

played a critical role in addressing racial discrimination, through legislation that grappled with civil rights issues like voting rights and employment discrimination. Americans are once again calling on the Congress to combat racial discrimination. With this legislation, we can take a step in the right direction, a step closer to becoming truly one America.

I urge my colleagues to support the Traffic Stops Statistics Study Act, and to back its enactment this session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank Senator FEINGOLD for his concerns about civil liberties in America. It is important for us to give great attention to these issues. Police need to be constantly reminded of their responsibilities.

I was a prosecutor for nearly 18 years full time. I have dealt with police. I remember clearly the policies for years against racial profiling. The law is against that. One of the most famous cases was 25 or 30 years ago, when an immigration officer stopped some individual in a car and arrested him for being an illegal alien. When he asked why he stopped him, he said he had a

“psychic feeling” that there was something wrong there.

The court said no. A psychic feeling is not good enough. A racial profile is not good enough. You have to have an articulable basis to make a stop.

But we do not want to suggest, in my view, that this is a routine thing in America. Police officers I know, and the Federal agents I know, are very sensitive about these issues. They have been trained about them. They know precisely what they have to do. It almost takes a law degree to know what to do, but they know precisely how and when they can make stops and when they cannot. I believe consistently they follow those rules.

I know Vice Presidential candidate Senator LIEBERMAN, in one of his debates, said that he knew someone who had been stopped, an African American, a Government employee. He described that he was offended by it. But the local police said, when they were asked about it—the local police said he was stopped because the car matched perfectly the description of a stolen car. When they stopped it, they did not even know whether the driver was white or black. They were just doing their job. It was not a racial profiling.

So we need not to go too far, suggesting this is too common. I do not believe it is. I think it may happen and it should not happen. It is against the law. It is not proper, and arrests and matters rising from it should not be justified.

I appreciate Senator FEINGOLD’s interest in making sure the law is properly followed.

SUBMITTING CHANGES TO THE BUDGETARY AGGREGATES AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ALLOCATION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to adjust the appropriate budgetary aggregates and the allocation for the Appropriations Committee to reflect amounts provided for emergency requirements.

I hereby submit revisions to the 2001 Senate Appropriations Committee allocations, pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act, in the following amounts:

	Budget authority	Outlays
Current Allocation:		
General purpose discretionary	\$606,674,000,000	\$597,098,000,000
Highways		26,920,000,000
Mass Transit		4,639,000,000
Mandatory	327,787,000,000	310,215,000,000
Total	934,461,000,000	938,872,000,000
Adjustments:		
General purpose discretionary	+1,299,000,000	
Highways		
Mass transit		
Mandatory		
Total	1,299,000,000	
Revised Allocation:		
General purpose discretionary	607,973,000,000	597,098,000,000
Highways		26,920,000,000
Mass transit		4,639,000,000
Mandatory	327,787,000,000	310,215,000,000
Total	935,760,000,000	938,872,000,000

I hereby submit revisions to the 2001 budget aggregates, pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, in the following amounts:

	Budget authority	Outlays	Surplus
Current Allocation: Budget Resolution	\$1,532,779,000,000	\$1,495,819,000,000	\$7,381,000,000
Adjustments: Emergencies	1,299,000,000		
Revised Allocation: Budget Resolution	1,534,078,000,000	1,495,819,000,000	7,381,000,000

NOMINATION OF MS. LOIS EPSTEIN TO BE A BOARD MEMBER OF THE CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the President of the United States today nominated Ms. Lois Epstein to be a Board Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board.

Ms. Epstein is a licensed professional engineer with over 16 years of technical and regulatory experience involving toxic and hazardous chemicals, with a significant focus on accident and pollution prevention. She currently is a Senior Engineer with Environmental Defense. In that capacity, she has served on three federal advisory committees, two for the Environmental

Protection Agency (EPA) and one for the Department of Transportation (DOT). She has also served as a consultant to the Science Advisory Board of EPA. Prior to coming to Environmental Defense, Ms. Epstein worked in the private sector and for the federal government in the EPA Region 9 office.

Ms. Epstein has demonstrated integrity, technical and analytical expertise, industrial plant knowledge, and a strong understanding of environmental laws and regulations. She has the ability to work with a diverse array of interests, and a commitment to resolving environmental and worker safety problems. These qualities, in combination with Ms. Epstein’s expertise in engineering, petroleum refining, and her fa-

miliarity with the National Transportation Safety Board—the model for the Chemical Safety Board—make her a strong candidate.

Although she is being nominated without enough time remaining in the 106th Congress for confirmation, I hope that the next Administration and Congress will look favorably upon this qualified candidate.

DISTURBING DOD POLICY

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on a disturbing Department of Defense (DOD) policy that prohibits the adoption of retired military working dogs (MWD).

The bill that I am speaking in support of today, H.R. 5314, will amend the law to allow a handler to adopt a retired military working dog. This legislation was constructed with the guidance and input of all the parties involved. While the Senate version provides more flexibility for the DOD than I would prefer, in the future the Congress will have the opportunity to evaluate the DOD's work when they report back to Congress on their progress in facilitating military dog adoptions.

In discussions with the Managers, my understanding is that this change is only intended to protect the Department of Defense's flexibility to retain animals it determines to be unsuitable for release. In no way is this intended to allow the Defense Department to retain animals that are suitable for release and are no longer needed. I believe it is important to clarify this point, but with that understanding, I am pleased to support this legislation.

The DOD's policy callously discards these highly trained and devoted animals after completion of their service to their country after 8–10 years of age, even if their handlers wish to adopt them.

Under the current law there is no happy retirement for these loyal canines. After their body is no longer able to sustain the workload of their mission, the future becomes bleak for these dogs. In a best case scenario, the dogs are sent back to Lackland Air Force Base, their original training school, where they are used to instruct their human counterparts to become handlers.

After they have served this final duty, they are kenneled for an undetermined amount of time and then put down. In some instances, military working dogs are caged as long as a year until they meet their final outcome. If no kennel space is available, the less fortunate are terminated directly upon their arrival to Lackland.

Without the loyal service of Military Working Dogs and their devotion to their handlers, countless American soldiers would have died or become casualties of war.

These dogs have abilities that our most advanced technology cannot match, rendering them priceless to the men and women serving in our military.

Of the 10,000 men who served with K-9 units during the Vietnam War more than 265 were Killed in Action. Of the 4,000 dogs that served, 281 were "Officially" listed as "Killed in Action," but only 190 were returned home at the end of the war.

More than 500 dogs died on the battlefields of Vietnam.

Military Working Dogs not only helped win battles and save lives, but had an enormous impact upon the mental well-being of those humans that surrounded them in the severest of battle conditions.

It is clear that the DOD's policy does not work in the best interests of the

dog handlers and the dogs. There is a distinctly strong bond between dog handlers and their dogs, who work, live and play together on a daily basis.

I believe that the military's policy unnecessarily severs a bond that has taken years to cultivate which can easily be alleviated by allowing dog handlers or other qualified people to care for these highly intelligent dogs after they can no longer serve their country.

The 1949 Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, enacted after World War II, reclassified military working dogs as equipment. According to the military mentality, any piece of equipment no longer operable, becomes a hardship to the unit and must be disposed.

In 1997, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act was amended. The law was altered to permit federal dog handlers, such as those in the Drug Enforcement Administration, to adopt their aging K-9 partners after their service in law enforcement was completed.

The DOD's K-9 partners were the only federal canine group not included in the modification. Are these worthy canines any less deserving of peacefully living out the remainder of their days than another federal working dogs? These dogs can be detrained of their aggressive responses and we have no reason to assume that they will not continue to obey their handlers.

The bill that I am speaking in support of today, H.R. 5315, will amend the law to allow a handler to adopt a retired military working dog. I believe that legislation was constructed with the best interest for all parties involved.

The decision to allow a handler to adopt their canine partner rests on the shoulders of those who know the dog best: the dog's last unit commander and the last unit veterinarian. Made on a case-by-case basis, the commander and veterinarian are obligated to give their consent before the adoption process can move forward.

Furthermore, H.R. 5314 provides an additional safeguard at the federal level. Upon receipt of the dog, the adopting handler waives all liability against the federal government.

H.R. 5314 will effectively accomplish two goals: it offers the DOD a solution to their dilemma of maintaining aging canines and lifts the restriction that prohibits the adoption of military working dogs. Former dog handlers, individuals with comparable experience, or law enforcement agencies will be able to provide a loving home for such deserving animals.

Through the passage of this legislation, not only will the military working dog be taken from a permanently caged status, but the dog will also be given the opportunity for a positive home environment. I know you will agree that after a lifetime of service, there can be no better reward for both handler and dog.

In closing, H.R. 5314 has been endorsed by the Humane Society of the

United States, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the Society for Animal Protective Legislation, the Doris Day Animal Rights League, and The American Society for the prevention of Cruelty to Animals. This is a positive measure which is a win-win solution for dog, handler and the Department of Defense.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to Senator WARNER from William W. Putney, DVM. He was a C.O. of the War Dog Training School at Camp Lejeune, NC, was awarded the Silver Star for his bravery during his command of a "war dog" platoon in the 3rd Marine Division during World War II.

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

WOODLAND HILLS, CA,
October 18, 2000.

Senator JOHN WARNER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Forces,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNER: I was born in Prince Edward County Virginia. Attended Virginia Tech (VPI then) then graduated from Auburn University in 1943. I immediately went into the Marine Corps and served throughout the war as a line officer in the war dog program and later as the Chief Veterinarian, USMC. Although I am not a constituent of yours, I have many relatives, living in Virginia, that are. I was the platoon leader of the 2nd and 3rd Marine War Dog Platoons that served with the 3rd Marine Division on Guadalcanal, Guam and Iwo Jima and the 2nd Marine Division on Saipan, Okinawa and Japan.

After the cessation of hostilities, I was C.O. of the War Dog Training School at Camp Lejeune, NC when we detrained and returned to civilian life our dogs that we used in WWII on places like Guadalcanal, Bougainville, Kuajalien, Enewetok, Guam, Pelelieu, Saipan, Okinawa and Japan. Our dogs saved a lot of Marines' lives including mine.

Of the 550 Marine war dogs that we had on duty at the end of the war, only four were destroyed due to our inability to detrain them sufficiently to be returned safely to civilian life. Never to my knowledge was there a recorded an instance where any one of those dogs ever attacked or bit anyone. It is not true that once a dog has had attack training, it can never be released safely into the civilian population. All of our dogs were attack trained.

I strongly support Senator Smith in his efforts to change present DoD policy that once a dog has received attack training, it will always be destroyed when he can no longer perform his military duties.

To use animals for our own use and then destroy them arbitrarily when they can no longer be of use to us is the worst kind of animal abuse.

WILLIAM W. PUTNEY, DVM,
Captain, USMC, WWII.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. He offers his strong support for a change in the law that will allow the adoption of military working dogs. Former Marine Lt. Putney led a successful effort to build a cemetery and monument for the 25 dogs who died in the liberation of Guam in 1944, and I applaud his work to memorialize their contribution to preventing more loss of life during WWII. I also want to have printed for

the RECORD an article that provides some details of his military life and his accomplishments in recognizing the special canine contribution to our war-time successes.

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

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 3, 1995]

MARINE, NOW 75, HONORED FOR HIS WARTIME COURAGE

(By Doyle McManus)

Marine Lt. William W. Putney was awarded the Silver Star for bravery on Saturday—at the age of 75, half a century after the end of his war.

Putney, a Woodland Hills veterinarian, commanded a "war dog" platoon in the 3rd Marine Division during World War II—a little-known specialty that used trained dogs both to guard American positions and sniff out enemy troops hidden in tunnels or caves.

On July 26, 1944, Putney's unit was defending 3rd Marine headquarters on Guam when the lieutenant, then 24, spotted a Japanese platoon heading toward the division hospital.

"Putney ordered the war dog handlers to tie their dogs to bushes and take up a firing line in the path of the enemy." His citation reads, "An enemy machine gun emplacement savagely opened fire. . . . Disregarding his own safety, (Putney) unhesitatingly arose from his position of cover, and standing exposed to the hail of bullets aimed at him, began firing."

"He succeeded in silencing the machine gun and killing the two enemy machine gunners. Although wounded, he exhorted the platoon to press the attack, resulting in the killing of all enemy soldiers, including the Japanese officer leading the attack."

Officials said Putney had been recommended for a decoration during the war but unaccountability did not receive one. His former commanding officer resubmitted the recommendation a few years ago, and Navy Secretary John H. Dalton approved it in time for Putney to formally receive the award at the Punchbowl military cemetery here as part of Saturday's commemoration of the end of World War II.

After the war, Putney served as chief veterinarian and commander of the U.S. Army War Dog Training School. He retired from the Marines and practiced as a veterinarian in Woodland Hills.

In recent years, he led a successful effort to build a cemetery and monument for the 25 Doberman pinschers and German shepherds who died in the liberation of Guam in 1944.

The memorial, which includes the names of the dogs and a life-size bronze statue of a Doberman, was dedicated in a military ceremony last year.

TESTING NORTH KOREA'S COMMITMENT TO PEACE

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to discuss the momentous changes underway on the Korean Peninsula and to take note of the contributions of one extraordinary American public servant to the cause of peace there. Former Secretary of Defense Bill Perry stepped down this month as special adviser to the President on Korea policy, a role he assumed when our relations with North Korea were in crisis and when congressional faith in our approach to the Korean challenge was at a nadir.

It was a job no one coveted. North Korea ranks as one of the most difficult foreign policy challenges we face.

It was a job fraught with risk. Err too far towards confrontation, and you might send North Korea over the brink and start another war. Err too far towards conciliation, and your initiative might be mistaken for appeasement, emboldening the North and undermining political support at home.

Under Bill Perry's leadership, the U.S. launched a hard-headed initiative designed to test North Korea's willingness to abandon the path of confrontation in favor of the road to peace. From its inception, the Perry initiative was predicated on maintenance of a strong military deterrent. But Dr. Perry recognized that deterrence alone was not likely to lure North Korea out of its shell and reduce the threat of war.

The Perry initiative was designed and implemented in concert with our South Korean and Japanese allies, and it continues to enjoy their full support.

The results of this comprehensive and integrated engagement strategy have stunned even the most optimistic observers.

The year began with a mysterious and unprecedented visit by Kim Jong-il to the Chinese Embassy in Pyongyang. Over the course of a four-hour dinner, Kim made it plain that the year 2000 would see a shift in the North's approach to reviving its moribund economy and ending its diplomatic isolation.

In quick succession, Kim hosted Russian President Putin and then South Korean President Kim Dae-jung. The historic Korean summit meeting in Pyongyang was a tremendous victory for South Korean President Kim Dae-jung's "Sunshine Policy" and a validation of Perry's engagement strategy. It is fitting that President Kim Dae-jung was just awarded the Nobel Peace prize for his life-long efforts on behalf of peace and democracy on the Korean peninsula.

With the rapid emergence of Kim Jong-il from what he admitted was a "hermit's" existence in North Korea, the prospects for a lasting peace on the peninsula are better today than at any time since the Korean War began more than 50 years ago. Time will tell.

If fully implemented, the agreement reached in Pyongyang by President Kim Dae-jung and Kim Jong-il promises to reduce tensions in this former war zone and enhance economic, cultural, environmental, and humanitarian cooperation.

There are encouraging signs that the summit meeting was not a fluke:

Family reunification visits are proceeding, albeit at a pace that is slower than the families divided for 50 years desire or deserve.

Ground will be broken soon to restore rail connections across the DMZ, restoring trade and communication links severed for 50 years.

A follow-on meeting of the North and South Korean Defense Ministers in September led to an agreement to resume military contacts and to explore confidence building measures along the

DMZ, including notification of exercises and creation of a North-South hot-line.

Planning is proceeding smoothly for next year's North-South summit meeting in Seoul.

There has also been progress in U.S.-North Korean relations. An historic meeting between President Clinton and senior North Korean military officer Cho Myong-nok occurred this month in Washington, setting the stage for next week's first ever visit to the North by an American Secretary of State.

Mr. President, this flurry of diplomatic activity has been dismissed by some critics as all form, and no substance. They marvel at our willingness—and that of our South Korean ally—to provide food aid to a despotic regime that continues to spend precious resources on weapons and military training rather than tractors and agricultural production.

No one condones the North Korean Government's callous disregard for the suffering of its own people. And obviously, much work remains to be done—especially in the security realm—to realize the hope generated by the summits. The North has not withdrawn any of its heavy artillery poised along the Demilitarized Zone.

It has not halted provocative military exercises. It has not yet ended all of its support for terrorist organizations.

And, although the North did reaffirm its moratorium on long-range missile testing this month in Washington, it has not stopped its development or export of long-range ballistic missile technology. North Korea's missile program continues to pose a serious threat not only to our allies South Korea and Japan, but also to other nations confronting the odious clients of North Korea's arms merchants.

All of these issues must be addressed if we are to forge a lasting peace on the Korean peninsula.

Our efforts to engage North Korea must ultimately be matched by reciprocal steps by the North. Engagement is not a one-way street.

But the question is not whether North Korea is a desirable partner for peace. Kim Jong-il has all the appeal of Saddam Hussein. The question is how we manage the North Korean threat.

I can't imagine how the situation would be improved if we did not offer North Korea a chance to choose peace over truculence. I can't imagine how the situation would be improved in any way if North Korean children were dying in droves from malnutrition and disease as they were prior to the launch of the U.S.-funded World Food Program relief efforts.

Mr. President, we should not discount the importance of the recent diplomatic developments on the peninsula. How soon we forget that it was a process called glasnost—openness—combined with maintenance of a strong NATO alliance, which ultimately brought about the demise of the Soviet