S. 1499

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1499, a bill to provide assistance to small business concerns adversely impacted by the terrorist attacks perpetrated against the United States on September 11, 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to extend and amend the Promoting Safe and Stable Families Program under subpart 2 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act, to provide the Secretary of Health and Human Services with new authority to support programs mentoring children of incarcerated parents, to amend the Foster Care Independent Living Program under part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide for educational and training vouchers for youths aging out of foster care, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 74

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 74, a concurrent resolution condemning bigotry and violence against Sikh-Americans in the wake of terrorist attacks in New York City and Washington, D.C. on September 11, 2001.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. DOMENICI):

S. 1522. A bill to support community-based group homes for young mothers and their children; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by Senators LIEBERMAN AND DOMENICI in introducing the Second Chance Homes Promotion Act. This legislation would provide needed resources to expand and improve the availability of community-based, adult-supervised group homes for unmarried teenage mothers and their babies.

Although rates of teenage pregnancy in the United States have dropped in recent years, they remain higher than most industrialized nations. Today, four in 10 young women become pregnant at least once before entering adulthood. Teenage parents are less likely to graduate from school and more likely to end up on public assistance than other adolescents. Also, children born to teenage mothers tend to fare more poorly in school, are less likely to receive needed health care services, and are at greater risk for abuse and neglect. ''Second Chance Homes'' help improve this situation by providing teen parents with a safe, nurturing environment where they can receive guidance in parenting, child development, budgeting, health and nutrition.

The welfare reform legislation enacted in 1996 requires that minor teens live with an adult in order to receive welfare benefits. During debate on this legislation, I worked with Senator LIEBERMAN and others to allow second chance homes to qualify as an alternative residence for teenage parents who may be at risk for abuse, neglect or other serious problems in their home. Since this time, we have learned that teenagers who were provided the opportunity to live in second chance homes are more likely to continue their education or receive job training, less likely to have a second teenage pregnancy, and more likely to find gainful employment that allows them to leave the welfare rolls. I strongly believe these are promising results.

Unfortunately, not all teenage parents who might benefit from second chance homes have access to these residences. Today, there are approximately 100 second chance homes nationwide, located in only six States. This legislation would provide resources for improving the homes that already exist and creating additional homes where none exist, particularly in tribal and rural communities where there may be fewer options for teenage parents and their babies to receive the assistance they need. Finally, this legislation would provide resources that can be used to conduct further evaluations on the quality and effectiveness of second chance homes. It is my hope others will join us in supporting this important effort.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to join Senators CONRAD and DOMENICI to introduce the Second Chance Homes Promotion Act of 2001. This legislation will promote the expansion of Second Chance Homes for parenting teenagers and provide needed resources for this innovative and accomplished program.

The United States has the highest rate of teen pregnancy and births in the Western industrialized world. This costs the country at least $7 billion annually. Four in 10 young women become pregnant at least once before they reach the age of 20, nearly one million a year. Teen mothers are less likely to complete high school, and more likely to end up on welfare. The children of teenage mothers have lower birth weights, are more likely to perform poorly in school, and are at greater risk of abuse and neglect. But we know we can do something about this. Second Chance Homes are an essential tool to improve the life chances of these teenagers.

In the 1996 welfare reform legislation, I worked to develop the concept of Second Chance Homes as an alternative for minor teen parents required by that law to live at home or under adult supervision. Welfare reform required states to provide or assist teen mothers in locating a second chance home, maternity home, or other supportive living arrangement if they cannot live at home because of abuse, neglect or other reasons.

Since 1996, these homes have produced notable and promising results: fewer second pregnancies, slightly higher adoption rates, less child abuse, better maternal and child health, dramatically increased school completion rates, higher employment rates, reduced welfare dependency. Clearly these are successes we want to replicate.

Currently only six States have networks of Second Chance Homes. This bill will provide resources to expand the number of Second Chance Homes across the country to continue these encouraging trends and assist these young mothers to the brightest future they can have.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor legislation with Senators LIEBERMAN and CONRAD that will help to address a very serious problem facing our Nation. The rise of teenage pregnancy has many implications for American society in terms of educational and employment opportunities, economic self-sufficiency, children's health, and child abuse and crime prevention. For example, many teenage mothers find that their educational and vocational opportunities are severely limited. In fact, only one-third of teenage mothers complete high school and receive their diploma. Furthermore, teenage pregnancy has been linked with increases in child abuse and criminal activity. But, perhaps most disturbing is the fact that daughters of teenage mothers are 22 percent more likely to become teenage mothers themselves, thus creating a self-perpetuating cycle from generation to generation.

It is clear that these problems will only continue unless we address the issue of teenage pregnancy. This is an especially critical issue, because the United States has the highest rates of teenage pregnancy in the western industrialized world. I believe that this legislation will help to address these concerns. One of the ideas endorsed by Congress in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 was the concept of second chance homes. Second chance homes are an option for many teenage mothers who are required by the 1996 act to live at home or under adult supervision. These homes provide both living arrangements and educational opportunities for young mothers.

Second chance homes have been remarkably successful in decreasing both second pregnancies and child abuse and in improving the educational and vocational opportunities of teenage mothers. For example, New Mexico's second chances homes have produced many success stories with several residents earning a registered nurse degree. It is truly inspiring to think that many

teenagers who had the odds stacked against them have been given a second chance and have become vital members of the health care profession.

Despite the successes of second chance homes, many teenage mothers do not have access to such a home. Although New Mexico has over a hundred second chance homes, many States are not so fortunate. Furthermore, according to a 1999 study, eighteen States do not have a policy for helping mothers find such a shelter. This is the genesis behind our legislation. We hope to increase the availability of second chance homes and allow a greater number of teenage mothers to take advantage of the many opportunities that they provide. This bill will create a competitive grant program within the Department of Health and Human Services that will award five-year grants to State, local, and tribal governments and to non-profit organizations to create or expand a second-chance home. I am hopeful that this significant federal investment will allow a greater number of teenage mothers to graduate from high school, and even college or vocational training, and will increase the health and safety of their children.

Second chance homes have a remarkable record in alleviating many of the problems associated with teenage pregnancy. From education to maternal and infant health, they have played a crucial role in the success of welfare reform. I thank Senators LIEBERMAN and CONRAD for their work on this important legislation, and I look forward to all teenage mothers having a true second chance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1523. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions of the Social Security Act, provisions of current law that reduce earned Social Security benefits for teachers and other government pensioners.

Under current law, public employees, whose salaries are often lower than those in the private sector to begin with, find that they are penalized and held to a different standard when it comes to retirement benefits. The unfair reduction in their benefits makes it more difficult to recruit teachers, police officers, and fire fighters.

The legislation that I introduce today addresses two provisions in the current Social Security Act that create this problem: The Windfall Elimination Provision and the Government Pension Offset provision.

The Social Security Windfall Elimination Provision reduces Social Security benefits for retirees who paid into Social Security and also receive a government pension, such as from a teacher retirement fund. Private sector retirees receive monthly Social Security checks equal to 90 percent of their first $561 in average monthly career earnings, plus 32 percent of monthly earnings up to $3,381 and 15 percent of earnings above $3,381. Government pensioners, however, are only allowed to receive 40 percent of the first $561 in career monthly earnings, a penalty of $280.50 per month.

To my mind it is simply unfair, especially at a time when we need to be doing all we can to attract qualified people government service, and this bill will allow government pensioners the chance to earn the same 90 percent to which non-government pension recipients are entitled.

The current Government Pension Offset provision reduces Social Security spousal benefits by an amount equal to two-thirds of the spouse's public employment civil service pension. This can have the effect of taking away, entirely, a spouse's benefits from Social Security.

It is beyond my understanding why we would want to discourage people from pursuing careers in public service, such as teaching, by essentially saying that if you do become a teacher your family will suffer by not being able to receive the full retirement benefits they would otherwise be entitled to.

There is a teaching crisis in California right now, as there is in many States. Yet current Social Security benefit rules penalize private sector employees who leave their jobs to become public school teachers, or public school teachers who work second jobs during the summer months to help make ends meet. They lose legitimately earned Social Security benefits. And in certain cases, their wives and husbands will lose spousal benefits, too.

That is simply not fair and not right. California faces a teaching crisis, and we need to do everything we can to attract and keep good, qualified people as public school teachers, not make an already difficult job more difficult.

The same can be said for other public employees, like police and fire fighters.

This legislation addresses this inequity in the Social Security Act, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BURNS, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1525. A bill to extend the moratorium on the imposition of taxes on the Internet for an additional 5 years; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Defense of Internet Tax Freedom Act, with my friends and colleagues from California, Montana, New Hampshire, and Virginia, to extend the moratorium on Internet access taxes and multiple and discriminatory taxes for five-years. As you know, the original provisions of the Internet Tax Freedom Act are set to expire this October 21, less than two weeks from now.

As many in this chamber know, I have made extending the moratorium on taxes that discriminate against the Internet one of my top priorities since coming to the Senate. I cannot ever envision a time when it will be okay for any government to tax freedom on the Internet by taxing access to the Internet. I cannot ever conceive of any instance or event that will precipitate justification for multiple or discriminatory taxes on the Internet by any government, large or small, national or local.

For this reason, I have maintained constant and steady support for the permanent extension of the Internet moratorium on Internet access, multiple and discriminatory taxes. I never thought I would be willing to vote for, much less sponsor, legislation that endorsed a limited extension, but the events of September 11, 2001 have forced all of us in this Congress, and indeed throughout the country, to think and act according to the most immediate interests of our Nation.

Now, more than ever, the people of this country need security, not only with regard to safety, but also with regard to their financial future. Any additional tax burdens on the Internet now, will mean additional costs that many Americans cannot afford, forcing the poorest in our society to reduce or even forgo their use of the Internet as a tool for education and exploration.

Consider the fact that by taxing Internet access, States and localities are actually contributing to an already growing economic ''digital divide.'' For every dollar added to the cost of Internet access, we can expect to see lost utilization of the Internet by thousands of poor and impoverished families nationwide.

Furthermore, the more expensive you make Internet access, the less likely people are to buy advanced services, including broadband delivered high-speed Internet access, multimedia expansion cards, and Internet protocol enabling software. Given the current state of the technology market as a whole, a decrease in consumption resulting from Internet access taxes could destroy what glimmer of hope remains for many telecommunications and technology manufacturers.

The effects of these closures have already been felt throughout our country. Congress should be working to keep businesses open and Americans employed, and that is why we must pass a reasonable extension of the moratorium on Internet access, multiple, and discriminatory taxes.

If you consider for a moment that the Internet has only been around in its contemporary form since 1995 or 1996, then you realize that this technology and the impact it has made and will continue to make on our economy is both very promising and very unsure. To date we have very little reliable data as to the real impact the

Internet is making on the daily lives of Americans.

We have little to no information as to how and why consumers on the web decide to spend their hard earned money. We have no real evidence that consumers would decide to spend money or purchase products they buy on the web today if these products were only available in traditional brick-n-mortar settings.

The studies we have seen thus far all contradict one another. In one study dealing with the effects of Internet purchasing on State revenues, I found a quote from the President of the National Conference of State Legislatures comparing State budgets in recent years to the engine of a luxury car. Yet, I have heard from this and other organizations that the Internet is destroying State tax revenue streams.

I don't know who or what to believe. All I know is that many in this Senate need time to understand this issue. There are many members in this body who do not fully recognize that the moratorium is completely unrelated to sales taxes or the collection thereof. Given that fact, I cannot see why extending the moratorium for a mere few months or years would be beneficial in terms of educating the general public and the Members of this body.

In a matter of months or a few years, the technology sector will only just be at the point of full recovery from the current downturn in our economy. We will need several years beyond that point of full recovery to complete the comprehensive, neutral studies of the Internet and e-commerce that Members of Congress will need in order to make these important decisions, decisions that may directly challenge the conventional wisdom of our Founding Fathers and our own historical experience.

Given these requirements, five years seems to be the minimum amount of time Congress, the private sector, and other interested organizations will need in order to make well-informed, proactive decisions regarding other issues not related to the Internet moratorium.

In the meantime, we can guarantee a level of stability for the Internet over the next five years that will allow our Nation to continue to close the digital divide and encourage new and enhanced uses of the web for consumers.

I call on my colleagues to join me and my fellow cosponsors in cosponsoring the Defense of Internet Tax Freedom Act, in supporting a five year extension of the Internet moratorium on access multiple and discriminatory taxes.

Let's give the Internet the future it deserves and show America that the answer is not more taxes but rather better, more efficient government for the people and by the people.

Mrs. BOXER. Today, I am joining Senators ALLEN, BURNS, and GREGG in supporting an extension of the Internet tax moratorium for another 5 years.

I supported the moratorium when it was initially instituted in order to encourage the growth of the then newly emerging Internet industry. In the 1990s, the industry enjoyed a growth spurt that helped move the whole economy forward. But recently, Internet companies have fallen on hard times.

Because Internet commerce and technology firms are not now fairing well, I support a five year extension of the tax moratorium. I believe that renewed investment in the Internet is crucial to the welfare of the entire economy and we need to support its growth as much now as we did in 1998. Through a clean extension of the tax moratorium, Congress can promote an environment for Internet growth that avoids the uncertainty, inefficiencies, and barriers to entry that new taxes would create.

The technology sector was in a recession before the September 11, 2001 attacks. In the first half of 2001, more than 300,000 technology sector jobs were eliminated and companies declared bankruptcy because of reduced consumer and business spending on technology products. One example, Webvan, an Internet grocery delivery company, closed shop in July. In the process, 2,000 employees lost their jobs in the company's seven markets—San Francisco, Los Angeles, Orange County, San Diego, Seattle, Chicago, and Portland.

With the additional decline in consumer confidence resulting from the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, the industry has fallen even deeper into recession. The results have been devastating for many firms. For example, since the attacks, Cisco laid off 8,500 workers, Excite@home has laid off 500 workers, and MicroStrategy has laid off 200 workers. By extending the Internet tax moratorium for five years, we send the message to the industry and its workers that we will not turn a deaf ear to this crisis.

The economy rose during the last eight years on the new jobs, efficiencies, and demand for products that the Internet and Internet-related companies created. Restoring economic growth will depend largely on our ability to spark renewed investment and growth in this vital industry. Firms that sell products over the Internet are key consumers of computers, software, and hardware. Their growth would encourage additional interest in connecting to the Internet and help produce new consumer demand for more technology products.

We should assist, not burden our technology firms at this time. Another five years could give the Internet time to work out its current growing pains. As technology innovations encourage additional growth and renewed interest in the Internet, our economy as a whole will benefit. A stronger Internet will mean more jobs, more companies, and a broader tax base. That is a net gain for everyone.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 1527. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to extend and improve the environmental quality incentive program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to announce the introduction of a bill that would amend and extend the Environmental Quality Improvement Program, EQIP, to make it more user friendly, and to make it more effective in it's on-the-ground implementation.

EQIP is a voluntary, Federal cost share program administered by the United States Department of Agriculture's, USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service, NRCS, and Farm Service Agency, FSA. The program was created to assist farmers and ranchers in implementing conservation management programs on private lands, lands that not only serve as the backbone of our Nation's food supplies but which also provide important habitat for America's wildlife, including many endangered species. It does this by providing technical, financial, and educational assistance to farmers and ranchers as they make capital improvements in irrigation and other water systems, address a wide variety of conservation problems, provide flood plain protection, support grazing lands conservation, and facilitate wildlife habitat protection programs.

When everything works right, EQIP provides a tremendous benefit to producers and the environment. One example of this can be found in an EQIP-funded project underway in central Wyoming. This project, known locally as the Sand Mesa project, is allowing a group of Wyoming farmers to increase irrigation efficiency while also reducing pumping costs. They are doing this by replacing an aging canal system with a gravity-flow pipeline.

Under the old system, the open air canals lost a lot of water to seepage and evaporation. The water savings from the new pipeline has turned out to be critically important in years, like this one, where drought is so prevalent in the West. The 14 miles of pipeline replaced 11 miles of open canal and committed 5,000 acre feet of water for existing wetlands. In the first year alone the new system saved at least 22,000 acre feet of water. This translates into that much more water being available in Bull Lake and Wind River for other uses. The gravity-flow pressure is also adequate to eventually run all 36 irrigation pivots on the new system, which will result in an even greater water savings.

Why did this project work out so well? It wasn't because Washington, DC bureaucrats stepped in and told the community the best things to do with their money.

Sand Mesa is a combined effort that unites the knowledge of local farmers with local technical experts who together are able to turn Wyoming's desert into fertile farmland. Together, the farmers and the technicians are designing a conservation and financial

plan that will allow them to make the most out of their limited environmental and financial resources.

The inclusion of local expertise in establishing program priorities is one of EQIP's strongest assets. Local working groups are made up of individuals who represent a wide range of interests. The groups are made up of farmers, ranchers, representatives from conservation districts, agricultural organizations, environmental groups, Native Americans, and other local, state and federal agencies.

Along with the State Advisory Committees, local work groups have made a conscientious effort to make sure limited EQIP dollars are put to their best use. They have not always been successful. The only existing authority these groups have is in identifying priority areas that may, if Washington, DC bureaucrats decide, receive funding. The result of this allocation structure is that funds are not always equitably distributed.

In 1999 a group of my constituents in Powell, WY approached me with serious concerns about the way EQIP regulations took authority away from local experts. EQIP was created as a part of the 1996 Farm Bill. In establishing EQIP, the Farm Bill terminated four previously existing cost share, conservation programs and replaced them with the new program. The terminated programs had relied heavily on local input to manage all aspects of implementation. Because of this history producers had come to expect local expertise to play a bigger role in the new program. EQIP regulations, however, consolidated the decision making process at the Federal level and left out local input.

My consitutents were concerned that an unusually large percentage of new EQIP dollars were being directed to applicants who did not necessarily require federal assistance to complete conservation improvements, while smaller, family-owned producers, who could sincerely benefit from the program, were being overlooked. Their fears were that funding decisions were determined more by politics and grant writing ability than by the greatest need or ability to maximize environmental benefit per dollar expended.

In response to their concerns, I wrote a letter to former Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman and asked for his help in correcting these inequities. He forwarded my request to the Wyoming NRCS offices where NRCS Wyoming State Director Ed Burton organized a team that reviewed the EQIP allocation process. This team identified a number of legislative and administrative actions which, if they are followed, would ensure the program's most effective implementation.

This bill is the result of their efforts. The bill addresses four areas that the Wyoming review team noted would require specific legislative fixes. First, the bill increases allocation flexibility by defining the phrase ''maximize environmental benefits per dollar expended'' in a way that gives the Secretary of Agriculture the ability to consult with local working groups in deciding what are the best ways to guarantee that limited EQIP funds can be directed to those ranchers and farmers who can provide the most effective use of the program's cost share program. The bill would simplify and streamline the current process to make the program less time consuming to field office staff, and less frustrating to producers.

The bill also would allow farmers and ranchers the flexibility to use EQIP funds when they are needed most. Too often weather conditions or other unrelated reasons make it impossible for eligible applicants to conform to Federal fiscal calendars. By allowing funds to be available until expended, this bill would keep program dollars available on a real-world schedule and would allow producers to receive cost share dollars at current costs and not at the rate in effect when the contract was written.

The third change this bill would make is to adjust the program to allow contracts from three to ten years. Current EQIP requirements allow five to ten year contracts only. EQIP payments are limited generally to $10,000 per person annually, and $50,000 over the 5 to 10 year life of the contract. This is often much more than is required by farmers and could place an undue hardship on producers who do not have the ability or the desire to enter into long-term contracts. Three to ten year contracts, based on the producer's conservation plan, would allow greater flexibility to implement resource management systems.

Finally, the bill would allow producers who are ready to begin work in the first year of the contract to immediately receive contract payments. Many producers who apply for EQIP are ready to install practices as soon as the contract is approved. Under current law, if practices are installed in the same year the contract is written, the producer must wait until the next fiscal year for their first payment. This delay can cause undue financial hardship, especially in an industry where cash flow is severely limited.

I am proud of the efforts of the people in my State to make this program better and more efficient. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill and to support our farmers in their work to feed the world.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Oregon):

S. 1528. a bill to improve the safety and security of rail transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Rail Safety and Security Act. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by Senator GORDON SMITH, the ranking Republican of the Commerce Committee's Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Subcommittee.

This legislation would authorize funding to improve rail passenger safety and security, while assuring accountability and oversight of all associated expenditures. It would also amend current law and allow for rail police officers to enforce laws on the properties of other railroads and would establish criminal sanctions for attacks against our Nation's rail system. And, it would also require a comprehensive assessment of the security risks surrounding rail transportation in order for the Congress to then take appropriate action based on the conclusions of the assessment. I believe this legislation is a much needed step in protecting our rail transportation system against security threats and vulnerabilities.

During the past four weeks, we have been working in a bipartisan manner to address the nation's most pressing needs in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks. We have worked with the administration to provide necessary emergency funding to aid in the aftermath of the attacks in New York and at the Pentagon.

Part of that effort has focused on the survival of the aviation industry, and rightly so. Our Nation, our citizens, and our economy cannot afford further deterioration of this critical segment of the transportation industry. It is equally important that we approve aviation security legislation and send it to the President.

Transportation systems are the target of 40 percent of terrorist attacks worldwide. That is why it is necessary for the government to play a key role in assessing potential security threats in our Nation's transportation system. We must ensure that we have taken every precaution to safeguard critical infrastructure and that procedures are in place to protect people and property in the event of actual terrorist attacks. In that effort, the Senate Commerce Committee has been conducting a series of hearings to gain the information we need to help us evaluate potential security risks and determine how best to respond to those potential risks.

In addition to aviation security legislation, the Commerce Committee has approved legislation to address security at our Nation's ports. I am hopeful the full Senate will have the opportunity to consider that bill in the near future.

Given the hundreds of thousands of miles of rail track, highways, and pipelines, hundreds of ports and terminals throughout the U.S., and the ease of access to public transportation, it is impossible to fully secure our transportation system against all deliberate acts of destruction. Efforts to reduce vulnerability, however, are essential and each industry has a responsibility to assess and respond to identified problems. Federal, State, and local governments also play an important role in this effort.

The legislation I am introducing today is designed to address the safety and security of our Nation's rail transportation network, both passenger and freight. Unlike other passenger rail funding proposals that have been suggested, this legislation would only fund legitimate safety and security initiatives. It would also assure the highest degree of accountability of all expenditures. I note my proposal would not provide a handout directly to Amtrak to fund long-planned capacity projects that it has been unable to accomplish. Therefore, some will likely object to my approach from the outset. But, I hope members interested in addressing legitimate rail safety and security concerns will join me in supporting this alternative approach.

Last week, the Senate Commerce Committee held a hearing on Rail and Maritime security. We learned from that hearing that certain actions that can be taken immediately to address security vulnerabilities. Therefore, this legislation is designed to address the needs we currently know exist and, at the same time, provide for an assessment of rail security that would enable us to act on matters identified through a more comprehensive review than has yet occurred.

First, the bill would authorize funding for security upgrades for rail transportation provided by Amtrak. However, the funding would be made available to Amtrak only after the Secretary establishes appropriate funding procedure safeguards and after approving a system wide security plan submitted by Amtrak.

Second, the bill would authorize funding for the Tunnel Life Safety projects in New York, Baltimore, Maryland, and Washington, D.C. The DOT Inspector General has confirmed the need to bring existing systems up to par with modern safety standards, including the replacement of narrow, winding spiral staircases, the installation of modern ventilation fans, and the rehabilitation of benchwalls. The IG further has expressed concerns that an extended schedule of repairs as would occur without federal assistance places the public at prolonged and unnecessary risk.

Based on the findings of the DOT–IG, this legislation includes provisions to fully fund these projects in order to reduce the risk to public safety. It would fund these projects, however, only after the Secretary approves engineering and financial plans submitted by Amtrak and conditions the release of funding by entering into proper funding procedures. In other words, the funding will not just be handed to Amtrak with no questions asked. It ensures proper federal oversight of the federal assistance.

Furthermore, the legislation would direct the DOT Inspector General to review the obligation and expenditure of funds provided under this legislation to ensure that the funds are used solely for the purposes intended by Congress.

Third, the bill would permit rail police officers to enforce laws on the properties of other railroads. Current law only permits officers to enforce laws on the properties of the rail carrier that employs the police officer. This provision would allow for flexibility and the sharing of enforcement resources among all rail carriers as may be necessary to address safety and security threats directed at a particular carrier.

Fourth, this legislation includes provisions to address potential security threats to our nation's rail transportation system. While the vulnerabilities of air travel may be most prevalent in our memory, our rail system has been and continues to be vulnerable to security threats. Five years ago, Arizonans and citizens throughout the country were saddened to learn of an Amtrak derailment near Hyder, AZ, which claimed the life of one individual and injured seventy-eight others. Shortly after the accident, the sadness turned to shock as we learned that the derailment may have been caused by someone who intentionally sabotaged the track. The Arizona accident is not unique. There have been other examples of acts against railroads.

Following that occurrence, the Senate passed legislation requested by the previous Administration addressing some of these vulnerabilities. Unfortunately, we failed to reach an agreement with the House during conference deliberations on the multi-year highway funding legislation. Therefore, I am including those provisions as part of this bill today. Now, more than ever, these provisions are essential.

The legislation would establish criminal sanctions for violent attacks against railroads, railroad employees and railroad passengers similar to sanctions currently afforded for attacks against airlines, vessels on the high seas, motor carriers, and pipelines. I strongly believe the rail industry and its employees and customers deserve the same protections afforded the other methods.

Finally, the legislation would direct the Secretary to assess the security risks associated with rail transportation and to develop recommendations for target hardening those areas identified as posing significant risk to public safety. As I previously mentioned, there has not yet been a comprehensive analysis of the security risks of the rail industry. This provision would direct that such an assessment be carried out and at the conclusion of the assessment, it would provide us with the information Congress needs in order to make future decisions on how to further address rail security matters.

I believe this legislation is a credible proposal that could do a great deal to improve the safety and security of our rail network. I stand ready to work with my colleagues, the Administration, industry, and public safety advocates in an effort to address the safety and security of our nation's rail system.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 1529. A bill to direct the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security to establish the National Energy Infrastructure Security Program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, as we consider the issue of national security in the weeks after the terrorist attacks of September 11, one sector in particular that deserves our undivided attention is the security of our national energy infrastructure. The vulnerability of our country's energy infrastructure became more clear last week when an individual was able to cause about 150,000 gallons of oil to spill from the 800 mile Trans-Alaska Pipeline with a bullet from a high powered rifle.

I believe the events of September 11 have proven that Congress has a responsibility to make sure our Nation's energy infrastructure is adequately protected from both hostile and natural attacks.

We are now engaged in an operation to combat terrorism which will take considerable time and resources. Some of the emergency measures put in place at energy facilities throughout the country in response to the September 11 attacks can only be maintained for so long. For example, off the coast of my State of Louisiana the Nation's largest port for offloading crude oil was being patrolled by a military vessel. While a kind of safety zone around such areas makes sense, should we expend our military's resources in order to do so? Merely using our present available resources to operate at such high levels of alert for the duration of what all indications are will be a long term effort does not seem realistic. There is a need for a substantial commitment to the protection of our country's energy infrastructure both in scope and duration.

Although 90 percent of the infrastructure in this country is privately owned and operated and industry does have an obligation to provide security, there is sufficient evidence to suggest the Federal Government should make a more significant contribution. First, our country is now experiencing an economic downturn. It is imperative for our government to continue to focus its attention on measures to increase and shore up production while keeping our domestic supply of energy steady.

Second, energy infrastructure is by nature not contained within the borders of one State or region. For example, three of the country's top ten gasoline consuming States are in the Midwest. The Midwest imports 25 percent of its total demand from the Gulf Coast. While the Gulf Coast refining centers handle half of the total barrels processed in the U.S. today, there are only two pipeline systems in place to move the product from the South to

the Midwest. This is a tremendous amount of pressure on Gulf Coast refineries to meet demand in the Midwest. What happens if one or both of these systems are disrupted? In addition, the only offshore oil terminal in the United States, the Louisiana Offshore Oil Port, LOOP, is estimated to take in 13 percent of the United States' imported oil and refining capacity and is connected by five pipelines to over 30 percent of the United States refining capacity. Imagine the impact its disruption from natural or hostile threats would have on the Nation's refining capacity.

So, whether we are talking about pipelines, transmission lines, electric generators, refineries, nuclear power plants, ports, rigs or platforms, the Federal Government has a clear and compelling interest in providing the necessary resources to ensure that our energy infrastructure is sufficiently protected. Since the disruption of a particular facility or transmission line has economic consequences and could pose a significant threat to the safety of the surrounding population, as well as the effect on our economy, environment, state and local authorities must also play a role. This would require a partnership among the federal, state and local governments and industry.

Today, I am introducing legislation, the National Energy Infrastructure Security Program Establishment Act, which would: Establish a multi-year national energy infrastructure program overseen by the newly appointed Assistant to the President for Homeland Security, to provide funding annually to all 50 States in order to make sure that all appropriate measures from the monitoring and detection of potential threats to mitigation, response and recovery are in place against hostile and natural threats; create two funds, one for the protection of energy infrastructure located in the coastal zones of oil and gas producing States, the other for the energy infrastructure of all fifty States excluding those areas in the oil and gas producing States that would be provided for in the first fund; provide funding based on a formula related to the amount of energy infrastructure a State has as well as to the contribution of the State's infrastructure to the rest of the country; the Governor of each State would consult with Federal, State and local law enforcement, public safety, officials, industry and other relevant persons or agencies to put together a security plan to submit to the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security as well as the Secretaries of Commerce, Energy and Interior detailing what measures were necessary provide adequate protection of that particular State's infrastructure; and in order to pay for this program we would use a percentage of offshore revenues from oil and gas development on the Outer Continental Shelf.

If we are truly serious about protecting our country's energy infrastructure from present and future threats, it is necessary for us to provide a commitment of significant Federal resources as soon as possible.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 78—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL CHARACTER COUNTS WEEK

Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOND, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BURNS, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. KOHL, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CONRAD, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DEWINE, Mrs. CARNAHAN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FRIST, Mr. REID, Mr. HAGEL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HELMS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. VOINOVICH) submitted the following concurrent resolution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. CON. RES. 78

Whereas the well-being of the Nation requires that the young people of the United States become an involved, caring citizenry with good character;

Whereas the character education of children has become more urgent as violence by and against youth increasingly threatens the physical and psychological well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas more than ever, children need strong and constructive guidance from their families and their communities, including schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, and civic groups;

Whereas the character of a nation is only as strong as the character of its individual citizens;

Whereas the public good is advanced when young people are taught the importance of good character and the positive effects that good character can have in personal relationships, in school, and in the workplace;

Whereas scholars and educators agree that people do not automatically develop good character and that, therefore, conscientious efforts must be made by institutions and individuals that influence youth to help young people develop the essential traits and characteristics that comprise good character;

Whereas, although character development is, first and foremost, an obligation of families, the efforts of faith communities, schools, and youth, civic, and human service organizations also play an important role in fostering and promoting good character;

Whereas Congress encourages students, teachers, parents, youth, and community leaders to recognize the importance of character education in preparing young people to play their role in determining the future of the Nation;

Whereas effective character education is based on core ethical values which form the foundation of democratic society;

Whereas examples of character are trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, citizenship, and honesty;

Whereas elements of character transcend cultural, religious, and socioeconomic differences;

Whereas the character and conduct of our youth reflect the character and conduct of society; therefore, every adult has the responsibility to teach and model ethical values and every social institution has the responsibility to promote the development of good character;

Whereas Congress encourages individuals and organizations, especially those who have an interest in the education and training of the young people of the United States, to adopt the elements of character as intrinsic to the well-being of individuals, communities, and society;

Whereas many schools in the United States recognize the need, and have taken steps, to integrate the values of their communities into their teaching activities;

Whereas the establishment of National Character Counts Week, during which individuals, families, schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, civic groups, and other organizations would focus on character education, would be of great benefit to the Nation; and

Whereas the week beginning October 15, 2001, and the week beginning October 14, 2002, are appropriate weeks to establish as National Character Counts Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a National Character Counts Week should be established to promote character education; and

(2) the President should issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to—

(A) embrace the elements of character identified by their local schools and communities, such as trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, citizenship, and honesty; and

(B) observe such a week with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1854. Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. KERRY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1447, to improve aviation security, and for other purposes.

SA 1855. Mr. DASCHLE (for Mrs. CARNAHAN (for herself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mrs. CLINTON)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1447, supra.

SA 1856. Mr. JEFFORDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1447, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1857. Mr. HOLLINGS (for Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1447, supra.

SA 1858. Mr. HOLLINGS (for Mr. ENSIGN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1447, supra.

SA 1859. Mr. GRAMM proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1855 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE to the bill (S. 1447) supra.

SA 1860. Mr. MCCAIN (for Ms. SNOWE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1447, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1854. Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr.