

for criminals and justice for their victims cannot again be sacrificed to our own intellectual impulses.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 315) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 315

Whereas more than 1,000,000 of Sierra Leone's 5,200,000 population are internally displaced and more than 500,000 are refugees as a direct result of the civil war in Sierra Leone, at least 50,000 people have been killed during the civil war, untold numbers of people have been mutilated and disabled largely by the Revolutionary United Front, and more than 20,000 individuals, including many children, are missing or have been kidnapped by the Revolutionary United Front;

Whereas the Revolutionary United Front continues to terrorize the population of Sierra Leone by mutilating their enemies and innocent civilians, including women and children, by chopping off their ears, noses, hands, arms, and legs;

Whereas the Revolutionary United Front continues to terrorize the population of Sierra Leone by decapitating innocent victims, including children as young as 10 months old and elderly men and women;

Whereas the Revolutionary United Front abducts women and children for use as forced laborers, sex slaves, and as human shields during skirmishes with government forces and the forces of the Economic Community of West African States;

Whereas the Revolutionary United Front has kidnapped boys as young as 6 or 7 years old and used them to kill and steal and to become soldiers, and its forces have routinely raped women and young girls as a terror tactic;

Whereas the Revolutionary United Front has abducted civilians, missionaries, humanitarian aid workers, United Nations peacekeepers, and journalists;

Whereas Charles Taylor, the President of Liberia, has provided and continues to provide significant support and direction to the Revolutionary United Front in exchange for diamonds and other natural resources and is therefore culpable for the abuses in Sierra Leone;

Whereas the Lome Peace Accords did not hold the Revolutionary United Front accountable for their abuses and, in fact, rewarded Foday Sankoh and other Revolutionary United Front leaders with high government offices and control of diamond mining throughout Sierra Leone;

Whereas the Revolutionary United Front in Sierra Leone is not a legitimate political movement, entity, or party;

Whereas all sides in the civil war in Sierra Leone are guilty of serious human rights abuses; and

Whereas the Revolutionary United Front led by Foday Sankoh is responsible for breaking the Lome Peace Accords and for the violent aftermath that has consumed Sierra Leone since May 1, 2000: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States Government should do all in its power to help ensure that the

Revolutionary United Front and its leaders, as well as other groups committing human rights abuses in Sierra Leone, are held accountable for the crimes and abuses committed against the people of Sierra Leone;

(2) the United States Government should not condone, support, or be a party to, any agreement that provides amnesty to those responsible for the crimes and abuses in Sierra Leone; and

(3) the United States Government should not provide incentives of any kind to regional supporters of the Revolutionary United Front until all support from them to the Revolutionary United Front has ceased.

AUTHORIZING THE PLACEMENT OF A PLAQUE WITHIN THE SITE OF THE VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent the Energy Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3293, and that the Senate then 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 (H.R. 3293) to amend the law that authorized Vietnam Veterans Memorial to authorize placement within the site of the memorial of a plaque to honor those Vietnam veterans who died after their service in the Vietnam war but as a direct result of that service.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a 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 bill (H.R. 3293) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I should note this is legislation that is sponsored in the Senate by Senator BEN CAMPBELL of Colorado, but this is a House bill, originally sponsored by Congressman GALLEGLY of California. I thank Senator WYDEN for helping us work through getting this cleared, since it is an authorization for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial before this Memorial Day weekend. I commend the three Senators and others who were involved in that issue.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE DATA MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of H.R. 4489, which is at the desk.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4489) to amend section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I support the passage of H.R. 4489, the Immi-

gration and Naturalization Service Data Management Improvement Act of 2000, which makes very important revisions to section 110 of the 1996 Immigration Act. I, along with many of my colleagues, introduced an identical Senate companion to this bill, S. 2599, late last week.

As originally enacted, section 110 of the 1996 law mandated that an automated system be established to record the entry and exit of all aliens as a means to provide more information on individuals who "overstay" their visas. In the opinion of many, it became clear that this well-intentioned measure, if implemented, could have an unforeseen impact. Today, when INS or Customs officials inspect people at land borders, they examine papers as necessary and make quick determinations, using their discretion on when to solicit more information. Section 110, however, was being understood to require revisions to that system that would have greatly complicated travel across the land border by mandating that every single passenger of every single vehicle be required to provide detailed information in a form that could be entered into a computer on the spot. According to Dan Stamper, president of the Detroit International Bridge Company, even assuming an incredibly quick 30 seconds per individual, the traffic delays could exceed 20 hours in numerous jurisdictions at the northern border. This would obviously create extraordinary economic and environmental harm. Moreover, it would divert scarce law enforcement resources away from more effective measures.

Out of concern for its harmful impact on Michigan and law enforcement, I passed legislation in 1998 to delay implementation of section 110 from its original start date of September 30, 1998, until March 30, 2001. But it remained clear that a delay could not sufficiently satisfy concerns that the INS might develop a system that would prove harmful to the people of Michigan and other states.

FRED UPTON showed great leadership in the House on this issue and served his constituents extraordinarily well in helping to forge this compromise. LAMAR SMITH deserves great credit for working closely with us and his other House colleagues in making an agreement that meets the economic and security interests of all sides on this issue. And JOHN LAFALCE also provided important assistance in this effort.

This is a great victory for the people of Michigan. This agreement strikes the right balance in enhancing our security and immigration enforcement needs while ensuring that we preserve the jobs and the other economic benefits Michigan receives from our close relationship with Canada.

This product of the agreement with the House replaces the current requirement that by March 30, 2001, a record of arrival and departure be collected for every alien at all ports of entry, with a more achievable requirement that the

Immigration and Naturalization Service develop an "integrated entry and exit data system" that focuses on data INS already regularly collects at ports of entry.

The goal of section 110 has been to track individuals who overstay their allowable stay in the United States. That goal is redirected into a more achievable direction. INS will be directed to put in electronic and retrievable form the information already collected at ports of entry and pursue other measured step to improve enforcement of U.S. immigration laws. It is also directed to prepare a report on unmatched entry and departure data. That report is required to contain not only numbers of unmatched records, but an analysis of those numbers. The purpose of the latter requirement is to make sure that sufficient context for the data is provided to ensure that readers of the report are able to understand to what extent unmatched records reflect actual overstays, versus to what extent they are simply a function of data weakness (such as a lag time between the acquisition of the data and the entry of the data into the system). This will allow those charged with assessing the system to be in a better position to recommend its proper use and recommend ways of improving it. To that end, and to the end of otherwise improving implementation of the section, a task force chaired by the Attorney General that will include representatives of other government agencies and the private sector is established to examine the effectiveness of the system, ways of improving it, and the need for and costs of any additional measures, including security improvements. The bill also calls for increased international cooperation in securing the land borders.

In essence, the agreement substitutes this approach in place of a mandate that a system be developed that would have required that all foreign travelers or U.S. permanent residents be individually recorded into a system at ports of entry and exit, thereby likely bringing traffic to a halt on the northern border for miles, trapping U.S. travelers in the process and costing potentially tens of thousands of jobs in manufacturing, tourism and other industries. The agreement also maintains the status quo in preventing new documentary requirements on Canadian travelers.

The bottom line is that we will have a system that enhances law enforcement capabilities and will not impose new or onerous requirements on travelers that would damage Americans or the American economy.

I thank the cosponsors of S. 2599, who have been so important in achieving success in this long 3-year effort: Senators LEAHY, GRAMS, KENNEDY, SNOWE, COLLINS, CRAIG, GORTON, JEFFORDS, SCHUMER, GRAHAM, LEVIN, DEWINE, MURRAY, MOYNIHAN, and VOINOVICH. I also thank Majority Leader LOTT for his strong support on this issue and for recognizing the impact on northern

border states if we did not solve this problem. Senator GORTON also played an important role in this successful effort. I thank Senator HELMS and his staff, who permitted an amendment related to section 110 to be part of the State Department authorization bill last year, which I think elevated the awareness of this issue and contributed to the solution we see today. Senator BIDEN and his staff were also supportive of this effort. And, of course, Senator GRAMS and his leadership were essential for the outcome today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this bill accomplishes the important goal of eliminating the existing section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act, IIRIRA. I am an original cosponsor of the Senate version of this bill, the Immigration and Naturalization Service Data Management Improvement Act of 2000.

Section 110 would mandate that the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) establish an automated system to record the entry and exit of all aliens. If implemented, such a provision would have terrible consequences for States all across our Northern Border. Its repeal will help protect America's economy and reinforce our excellent relationship with Canada.

To implement and maintain an automated system for monitoring the entry and exit of "all aliens," INS and Customs agents would have to stop each vehicle or individual entering or exiting the United States at all ports of entry. Canadians, U.S. permanent residents, and many others who are not currently required to show documentation of their status would likely either have to carry some form of identification or fill out paperwork at the points of entry.

This sort of tracking system would be extraordinarily costly to implement along the Northern Border, especially since there is no current system or infrastructure to track the departure of citizens and others leaving the United States.

Section 110 would also lead to excessive and costly traffic delays for those living and working near the border. These delays would surely have a negative impact on the \$2.4 billion in goods and services shipped annually from Vermont to Canada and would likely reduce the \$120 million per year that Canadians spend in Vermont.

This legislation would replace the existing section 110 with a new provision that requires the Attorney General to implement an "integrated entry and exit data system." This system would simply integrate the arrival and departure data which already is authorized or required to be collected under current law, and which is in electronic format within databases held by the Justice and State Departments. The INS would not be required to take new steps to collect information from those entering and leaving the country,

meaning that Canadians will have the same ability to enter the United States as they do today.

This bill will ensure that tourists continue to freely cross the border, without additional documentation requirements. This bill will also guarantee that more than \$1 billion in daily cross-border trade is not hindered in any way. Just as importantly, Vermonters and others who cross our nation's land borders on a daily basis to work or visit with family or friends should be able to continue doing so without additional border delays.

The interconnection between Canada and the United States may be demonstrated most clearly by a store in Derby Line, Vermont. Actually, only part of the store is located in Derby Line—the other side of it is in Rock Island, Quebec. The U.S.-Canadian border runs down the middle of the store, and a white stripe is painted there to mark it. Would the integrated entry and exit data system called for under section 110 have had to monitor the clerks who move from one side of the store to the other collecting goods? This is just one of many examples that would make the implementation of section 110 a destructive folly for Vermont, and I am sure that Senators from other States along the Northern Border can tell similar stories about their States.

This is an issue that I have worked on ever since section 110 was originally adopted in 1996. In 1997, along with Senator ABRAHAM and others, I introduced the Border Improvement and Immigration Act of 1997. Among other things, that legislation would have (1) specifically exempted Canadians from any new documentation or paperwork requirements when crossing the border into the United States; (2) required the Attorney General to discuss the development of "reciprocal agreements" with the Secretary of State and the governments of contiguous countries to collect the data on visa overstayers; and (3) required the Attorney General to increase the number of INS inspectors by 300 per year and the number of Customs inspectors by 150 per year for the next three years, with at least half of those inspectors being assigned to the Northern Border.

I also worked with Senator KENNEDY, Senator ABRAHAM, and other Senators to obtain postponements in the implementation date for the automated system mandated by section 110. We were successful in those attempts, delaying implementation until March 30, 2001. But delays are by nature only a temporary solution; in the legislation we vote on today, I believe we have found a permanent solution that allows us to keep track of the flow of foreign nationals entering and leaving the United States without crippling commerce or our important relationship with Canada. That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and why I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it today.

The Immigration mistakes of 1996: I fought against the adoption of section

110 in 1996, when this Congress passed the IIRIRA. It was wrong at the time, it is wrong today, and I am relieved that we are prepared to do away with it. But our job of rectifying the wrongs of our 1996 immigration legislation is far from over; indeed, it has hardly begun. I would like to use this occasion to draw my colleagues' attention to what I believe our next priorities should be in the immigration area.

Expedited removal: First, in the 1996 Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA), a bill ostensibly about terrorism, Congress instituted an immigration measure called expedited removal. Under expedited removal, low-level INS officers with cursory supervision have the authority to summarily remove people who arrive at our border without proper documentation, or with facially valid documentation that the officer simply suspects is invalid. No review—administrative or judicial—is available of the INS officer's decision, which is rendered after a so-called secondary inspection interview. Expedited removal was widely criticized at the time as ignoring the realities of political persecution, since people being tortured by their government are quite likely to have difficulties obtaining valid travel documents from that government. Its adoption was viewed by many—including a majority of this body—as an abandonment of our historical commitment to refugees and a misplaced reaction to our legitimate fears of terrorism.

When we debated the IIRIRA later the same year, I offered an amendment with Senator DEWINE to restrict the use of expedited removal to times of immigration emergencies, which would be certified by the Attorney General. This more limited authority was all that the Administration had requested in the first place, and it was far more in line with our international and historical commitments. This amendment passed the Senate with bipartisan support, but it was removed in one of the most partisan conference committees I have ever witnessed. As a result, the extreme version of expedited removal contained in AEDPA became law, and was implemented in 1997. Ever since, I have attempted to raise consciousness about the problems with expedited removal.

Last year, I introduced the Refugee Protection Act (S. 1940) with Senator BROWBACK and five other Senators of both parties. The bill is modeled closely on the 1996 amendment that passed the Senate, and I was optimistic that it too would be supported by a broad coalition of Senators. It allows expedited removal only in times of immigration emergencies, and it provides due process rights and elemental fairness for those arriving at our borders without sacrificing security concerns. But even as the Refugee Protection Act has gained additional cosponsors, it has been ignored by the Senate leadership. Indeed, the bill has not even received a

hearing in the Judiciary Committee, despite my request.

Meanwhile, in the little more than three years that expedited removal has been in operation, we already have numerous stories of valid asylum seekers who were forced to leave our country without the opportunity to convince an immigration judge that they faced persecution in their native lands. To provide just one example, "Dem," a Kosovar Albanian, was summarily removed from the U.S. after the civil war in Kosovo had already made the front pages of America's newspapers. During his interview with the INS inspector who had unreviewable discretion over his fate, he was provided with a Serbian translator who did not speak Albanian, rendering the interview a farce. Instead of being embraced as a political refugee, he was put on the next plane back to where his flight had originated. We only know about his story at all because he was dogged enough to make it back to the United States. On this second trip, he was found to have a credible fear of persecution and he is currently in the midst of the asylum process.

Perhaps the most distressing part of expedited removal is that there is no way for us to know how many deserving refugees have been excluded. Because secondary inspection interviews are conducted in secret, we typically only learn about mistakes when refugees manage to make it back to the United States a second time, like Dem, or when they are deported to a third country they passed through on their way to the United States. This uncertainty should lead us to be especially wary of continuing this failed experiment.

Unjust deportation: Another injustice in the 1996 legislation that we must address is its drastically expanded definition of what makes a legal resident deportable. First, the IIRIRA defined the term "aggravated felony" in such a way as to make numerous misdemeanors deportable offenses. Then it applied this new standard retroactively, so that people who had committed crimes in the past that were so minor they did not even serve jail time were now subject to automatic deportation—including people who pleaded guilty to those crimes without any reason to believe there would be immigration consequences for that plea. The effects of this change have been unfair to numerous men and women, and their families, who have worked hard for years to turn their lives around, and have paid taxes, contributed their labor to the American economy, and raised children who are American citizens. I applaud the efforts of those in the House who are working to do away with retroactivity altogether.

I have chosen to take a narrower approach to this issue, focusing on the effect that this punitive policy has had on decorated war veterans who are being deported without any adminis-

trative or judicial consideration of the equities. I have introduced the Fairness to Immigrant Veterans Act, S. 871, which would ensure that veterans of our Armed Forces who have committed "aggravated felonies" have the opportunity to go before an immigration judge and plead their case to stay in the United States. It would also give veterans the right to federal court review of the immigration judges' decisions, and allow them to be released from detention while their claim is pending. If this bill becomes law, we will still be able to deport people who have committed serious crimes and present a danger to the community, regardless of their service record. But we will give veterans every opportunity to show that they and their families deserve a second chance, a chance they have earned through the sacrifices they made for our country.

Veterans groups have been very supportive of this legislation, with the American Legion, AMVETS, Vietnam Veterans of America, and the Blinded American Veterans all endorsing the bill. Despite these endorsements and my efforts to promote this legislation, however, the majority has failed even to hold a hearing on this bill.

Restoring basic benefits: Unfortunately, the IIRIRA and the AEDPA were not the only 1996 laws that distorted our immigration policy and harmed immigrants. The welfare reform law, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, added to that year's anti-immigration chorus, unreasonably restricting the eligibility of legal immigrants for social safety net provisions. It barred many legal immigrants from receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI), food stamps, and Medicaid coverage, even as Congress sought to ensure that Medicaid be preserved for those who were leaving welfare. It has prevented the children of legal immigrants from eligibility under the new Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). Under this statute, if legal immigrants (or their children) become sick, or lose their job, they are simply out of luck. These punitive restrictions were aimed not at illegal immigrants—who already were ineligible for most benefits—but at legal immigrants, people who were invited to come here and work, people who paid taxes and contributed to our society in myriad ways.

Senators MOYNIHAN and GRAHAM have introduced S. 792, the Fairness for Legal Immigrants Act, to rectify this injustice, and I am a proud cosponsor of their bill. Among other things, the bill would:

Permit States to cover all eligible legal immigrant pregnant women and children under Medicaid immediately;

Permit states to cover all legal immigrant children under CHIP;

Restore SSI eligibility for legal immigrants who arrived here before August 1996 and who are elderly and poor but not disabled by SSI standards;

Restore SSI eligibility for legal immigrants who arrived here after August 1996 and become disabled after entering the country; and

Restore food stamp eligibility for all pre-August 1996 legal immigrants.

This is a vital bill, but the majority has declined even to hold a hearing on it since it was introduced in April 1999. It is difficult to tell whether this inaction results from indifference to the plight of these legal immigrants, or from a belief on the majority's part that immigrants come here to take advantage of the social safety net that our country offers. If it is the latter, I would recommend to my colleagues to remarks made by former Housing and Urban Development Secretary and Republican Vice-Presidential candidate Jack Kemp at a recent press conference designed to highlight the need for Congress to take action on a variety of immigration legislation. Mr. Kemp said that immigrants do not come to the United States because of its welfare system—they come here because they want to make a better life for themselves through hard work. I would add, and I'm sure that Jack Kemp would agree, that they often come here to experience political freedom they cannot obtain in their own countries.

Detention: The IIRIRA made the detention of asylum seekers who arrive without proper documents mandatory until they establish a credible fear of persecution. It allowed the INS no discretion, even where asylum applicants had relatives willing to take them in and spare the government the cost of detaining them, or even where the asylum applicants were children. It took this step even though the INS had already issued regulations that prevented asylum applicants from working while their applications were pending—a step that had drastically reduced the filing of frivolous applications.

This detention mandate has created serious strains for the INS and has led to often inhumane conditions for people who are fleeing persecution. For example, in October 1998, the Miami Herald reported that the INS—under the pressures created by the 1996 law—had warehoused some of its detainees to a local jail in the Florida Panhandle. The jailers there constructed an “electric blanket” that it “placed over detainees, who [were] then subjected to intense electric shocks.” These asylum seekers were forced to remain under the blanket “for hours, worried about repeated shocks, and when refused bathroom privileges, they often soiled themselves. . . . They [also] endured broken bones, racial slurs, and attacks with Mace and pepper spray.”

The Refugee Protection Act, which I talked about earlier, also addresses the detention issue. It clarifies that the Attorney General is not obligated to detain asylum seekers while their claims are being processed—the bill preserves the Attorney General's ability to do so, but does not encourage deten-

tion. Asylum seekers are not criminals and they do not deserve to be imprisoned or detained without cause. Detention may be appropriate in rare cases, but it should be used sparingly. Detention is also extraordinarily costly for the taxpayers; indeed, the Department of Justice has projected that by the year 2001 it will need bed space for 24,000 INS detainees. The current policy is a humanitarian and fiscal failure, and we must reform it.

Conclusion: Although I am proud of the legislation we pass today, we have equally necessary and more challenging tasks ahead of us if we truly want to address the damage done by the laws passed in 1996. I urge my colleagues to focus on these issues and to work during the time we have remaining in this Congress to create sensible immigration laws. Let us not leave it to another Congress to fix the mistakes the majority made 4 years ago.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 4489) was read the third time and passed.

HONORING SENIOR JUDGE DANIEL H. THOMAS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 316, submitted earlier by Senators SESSIONS and SHELBY.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 316) honoring Senior Judge Daniel H. Thomas of the United States District Court of the Southern District of Alabama.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am familiar with this particular judge. He was from Mobile, AL, 40 miles from my hometown of Pascagoula, MS. He served long and honorably, having reached a grand old age of 94. He was known particularly for his expertise in admiralty. He will be sincerely missed by those who have known him over the years as a Federal judge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 316) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 316

Whereas Daniel H. Thomas devoted his life to the dedicated and principled service of his country, his State, and his community;

Whereas Daniel H. Thomas, a native of Prattville, Alabama, was born August 25, 1906, to Judge C.E. Thomas and Augusta Pratt.

Whereas Daniel H. Thomas obtained his law degree from the University of Alabama in 1928, where his uncle, Daniel H. Pratt, served as President pro tem of the Board of Trustees of the University;

Whereas Daniel H. Thomas, having served his country with distinction for 3 years as a Navy Lieutenant during World War II, returned to Mobile, Alabama and continued in the practice of law with Mr. Joseph C. Lyons and Sam Pipes in the law firm of Lyons, Thomas and Pipes until he was elevated to the Federal bench;

Whereas Daniel H. Thomas was appointed a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Alabama by President Truman in 1951, joining in distinguished judicial service his father, C.E. Thomas, who was a probate judge of Augusta County, Alabama, his uncle, William Thomas, who served the State of Alabama as a Supreme Court Justice, and his uncle, J. Render Thomas, who served many years as the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Alabama;

Whereas 49 years of judicial service made Judge Thomas one of the longest serving Federal judges in American history;

Whereas the years of distinguished judicial service by Judge Thomas were characterized by unflinching integrity and unquestioned legal ability;

Whereas in a time of great political and social turmoil, Judge Thomas inspired continued respect for the rule of law established under the Constitution of the United States, and for the propositions that “all men are created equal” and deserve “equal protection of the laws” by faithfully adhering to the precedents of the United States Supreme Court, even when such actions were not popular;

Whereas the depth of legal scholarship exhibited by Judge Thomas led him to become one of the most respected experts in the nation in the important field of Admiralty Law;

Whereas the reach of service by Judge Thomas to his country extended beyond his courtroom to his community through his active leadership as a founding trustee of the Ashland Place Methodist Church in Mobile, Alabama, and to America's youth through his efforts in support of the Boy Scouts of America;

Whereas Judge Thomas, a man who enjoyed the outdoors, being an accomplished fisherman and quail hunter, exhibited great common sense, had a vibrant sense of humor, and was extremely friendly and thoughtful of others, thereby truly fitting the description of a true “southern gentleman”;

Whereas Judge Thomas truly was a great judge whose life was the law, and who was loved and respected by members of the bar and community to a degree seldom reached and never surpassed;

Whereas Judge Thomas passed away at his home in Mobile, Alabama, on Thursday, April 13, 2000;

Whereas the members of the Senate extend our deepest sympathies to the wife of Judge Thomas, Catherine Miller Thomas, his 2 sons, Daniel H. Thomas, Jr. and Merrill P. Thomas, other family members, and a host of friends that he had across the country; and

Whereas in the example of Judge Daniel H. Thomas, the American people have an enduring symbol of moral courage, judicial restraint, and public service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate honors the memory of Judge Daniel H. Thomas for his exemplary service to his country; and