

equation; that is, how do you deal with all of this lost revenue and the need to fund our schools and education?

We really need to deal with both issues. I agree with the extension of the moratorium. What I propose is that we extend the moratorium to next June 30, do that immediately—I will propose a unanimous consent request when I send this to the desk—and between now and then, ask all of the sides involved to get serious and get this done, develop a compact we can work on together, and therefore require simplification of local tax systems and allow the State and local governments to enforce collection.

My colleague, Senator ENZI from Wyoming, with whom I have worked, as well as Senator VOINOVICH, Senator WYDEN, Senator McCAIN, Senator GRAHAM of Florida, and many others have worked on this issue for a long while. We have not met success at this point. But Senator ENZI has been working very hard on it and another approach that would have a longer extension but would establish a more concrete system by which the State and local governments could develop a compact.

I am going to be a cosponsor of that proposal. I know he is working with other colleagues on it. I think that is good work as well. In the interim, I didn't want people to think that those of us who were working to solve both problems here—and there are two problems—were insensitive to the need to extend the moratorium. For that reason, I propose today that we extend the moratorium to next June 30. I will ask unanimous consent to do so, and I will send S. 1504 to the desk.

---

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—  
S. 1504

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1504, the Internet tax moratorium bill; that the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration, that the bill be read three times, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will state the objection that I understand will be raised, but let me assure my colleague and friend that there is an interest on both sides of the aisle to extend the moratorium, maybe with not this precise language, maybe it would be the Enzi proposal, maybe it would be something Senators ALLARD and McCAIN and others are working on. We will try to work with you to make sure the moratorium is extended. At this particular time, an objection will be raised.

Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me say that I understood there would be

an objection. We will now experience a circumstance where the moratorium expires on Sunday. My expectation is that will not have much material impact on what or what might not happen in the country in the intervening days.

It is my hope that all of us who have worked on this can reach an agreement on how to do a number of these things. I don't want to retard the ability of remote sellers, catalogs, Internet, or other devices; I don't want to retard their ability to use that marketing strategy to enhance commerce in this country. I don't want to burden them in a way that would be unfair.

By the same token, we have this growth of remote sales by enterprises that, in many cases, have grown very large but have very few locations and use the mail and Internet transactions with which to conduct business; much of the commerce is then outside of the ability of State and local governments to receive the sales and use tax from that commerce just as other transactions would require.

That doesn't mean that when you buy something over the Internet, or from a catalog, it is tax free; it is not. A use tax is required to be paid, but almost no one pays it.

Some would make the case that, for example, those who want to solve this problem are talking about a new tax. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is already a tax on these transactions. It is not paid because it is horribly complicated for individual citizens to find a use tax form and submit a use tax to Oklahoma, or North Dakota, or Virginia, and say, by the way, I bought a shirt, or shoes, or a tool set, and here is the use tax I owe because the sales tax wasn't collected when I purchased it.

Because of that set of circumstances, we believed it would be better for the seller and the buyer to find a way to collect that, remit that to the coffers of State and local governments. It is used largely for education and improving and strengthening our schools, and we believe it would be important to do that.

We are trying to solve several problems. I believe at the end of the day we will extend this moratorium. I wish we had done it today. We will extend this moratorium. My colleague from Wyoming would make permanent the moratorium on taxing access. I will support that. We will extend the moratorium. If we are doing the right thing, I think we will at the same time begin to address the second part of the issue on behalf of the Governors, mayors, State legislators, States, school administrators, and all the folks who care about that.

On the other side, we are going to address the question of complexity on behalf of the remote sellers. They are not just whistling in the dark here. This is a real problem and a serious problem that we have to address. We are dealing with both sides of the equation. I support addressing both sides in a thoughtful and sensible way.

Again, I understand why an objection was raised, although I regret that it was made. I wish we had been able to extend the moratorium today. I want everybody to understand that there is no division in the Senate, in my judgment, about whether the moratorium should be extended; it is how long, and should we do it without trying to find a way to buckle up the other part of the solution. We ought to, in my judgment, deal with both sets of problems at the same time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, as the Senate sponsor of the Internet tax freedom bill, I appreciate a chance to set the record straight about exactly what this law is.

For example, it is continually cited that the Internet tax freedom law creates a kind of Cayman Islands for the Internet, where you can't collect taxes. That is not right. The only thing the Internet tax freedom law does is it bans discriminatory taxes. You can tax the Internet; you just must do to the offline world what you do to the online world. That is No. 1.

No. 2, not a single jurisdiction in this country—not even one—has been able to show any evidence that they have been hurt by their inability to impose discriminatory taxes on electronic commerce. We are constantly told by the mayors and Governors in some jurisdictions that they have been hurt. We have repeatedly asked for the evidence, and there has been none forthcoming.

I have made it clear that I am very anxious to work with the mayors and Governors on this issue. I was not aware there was going to be an effort to extend the moratorium today for just a few months, because we have had these negotiations now for 18 months in an effort to try to bring the parties together. I want to make it clear that I am anxious to continue those negotiations.

No. 3, there is absolutely nothing in current law that prohibits States and localities from collecting revenue that is owed to them. There is nothing in the Internet Tax Freedom Act that bars them from doing that. I just hope that as we make this effort to bring together technology companies, States, localities, and the mayors, we can recognize that it is possible today under current law to collect all taxes owed. The reason it is not done is, A, the technology doesn't exist to do it in a fashion that would not burden business and, B, a lot of the mayors and Governors don't want the political heat associated with collecting those taxes. Probably most illustrative of this point is what former Governor Celucci of Massachusetts, now Ambassador to Canada, said: Look, I am not going to put people on the border of Massachusetts to chase people down coming

from New Hampshire. I am not going to have that kind of chaos on my hands.

I hope we will continue this effort to try to bring the parties together in a constructive fashion. I wasn't aware there was going to be an effort today by unanimous consent to deal with this issue. I want to make it clear that I am anxious to work with all of the parties who have been involved in this issue. But there is absolutely nothing in the Internet tax freedom law that creates a Cayman Islands with respect to the Internet, No. 1; and, No. 2, there isn't anything that keeps States and localities from collecting taxes that are now owed; the reason it is not done is technology and politics. I hope, working cooperatively together, as we have sought to do for 18 months, it will be possible to do that.

Senator MCCAIN and I have introduced a bill that would bar discriminatory taxes on electronic commerce for 2 years. We introduced that legislation several weeks ago. It is virtually identical to what the House passed this week. I hope we can work from that. I want colleagues to know that before we come to the floor, we will be consulting with all the parties, and we will make an effort to bring people together on that.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I just want to clarify a point the Senator made. I assume he was not making the point that I was suggesting that the Internet Tax Freedom Act created a "Cayman Islands." I have not suggested that, and I didn't say that today. If the Senator is responding to somebody who might have done that, it wasn't I. I want to make sure the Senator understands that.

If I might make a final point, the Senator is accurate that the State and local governments can now impose a use tax on sales that are made by remote seller to a customer in that State. He is also accurate that they almost never do because it would require the hiring of tens of thousands of Federal workers to try, in each individual case, to achieve that tax collection. That is precisely why there needs to be a balance in these proposals, to achieve both goals: Extend the moratorium and, in some cases, make them permanent; second, to both simplify the sales use tax systems and allow the collection.

I might finally say that I appreciate the generous time, and I say that I would object to a 2-year moratorium with nothing else in it that gives us an assurance of solving the second problem, as some today objected to the 8-month extension of the moratorium I suggested. We will come to a balance on that. The reason I felt the need to offer this today is that Sunday the moratorium expires, and this is simply saying we can solve that and extend it for 8 months, until next June 30, and there will be no expiration.

I appreciate the Senator yielding.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, to wrap up briefly, we have tried for 18 months

to bring the parties together. For example, I proposed—in spite of the fact that I see absolutely no evidence that any jurisdiction in this country has been hurt by their inability to impose discriminatory taxes, I proposed, over the opposition of many in business, that when the mayors and Governors have a proposal that is ready to go, they be given an opportunity to have a vote in the Congress, an opportunity to vote on a proposal of their choosing.

So I have clearly gone to considerable lengths to try to be sensitive to the concerns of mayors and Governors. I hope we will continue the effort to try to bring the parties together.

I was not aware there was going to be an effort to proceed to this bill by UC today, otherwise there would have been many colleagues, who share my view and support the legislation I offered with Congressman Cox that passed 98 to 2 in this Chamber, to support those positions to carry on this debate. The only way we are going to get this done is to bring the parties together.

I point out finally with respect to the time period, the National Conference of State Legislatures, known as NCSL, said recently they wanted a 4-year moratorium because they were not ready, from a technological standpoint, to advance the solutions that would address this issue without putting burdens on out-of-state sellers.

We are dealing with an extraordinarily important issue. The technology sector has been very hard hit, as all of our colleagues know. The last thing they need is to be shellacked with discriminatory taxes. There are more than 7,600 taxing jurisdictions in this country. If you are talking about overturning the Quill case, which is what this debate is all about, which says that you cannot impose taxes unless there is physical presence in a particular jurisdiction—a case I strongly support—you are dealing with very serious matters with respect to the economy of this country.

I would like to see us go back to the way we tried to deal with this for the last 18 months, which was in a conciliatory way, trying to bring the parties together. Starting Monday, there is an opportunity for considerable economic mischief. Fortunately, only four State legislatures are in session right now, but there is an opportunity for considerable economic mischief.

The legislation that Senator MCCAIN and I have advanced on a bipartisan basis provides the framework to proceed, but Senator Enzi, who has been very constructive on this issue for quite some time now, has made for me and others a copy of another proposal he has. I assure him and those with whom he is working that we will look at it very carefully and work with him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak this morning, but I arrived in the midst of the discus-

sion of an issue which I think is very central to our federalist system of government. The Nation depends upon our States and local governments to deliver some of the most basic services that protect the security and advance the well-being of our people and our Nation as a whole.

We just had a dramatic demonstration of that with what happened after September 11. While there were a number of Federal personnel involved, the front line, the first responders, the people who lost their lives in the collapse of those buildings serving the public interest were largely employees of State and local governments.

We know, and we all applaud the importance of education for the future of our Nation. That is predominantly a State and local responsibility. What we are talking about today is the capacity of State and local governments to have sufficient control of their sources of revenue to continue to provide those very services.

While the current law, as the Senator from Oregon has correctly stated, focuses on prohibiting the States from adopting discriminatory tax systems that will single out and adversely affect distance sellers, particularly those who sell over the Internet, the fact is there is another form of discrimination between the Main Street retail seller and that distant seller.

The discrimination is that in times past, we have adopted a philosophy that said in order for a State to require a seller to collect its sales tax, there had to be a physical presence of that seller within the State. That was a concept that made sense in a previous era, but that era has passed.

We just passed a major antiterrorism bill, and one of the basic changes we made had to do with wiretaps. Our wiretap law was basically written for the old rotary phone. It proved to be inadequate to deal with the issues of the cellular phone, computer communication, and all the things with which we are now familiar and in daily personal use.

The same economic and technical changes that have caused the Congress to reevaluate its concept of what it takes to fight terrorism have affected the way in which commerce is delivered in America.

We now have a situation where if you sell the same book at a retail store on Main Street, that seller is obligated to collect the sales tax of the State and local jurisdictions that might be imposed on that book. If you buy the identical book over the Internet, there is no obligation to collect sales tax.

I do not think that is a defensible differentiation, and the practical effect of that is going to be over time to erode the competitive position of the Main Street seller, and through that erosion also affect the ability to properly finance our police, fire, and education systems that are so critical to the functioning of our Nation.

Yes, there is an issue of discrimination here, a mild discrimination, and a quite unlikely discrimination that might be directed by State legislatures against Internet sellers and a massive discrimination that is being directed today against the Main Street retailer.

I believe these two issues are interconnected, and we should do as Senator ENZI is suggesting: At the same time we grant an extension of the moratorium, we build into that extension a mechanism that will result in the resolution of this much bigger issue of discrimination—the discrimination against the Main Street seller.

Mr. WYDEN. Will the distinguished Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. GRAHAM. In just a moment when I complete my remarks, I will be pleased to yield.

The reality is that what we are about here, for those who are new to this issue, is the fact that time is on the side of the distant sellers. Right now, a relatively small percentage of American retail sales are conducted over the Internet, but that percentage has been growing every year. Already the distant sellers have acquired enough influence to cause the House of Representatives to take the action it has taken and to build considerable support within the Senate for an extension of the moratorium without any mechanism to deal with the discrimination against Main Street and the discrimination against the children and the other citizens who depend upon State and local government for fundamental services such as education and police.

The secret of those who would like to effectively make this discrimination against Main Street permanent is they want to continue moratorium after moratorium until the percentage of people who are using the Internet is so great that there will be no political constituency to deal with this discrimination.

I state for myself and I believe for others that we consider this to be a core issue of the future of federalism in America; that we have to have strong State and local governments, and we have to depend upon them to make decisions appropriate to their people. State and local governments, as one who served there for 20 years, do not like taxing their people. They are as sensitive to that as we are in Washington, maybe more so.

We should not deny them the capacity to make the decisions that are in the best interest of their people. That is a fundamental part of our federalist system, that different levels of government have responsibilities and must accept the obligation of those responsibilities, including the appropriate way to finance them.

So this is, as I say, a very basic issue. I, for one, will insist before we extend this moratorium beyond the very short period as suggested by the Senator from North Dakota that any longer extension must be linked to a process,

not a solution but a process, to move us towards the resolution of this fundamental discrimination that exists within our Nation and within our economy today.

I yield to the Senator from Oregon for his question.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague, and I think he knows I am very much committed to working with him and with Senator ENZI. I do not know how many hours we have put in over the last 18 months trying to do this. My question was designed really to get a sense of the thinking of the Senator on a particular point that may help us move this issue along.

What I and many others are concerned about is sticking it to sellers who are located thousands of miles away from a local jurisdiction and that seller has no presence in the local jurisdiction other than a Web site. That is the only presence they have today. Of course, the Supreme Court has said there has to be physical presence, under a current Court decision, in order to do that.

In the view of the Senator from Florida, what is the case for imposing these various taxes—of course, anything that is already owed can be collected under the current Internet tax freedom bill, so we are talking about something new. What is the case in the mind of the Senator for having changed treatment of that particular seller who is located thousands of miles from a local jurisdiction and who has no presence in that jurisdiction other than a Web site?

Again, I do not ask this question for any other reason than I think it would be helpful for me and others who spent a significant amount of time to get the thinking of colleagues as we try to figure out a way to move forward on it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I appreciate the very sincere and committed effort the Senator has made to try to arrive at a resolution, and I hope in this debate which has arisen today, and will arise with greater frequency now that the moratorium is about to lapse, that we can reach such a resolution.

What I think is basic is, first, the Constitution. The Constitution vests—and it was one of the most controversial debates at the Constitutional Convention of 1787—in the Federal Government the control of interstate commerce. The Supreme Court, as I read the most recent opinions on this issue, did not say requiring distant sellers to collect sales tax was unconstitutional. Rather, they said it was unauthorized; that it would take an affirmative act of Congress to sanction the States to require distant sellers—that is, sellers who did not have a physical presence in their State—to collect their sales tax.

So the issue is, we have to take an affirmative act in order to empower the States to require that distant sellers should collect their sales tax. So then the question is why—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). The time of the Senator from

Florida has expired in morning business.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I ask for an additional 2 minutes to complete the answer to the question from the Senator from Oregon.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. So the question then is whether we should take that affirmative action. I think we should for two basic reasons. One is fairness. It is, in my judgment, intolerable to have an economic system in which government says if you are selling from a distant location, you are at a competitive advantage over persons who are selling on Main Street. That is precisely the current circumstance of requiring one to collect sales tax but not requiring the other to do it, and it is not an insubstantial competitive disadvantage. In my State, depending on which locality one is in, it could be a 6-, 7-, or more percent differential.

Second, the practical effect of this is going to be to erode the capacity of State and local governments, acting through the democratic process of representative election and decision, as to what services should be provided and how they should be financed to substantially erode that capability.

My State happens to be particularly dependent upon sales tax. About 70 percent or more of our general revenue is collected by sales tax. So if there were a significant percentage of that which moved from Main Street to distant seller, it would have an immediate and substantial impact on the capacity of our State to educate its children, to defend our people through police, to protect our people in time of emergency through fire and other emergency response institutions.

So this is a basic question of whether we at the national level are going to say to our brethren in the 50 States that for all time you are going to be saddled by this discrimination, which will have the effect of eroding your capacity to decide how to finance the services your people are asking you to provide.

I do not believe all wisdom resides in Washington. I believe in a distributed democracy and that we ought to let 50 States and thousands of local jurisdictions make those kinds of judgments, and eliminating this massive discrimination that currently is part of our tax system will return that degree of respect and capacity to State and local governments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, at what time is the Senate expected to reconvene following the recess?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 2 p.m.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that at 2 p.m., when the Senate reconvenes following the recess, I be recognized for not to exceed 35 minutes.

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

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator

VOINOVICH be allowed to follow the Senator from West Virginia.

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

The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the Chair.

I have refrained from getting into this discussion about the moratorium on Internet taxes up to this point, but I need to voice some comments because I am one of the people who has been working on this issue for the last 18 months and was a part of the debate we had 18 months ago that put the current moratorium into effect.

I thank Senator GRAHAM from Florida, who has been intensely involved. He has been one of the main people who has provided a connection with Congress and State legislators. I thank Senator RON WYDEN, the Senator from Oregon, for his intense interest. I think probably the number of hours the Senator from Oregon and I, and Senator MCCAIN, Senator KERRY, Senator DORGAN, and Senator GRAHAM have spent in meetings on this issue, which has not been a specific bill, probably exceeds the time spent on any other issue that was not actually a bill, which indicates the intensity of the need there is to resolve the issue nationwide.

Particularly since the events of September 11, there has been a drain on resources for cities, towns, counties, and States as they have put more security in place, as they have provided for the difficulties that have happened in their States. Most of them rely on a sales tax to be able to do that.

Education is another area heavily funded by sales taxes. Those States that collect sales taxes and rely on sales taxes have been intensely interested that their right to collect sales taxes is not taken away. Getting all of the groups together has been extremely difficult: the recognition that there is an added burden on direct marketers when they do this, that the States need it, that the retailers are at an unfair disadvantage if there is not a sales tax collected. And it is small retail merchants that provide for donations for the year books and the other local activities that would be sorely missed if they were not there.

Getting some protection for all of these groups and bringing them together has been a real task. We have been making tremendous progress. There has been some concern that the moratorium runs out Sunday and the Nation will go into a major crisis. That is not the case. The grandfathering dates back to 1998. I suspect nobody is going to undo that particular date.

We need a solution. This is not my solution. This is the solution of all of the people I mentioned who have been working on it and will be continuing to work on it to come to some kind of an agreement where, first of all, we extend the moratorium; second, we make sure we protect the States so they can, with some pressure—and this is where the States have to come to the middle,

too—simplify their tax system so that direct marketer or that person doing remote sales has some capability of complying. In order to make that easier, one of the things we have built into the bill is a requirement that there be one form, one reporting place, one place to send the check, and a maximum of one audit. There is also a requirement there be reasonable compensation to the person who collects it.

Everybody who does direct sales collects sales taxes. They collect it in the State in which they are located, which is where they have a nexus and in other States where they have a nexus. There is an intense interest on their part to see that there is some simplification to the tax system in the States where they have to work.

Mr. WYDEN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ENZI. I am happy to yield for a question when I complete my remarks.

As I mentioned, we have been working with retailers and a coalition, including a lot of retailers and others who rely on the sales tax or rely on businesses that have a sales tax. That includes people who build shopping malls and do other types of retail businesses. I acknowledge their help in coming to this particular bill. I thank the National League of Cities and the National Governors' Association, and most particularly, my Governor from Wyoming, Governor Geringer, and the Governor from Utah, Governor Leavitt, for the tremendous hours they have put in together trying to get everybody on the same page.

I yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague from Wyoming. I appreciate the work that has gone into this. He obviously has strong views on it. It has been very constructive in trying to work with me and others.

I ask my colleague about a procedural matter that could allow us to go forward and bring the parties together. Senator MCCAIN and I introduced legislation several weeks ago that is virtually identical to what the House passed this week. The House has already begun to move.

My question to my colleague is, would the distinguished Senator from Wyoming be willing to work with me and others, the entire group involved, to craft a unanimous consent request that could come up early next week where we could take up in the Senate the House-passed bill and then have an open and fair debate on amendments and all of the up-or-down votes that Members of this body would choose to have?

Would my colleague be willing to work with me and others to see if we could craft that kind of approach that is agreeable all around?

Mr. ENZI. I am happy to work with the Senator from Oregon. I have been working also with the Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN, to see if we can-

not propound some kind of unanimous consent. It needs to be done quickly before States run off the edge and pass some things we might then feel bad about repealing but have to repeal. I am interested in doing that.

However, I hope the propounded unanimous consent could deal with this bill, rather than the straight 12-month extension. I have been talking to people on the House side and I think they see some reasonableness in going with the approach I am providing, as well.

We need to come up with a propounded unanimous consent that will get us to this form of debate and voting on amendments so this bill will have a majority of cosponsors and can be passed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. REID. Today Senator DORGAN, the chairman of the Democratic Policy Committee, is going to have at our luncheon the Ambassador of Egypt, the Ambassador of Jordan, the Ambassador of the United Arab Emirates and the Charge d'Affaires of Pakistan. I compliment Senator DORGAN for arranging these eminent people to speak with Members.

I mention that only as a preface to a letter I received from a constituent of mine in Las Vegas, a young constituent. Her name is Sanaa Khan, and she is a ninth grade student. The letter reads:

Dear Senator Reid: It is unfortunate that Americans do not have the basic knowledge about Islam. This is the faith practiced by almost seven million Muslims living in the United States, and over one billion people around the world. It is the fastest growing religion in the world. As a research topic for my 9th grade English project, I chose to highlight the basic tenets of Islam, in order to develop a better understanding among my friends and teachers in school. I would like to send this to you so that you may share with your friends and colleagues.

The Islamic belief is structured around five main pillars: (1) The profession of faith. (2) Daily worship. (3) Fasting during the month of Ramadan (based on the Islamic lunar calendar). (4) Charity and (5) Making the pilgrimage to Makkah.

The profession of faith is simple. It's declaring that one believes in one God and that Muhammad (peace be upon him) is the messenger of God. By reciting this, one may convert to Islam. Muhammad (peace be upon him) was the last prophet of God who lived from 570 to 633 BCE.

Daily worship is praying five times a day: at dawn, midday, afternoon, evening, and at night. These prayers are short and include recitation of verses from the Qur'an, the holy book for Muslims. During these prayers, Muslims bow their heads in the direction of Makkah, Saudi Arabia, the holiest place for Muslims.

Charity in Islam is called "zakat". This is the obligation to share what one possesses with the poor. Muslims are required to give 2.5% of all the money and jewelry they own once a year to less fortunate people.

Fasting during the month of Ramadan is also mandatory. Fasting is refraining from food and drink from dawn until dusk. Muslims go by the Islamic lunar calendar making Ramadan the ninth month. Fasting is

significant because it makes you a stronger person by realizing the significance of self control, discipline, and restricting ones desires.

The last pillar is making the pilgrimage to Makkah, Saudi Arabia. This pilgrimage is called Hajj. The holiest mosque is in Makkah, Masjid-al-Haram. Hajj occurs only once a year during the twelfth month of the Islamic calendar. It is required that you perform Hajj at least once in your lifetime if one can financially afford it.

The prophet of Islam is Muhammad (peace be upon him). He was born in Makkah, Saudi Arabia in 570 BCE. In 610 BCE, the angel Gabriel carried the revelation from God and brought it down to Muhammad (peace be upon him). After a period of time, these revelations were placed into one book called the Qur'an.

I hope this information, though very basic, would at least provoke some thought process towards efforts to better understand Islam.

I appreciate very much Sanaa sending me this letter. I hope everyone in the Senate will become familiar with her letter and become familiar with the tenets of her religion.

I have been on the floor before speaking about Islam and what a great religion it is. I have said before and I repeat that my wife's primary physicians are two members of the Islamic faith, her internist and the person who has performed surgery on her. I know them well. I have been in their homes. I have socialized with them. I have talked about very serious things with them. We have helped each other with family problems.

I have been to the new mosque with them in Las Vegas. They are wonderful people with great families. I have come to realize Islam is a good religion; it is a good way of life. Muslims maintain a good health code as their religion dictates, and they have great spiritual values as their religion dictates. It is too bad there are some people—evil people around the world—who would target the innocent in the name of Islam.

I believe that the strength of Islam, and the faith and fortitude of more than one billion Muslims around the world, will overcome these evil people and their evil deeds.

(The remarks of Mr. REID pertaining to the introduction of S. 1566 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### EMILY COURIC

Mr. ALLEN. Madam President, I rise this afternoon on a very sad note. We lost a State senator from Virginia, Emily Couric.

For those who knew Emily Couric, and for those who worked with Emily Couric and followed her life and her battles, we all know we have lost a fine person. We have lost an articulate, passionate, and inspirational leader.

Emily Couric passed away today, October 18. She had been a State senator in the 25th District of Virginia since after her election in 1995. That is an area around Charlottesville, Albemarle County, Greene County, Madison County, Orange County, and Nelson County—generally the Piedmont area of Virginia.

She passed away of pancreatic cancer today in her home in Charlottesville.

She served in the State senate while I served as the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

She was recognized by all on both sides of the aisle as a leader—especially in her areas of greatest concern, which were health care and education.

Before serving in the State senate, she served on the school board in the city of Charlottesville, and indeed before getting elected to the State senate was chairman of the school board.

She had many accomplishments, such as establishing advanced mathematics and technology diploma seals for those high school graduates. Picture that—encouraging students to do even more than what is just enough to get by. But if they wanted to do even more, they could add an advanced mathematics and technology aspect to their education.

She was also a leader in supporting research and rehabilitation for victims of spinal cord injuries and traumatic brain injuries.

She was a leader in the Democrat Party in Virginia. Had she not contracted pancreatic cancer, she would right now certainly be running for Lieutenant Governor on the Democrat ticket. She explored that race. But she was diagnosed with cancer back in July of last year—2000. She was certainly regarded as a frontrunner and would not have had any opposition whatsoever in her party. I would certainly guess that she would probably have won very easily. But she had to withdraw from the race because she had to undergo treatment for the pancreatic cancer.

Nevertheless, she didn't want to get out of what she cared about, which was serving the people. Indeed, she served as the general chair of the Democrat Party of Virginia, and undertook that responsibility in December of 2000.

She served on many committees in the State senate, such as the Education and Health Committee, the Agriculture, Conservation and Natural Resources Committee, and the Rehabilitation and Social Services Committee.

She served in a variety of areas, but she did not just serve Virginia, she served the region. She served not only in the legislature, but on the Southern Regional Education Board and the Southern Legislative Conference Education Committee, as well as other policy committees.

As I said, prior to her election, she did serve on the Charlottesville School Board from 1985 to 1991, including one term as chairman. She served on a lot of community boards and organizations. She was a member of the Charlottesville Boys & Girls Club, the Charlottesville Area School Business Alliance, the Jefferson Area Board for Aging, the Virginia National Bank, the Virginia Festival of the Book, the Heritage Repertory Theater, Camp Holiday Trails, and various other activities in the community. Until her last breath, you knew her passion was for all these ideas, but especially those that would benefit youngsters with their health, their education, and their future opportunities.

She was born in Atlanta, GA. She moved to Virginia in 1951. She was a graduate of Yorktown High School in Arlington, VA, right across the river from us.

She received her bachelor of arts from Smith College and graduated with honors, magna cum laude, Phi Beta Kappa, and Sigma Xi from Smith College.

Expressing for my colleague and myself, and I think all Senators and anybody who knew Emily Couric, our prayers and thoughts are with her husband, Dr. George Beller of Charlottesville, VA, her son Ray Wadlow—he is a doctor—and her daughter-in-law Jessica of Philadelphia, PA; and her son Jeff Wadlow of Los Angeles, CA.

She is also survived by her parents Elinor and John Couric of Arlington, VA; her siblings, Clara Couric Batchelor, John Couric, Jr., and, of course, one we know and see every morning, Katie Couric; her step children, Michael Beller, Amy Beller, and Leslie Beller; and also seven nieces and nephews; and two step-grandchildren.

We will all miss Emily Couric. Regardless of our political parties, Emily Couric was an inspiration. Her life really embodied her true dedication to her fellow human beings.

Once she was diagnosed with this terrible cancer, she kept fighting. She did not give up. She is an inspiration and her spirit lives on. All of us have been blessed to have known her; and, indeed, future generations will have healthier, better lives because Emily Couric cared enough to devote a great deal of her lifetime to public service and the betterment of others.

Mr. WARNER. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. ALLEN. I am pleased to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I associate myself with my colleague's remarks. I say to Senator ALLEN, indeed, you knew her very well. I had come to know her in later years.

The Presiding Officer might be interested in this little story. I had a chance to be with her about 6 or 8 months ago, it seems to me, when she won an award in Northern Virginia and I was sort of the toastmaster of that evening. We