettably, the Supreme Court thwarted the people's will—and discarded the judgment of state legislatures and the Congress that protecting the Flag is fully consistent with our Constitution—by holding that, as far as the Constitution is concerned, the American Flag is just another piece of cloth for which no minimum of respect may be demanded. As a consequence, that which represents the struggles of those who came before us, our current ideals, and our hopes for years to come, cannot be recognized for what it truly is—a national treasure in need of protection.

Further, the question must be asked, what is the legacy we are leaving our children? At a time when our nation's virtues are too rarely extolled by our national leaders, and national pride is dismissed by many as arrogance, America needs, more than ever, something to celebrate. At a time when our political leaders labor under the taint of scandal, we need a national symbol

that is beyond reproach. America needs its Flag unblemished, representing more than any person or any partisan interest, but this extraordinary nation. The Flag, and the freedom for which it stands, has a unique ability to unite us as Americans. Whatever our disagreements, we are united in our respect for the Flag. We are in need of healing. We should not allow the healing and unifying power of the Flag to become a source of divisiveness.

The protection that the people seek for the Flag does not threaten the sacred rights afforded by the First Amendment. I sincerely doubt that the Framers intended the First Amendment of the Constitution to prevent state legislatures and Congress from protecting the Flag of the nation for which they shed their blood. At the time of the Supreme Court's decision, the tradition of protecting the Flag was too firmly established to suggest that such laws are inconsistent with our constitutional traditions. Many of the state laws were based on the Uniform Flag Act of 1917. No one at that time, or for 70 years afterwards, felt that these laws ran afoul of the First Amendment. Indeed, the Supreme Court itself upheld a Nebraska statute preventing commercial use of the Flag in 1907 in *Halter versus Nebraska*. As the Chief Justice stated in his dissent, "I cannot agree that the First Amendment invalidates the Act of Congress, and the laws of 48 of the 50 States which make criminal the public burning of the flag."

Nor do I accept the notion that amending the Constitution to overrule the Supreme Court's decisions in the specific context of desecration of the Flag will somehow undermine the First Amendment as it is applied in other contexts. This amendment does not create a slippery slope which will lead to the erosion of Americans' right to free speech. The Flag is wholly unique. It has not rightful counterpart. An amendment protecting the Flag from desecration will provide no aid or comfort in any future campaigns to restrict speech. Moreover, an amendment banning the desecration of the Flag does not limit the content of any true speech. As Justice Stevens noted in his dissent in *Johnson versus Texas*, "[t]he concept of 'desecration' does not turn on the substance of the message the actor intends to convey, but rather on whether those who view the act will take serious offense." Likewise, the act of desecrating the Flag does not have any content in and of itself. The act takes meaning and expresses conduct only in the context of the true speech which accompanies the act. And that speech remains unregulated. As the Chief Justice noted, "flag burning is the equivalent of an inarticulate grunt or roar that, it seems fair to say, is most likely to be indulged in not to express any particular idea, but to antagonize others."

In sum, there is no principal or fear that should stand as an obstacle to our

protection of the Flag. Unfortunately, at no other time in history has our country so needed such a symbol of sacrifice, honor, unity and freedom. It is my earnest hope that by amending the Constitution to prohibit its desecration, this body will protect the heritage, sacrifice, ideals, freedom and honor that the Flag uniquely represents.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 168

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 168, a bill for the relief of Thomas J. Sansone, Jr.

S. 329

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 329, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend eligibility for hospital care and medical services under chapter 17 of that title to veterans who have been awarded the Purple Heart, and for other purposes.

S. 346

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 346, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit the recoupment of funds recovered by States from one or more tobacco manufacturers.

S. 348

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 348, a bill to authorize and facilitate a program to enhance training, research and development, energy conservation and efficiency, and consumer education in the oilheat industry for the benefit of oilheat consumers and the public, and for other purposes.

S. 355

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 355, a bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to eliminate the provision that prevents sampling from being used in determining the population for purposes of the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States.

S. 376

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 376, a bill to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, and for other purposes.

S. 391

At the request of Mr. KERREY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 391, a bill to provide for payments to

children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs.

S. 396

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 396, a bill to provide dollars to the classroom.

S. 429

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to designate the legal public holiday of "Washington's Birthday" as "Presidents' Day" in honor of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin Roosevelt and in recognition of the importance of the institution of the Presidency and the contributions that Presidents have made to the development of our Nation and the principles of freedom and democracy.

S. 443

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 443, a bill to regulate the sale of firearms at gun shows.

S. 459

At the request of Mr. BREAU, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 459, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the State ceiling on private activity bonds.

S. 482

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 482, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the increase in the tax on the social security benefits.

S. 502

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 502, a bill to protect social security.

S. 522

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 522, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the quality of beaches and coastal recreation water, and for other purposes.

S. 529

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 529, a bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to improve crop insurance coverage, to make structural changes to the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and the Risk Management Agency, and for other purposes.

S. 531

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator