

bill occur at 2 p.m. today, with rule XII, paragraph 4, being waived.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, if the manager of the bill has nothing further, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business until 2 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for a period of up to 10 minutes each.

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

THERE IS A NEED FOR IMPROVED AIRLINE SECURITY

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, as we are locked in this deadlock with the House of Representatives over the question of airport passenger screening security, basically the deadlock is the Senate has passed a bill 100–0 that would provide for federalizing the screening process of passengers; that is, attaches to the Justice Department that these would be Federal employees who have specific training in law enforcement so we can heighten the feeling of confidence of the American flying public that they will be safe when they get in an airliner to take their travel.

Why is this important? It is obvious the airline industry is one of the important economic components of our national economic engine, and as long as people are scared to get into a plane and fly, then we are not going to rev up that economic engine and get it functioning on all cylinders as is so necessary.

There are parts of this country that are certainly more affected than others by the diminution of airline travel. Clearly, the city of New York, the State of the Presiding Officer, is drastically affected; clearly, cities in my State, such as Miami, or Orlando, the No. 1 tourist destination in the world. I have talked to the owners of hotels—not the business hotels; the business hotels are doing OK, not good but OK—and the tourist-oriented hotels now have an occupancy rate in the range of 40 to 45 percent.

I talked to the owner of one hotel with 800 rooms; they shut down 600 rooms. It does not take a rocket scientist to recognize with that diminished revenue they will not be able to pay mortgage payments, taxes. They have already laid off a significant portion of their staff.

We understand what happens as the ripples run through the economy. What do we do? We want to give a feeling of confidence, of safety, to the American flying public. What better way to do that than for the public to know, when they go through that passenger screening process, in fact, if there are people trying to do dastardly things to them by sneaking through implements of destruction, they will get caught.

The fact is, recently they have not been caught. We heard this rather astounding story a couple of days ago about in the Chicago area a person had two knives, got on the plane, and had in their carryon luggage other implements of destruction. This is several weeks now, after September 11.

We read the story last week about the fellow sitting on the airplane, in flight, horrified to suddenly realize someone had given him a pistol as a present, and he forgot it was in his carry-on luggage. He had the presence of mind to call over the flight attendant in the midst of the flight to say what happened. The fact is, airline passenger security had failed again.

Does this engender confidence in the American flying public? Of course, it doesn't. We are undercutting the very thing we need to be doing for those desperately needing the airlines back in robust business again—the hotel operators, the service personnel, the gift stores in the hotels, the restaurants, the tourist destinations, and the multiplicity of industries and businesses, both large and small, that spawn from this wonderful, robust transportation network we have had in the skies.

Why am I saying this? It took 4 weeks in the Senate to pass this bill because people in this Chamber were filibustering it because they wanted that passenger security screening operation to continue as it is, privately contracted out. That is not going to cut it. Yet we were held up 4 weeks. By the time it got around to the final passage, there was no Senator who was going to vote against it. It was 100–0 in this Chamber. Now we are at loggerheads with the House of Representatives, which by a very narrow margin of one or two votes passed a highly partisan bill that says it is still going to be contracted out. They say: Don't worry; we will federally oversee the contracting. But if the whole Nation's economy hinges on getting the public to believe it is safe to get back into an airliner and fly, are we not wasting precious minutes every day we are at loggerheads with the House of Representatives? We have a 100–0 vote here; they have virtually a split vote of 215 each. Why not look at what is best for the country?

How many more newspaper stories do we have to read, as we have in the last couple of days, about the stun guns, the knives, and the box cutters getting through security. How much more do we have to read before it convinces us and convinces the body at the other end of this United States Capitol that it is time to put aside their philosophical positions, their partisan positions, and pass something into law so we can restore the confidence of the American people.

I share these thoughts after considering this very important intelligence legislation, all of which is very necessary to the security of this country, as is the airline security bill important to the security of this country, both

economically and as we take on the terrorists.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDWARDS). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order entered setting the vote at 2 p.m. be modified to allow the vote to occur at 1:55 p.m.

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

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to speak as in morning business for about 20 minutes.

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

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I do not think there is any question about the condition of this country. We are clearly a nation at war. As we look at the instability, the uncertainty of regions of the world, regions where many of the nations that want to destroy Israel and the U.S. reside, the reality is these particular areas of the world are ones on which we are growing more dependent all the time.

It is no secret to the occupant of the chair that we are now 57 percent dependent on imported oil. However, during the 1970s, we were about 34 percent dependent on oil. Some remember the inconvenience of the gas lines around the block. This was at a time of conflict in the Mideast, the Yom Kippur War. Americans were outraged. They were indignant. How could it possibly happen in our Nation that we should be so inconvenienced?

So there we were, in the 1970s, 33 percent dependent; today we 57 percent dependent, and the Department of Energy indicates by the year 2010 we are going to be somewhere in the area of 66 percent dependent.

We are, in my opinion, held hostage by the same interests that seek to destroy and uproot Israel. Through our energy policies of dependence, we have

tipped the scales and given tremendous power to extremists in the Mideast. We are only making Iran, Iraq, and Libya, perhaps, stronger. Is that our wish?

What happens if the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia fails? There is almost a parallel occurring in that country between what happened in Iran 30 years ago with the fall of the Shah. When it occurred, the Shah was one of America's greatest allies. What happened was his regime came down as a consequence of corruption, a concentration of too much wealth in too few hands. That situation is very much evident in Saudi Arabia today.

I might add, if we look to bin Laden followers, a number of them have come from Saudi Arabia. As we examine the background of those responsible for the aircraft that went into the Pentagon and the Trade Centers, we find they have connections. Some are actually from Saudi Arabia.

Now, I am not condemning Saudi Arabia by any means. I am simply drawing a comparison. As our dependence on imported oil increases, we focus more on Saudi Arabia because that is where the significant supply of petroleum in the world exists. We are becoming more vulnerable as their regime becomes more unstable.

Furthermore, we are importing a million barrels of oil a day from Iraq. Now, what is the uniqueness of Iraq? We happen to enforce a no-fly zone over Iraq. We are putting our men's and women's lives at stake to ensure that Iraq stays within the constraints of the U.N. sanctions. Yet we know they have moved beyond those constraints, that they are selling oil outside the U.N. oversight, illegally in that sense.

So here we are, we are taking their oil and we are enforcing a no-fly zone over Iraq. We put the oil in our aircraft and then we go and enforce that no-fly zone by taking out some of their targets. We almost had one of our interceptor aircraft shot down a few weeks ago. What does Saddam Hussein do with the money? He pays his Republican Guards to keep him alive and develops missile capability with biological warheads aimed at our ally, Israel.

Is this part of our foreign policy or is it because we have no other choice than to depend on Iraq for a certain amount of our imported oil? I am not suggesting we might funnel some of the money for terrorist attacks to keep Saddam Hussein in charge, but one has to wonder what his future holds. We must address this dependence with a new sense of urgency, a new sense of purpose. To ensure our energy security, we must put in place solutions that begin and end at home. In my opinion, the sooner the better.

There are tremendous resources and ingenuity in this country. Our balanced, bipartisan energy plan puts them to work. It adjusts fuel economy standards; encourages conservation, provides incentives for the development of advanced newer, cleaner alternative fuels, and encourages the use of our own energy supplies.

I know the occupant of the chair would be disappointed if I didn't bring up the issue of ANWR and what kind of a contribution this can make. Clearly, we can open this area safely, effectively, and quickly. What does it hold? Somewhere between 5.6 and 16 billion barrels—enough oil to replace what we would import from Saudi Arabia in a 30-year period of time. All the economic benefits are there. When I say "employment," perhaps 200,000 jobs.

There is the potential of revenue to the Federal Government from lease sales amounting to about \$2.6 billion. This is a stimulus. It would not cost the Federal Government one red cent.

Our President has said energy is one of our two key components to a strong stimulus package necessary to get this economy growing again, somewhat like the old Lee Iacocca ad. If you can find a better economic stimulus that adds jobs to our economy, billions to our gross national product, and will not cost the taxpayer one red cent, go buy it.

The problem is reluctance in this body. The House has done its job and passed H.R. 4. The Democratic leader has not seen fit to bring this bill or schedule this bill before this body. Apparently, there is no indication from him as to his intentions. It appears he shut the door on the Energy Committee actions. I happen to be ranking member. We have not had markup on any bill or any action, with the exception of reporting out a nomination or two, for well over a month. The Democratic leader has basically shut down the Energy Committee and the process associated with the authorization which is the duty of the authorizing committees.

Evidently, the writing of the bill is underway, independently, with very little input, if any, from the other side. Republican interests will not be heard. We cannot share with our Democratic colleagues our input.

The President has said the Senate must act. As I indicated, the House has done its job. It is certainly not in the national interest to treat this issue for what it is, a critical component of national security. Our Achilles' heel in this war is our dependence on foreign oil. Bin Laden knows it; Saddam Hussein knows it. But the United States does not seem to know it is, to our immense discredit. How could we not know? Didn't we recognize on September 11 the significance that much of the terrorist activity is funded by oil? If we do not recognize it soon, God help us.

In my few remaining minutes I want to enlighten my colleagues on the significance of what has occurred over an extended period of time relative to public opinion on this matter. We have heard from our President on four occasions, specifically saying this country must have an energy plan that encourages conservation and encourages exploration.

He says: I want the Congress to know there is more to helping our economy

grow than tax relief. One of the major components is an energy plan.

He goes on to say on another occasion when the bill has passed the House of Representatives: They have done their job. He wants the Senate to do its job.

On October 17, he asked Congress to act on an energy bill the House of Representatives passed in August. On October 14, there are two other aspects to a good, strong stimulus package. One is an energy bill. October 31, our Nation needs an energy plan.

I don't know who is listening around here. I am certainly listening. It is unfortunate that the Democratic leader evidently is not listening to the President. I don't understand this political momentum. Why can't we do as the House and have an open discussion on the merits of this energy bill as proposed? Where is the energy bill? We introduced a bill in February, about 304 pages. The only thing on which anybody seemed to want to focus was the two or three pages of ANWR, opening up this area.

This has become a cash cow for the extreme environmental community. Make no mistake; they are milking it for all it is worth. It is an issue that is thousands of miles away from the American people. It is an issue filled with emotion. They say the polar bear is endangered, but they will not say you cannot take the polar bear—they are marine mammals—from the United States, and that includes from my State of Alaska. They are protected. You can go to Canada and take them for trophies, or go to Russia, but you cannot in the United States.

They say somehow the Gwich'in people, in their dependence on the caribou, are somehow in jeopardy. I will read for the RECORD from the Petroleum News: "Gwich'in, Ensign link up in new McKenzie Delta Drilling Company," September 30:

A new Native-controlled oil and gas drilling company has been formed to provide oilfield services in a land claims area of the Mackenzie Delta that is seen as a likely route for any Mackenzie Valley pipeline.

Gwich'in Oilfield Services, 51 percent owned by Gwich'in Development Corp. of Inuvik, Northwest Territories, and 49 percent by Calgary-based Ensign Drilling, is expecting to start operations this winter.

The Gwich'in settlement area covers 22,242 square miles and is governed by the Gwich'in Tribal Council.

Gwich'in Development Corp., wholly owned by the tribal council, has a mission to build an investment portfolio that offers business opportunities, employment and training to Gwich'in residents.

Tom Connors, chief executive officer of the corporation, said Sept. 10 that the deal with Ensign gives the community a chance to participate in the development of oil and gas resources.

Ensign president Selby Porter said his company's experience and equipment make it the right choice to work with the Gwich'in people.

The development of a local work force and infrastructure is key to the continued development of oil and gas resources of the Arctic region of Canada," he said.

Formation of the new company was announced Sept. 6.

About 80 percent of the Gwich'in people live in Canada. Why is it OK for the Gwich'in people in Canada to go ahead and develop their land and somehow the Gwich'ins who live in Alaska and are funded by the Sierra Club and various other environmental groups in opposition are opposed? Obviously, there is some skulduggery associated with this.

The other issue is relative to the base of support. We have seen the President's statements in favor of opening ANWR. Secretary of Interior Gale Norton, Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham, Secretary of Labor Chao, and Secretary of Veterans Affairs Principi have all spoken at more than one event. Yet we have had press conferences with the American Legion, all the veterans organizations, including the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The AMVETS, Catholic War Veterans, and Vietnam veterans have all spoken in favor. It is interesting to hear their point of view. It is enlightening. They say they have fought wars on foreign soil. They have fought wars over oil in the Persian Gulf conflict where, obviously, we stopped Saddam Hussein from going into Kuwait, and his objective was to go into Saudi Arabia and take over the oil.

I am reminded of remarks made in this Chamber by Senator Mark Hatfield from Oregon. He indicated on more than one occasion he would vote for opening up ANWR any day rather than send other American men and women over on foreign soil to fight a war over oil.

This is the theme of America's veterans. They say the national security of this Nation is at risk because of our increased dependence on oil. What can we do about it? What we can do about it is increase domestic production. We are not going to relieve our dependence totally, but we will reduce it substantially.

The intent of the Senate, if it votes to authorize the opening of this area, is to send a message to the Mideast that we mean business about reducing our dependence. You are going to see a change in the OPEC structure, where they are going to be more sensitive to the significance of what the United States states when we say we are going to reduce our dependence on imports.

I suggest they are going to increase production. When they increase production, what does that mean? It means the price goes down. We know, as a consequence of terrorist activities, people are not flying, we do not have the same utilization of gasoline, and we have a temporary decline in price. But that is only temporary because what we saw OPEC do the other day was cut production another 1.5 million barrels. They know we are addicted to their oil. As a consequence, they are playing it for all it is worth.

As to organized labor, we have the Teamsters, maritime unions, seafarers

unions, operating engineers, plumbers, pipefitters, carpenters and joiners—I could go on with this list—because this is a jobs issue.

Mr. President, as you know very well, we have a very soft economy. We are in a recession. This is a jobs issue—several hundred thousand jobs in every State.

What are we going to do? We are going to build more ships. We will build them in U.S. yards because those ships that move Alaskan oil, under law, have to be U.S. flagged vessels, built in U.S. yards with U.S. crews. This is shipbuilding, gulf shipbuilding and west coast. It is a big jobs issue.

As we debate the stimulus package, I challenge any Member of this body to tell me a better stimulus than opening up ANWR. Why do I say that? Because it is a jobs issue. It is going to create a couple of hundred thousand jobs. It is going to create about \$2.6 billion in Federal lease sales when the Federal Government puts up those leases. Where will that go? Into the Treasury. It will help offset some of the costs associated with security and terrorism activities. And it is not going to cost the taxpayer one red cent. You tell me anything else in that stimulus package that fits that category. There isn't any. That is why organized labor is for it.

We have senior citizens; 60-Plus held a press conference the day before yesterday. The Hispanic community, the Latin-American Management Association and Latino coalition, the United States-Mexico Chamber of Commerce, they had a press conference this morning. American business groups: The National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Black Chamber of Commerce, U.S. Pan Asian Chamber of Commerce, the American Women's Economic Development, the Alliance For Energy—it goes on and on and on.

Why is that message not coming through to this body? I can only assume there are several Members on the other side who do not want to vote on this issue. Why don't they want to vote on the issue? Perhaps they made commitments to extreme environmental groups. I don't know.

In any event, we are here at a stage where we are late in the session. The House has taken on its responsibility totally, passing H.R. 4. We have implored the Democratic leader to bring this matter up, let us vote on it, let us debate it, and let us offer amendments. We do not even get an answer.

I am putting this body on notice. If we do not get an answer from the Democratic leader—this is not a threat, this is a reality—we will put this on the stimulus bill and we will vote on it. I want everybody to understand there is going to be a vote on this floor, on this issue, on an energy bill that will contain ANWR, before we get out of here.

Some Members have threatened a filibuster. I cannot understand—while it

is everybody's right to do as they see fit—why anybody would consider filibustering an issue as important as this, in the national security interests of our Nation. I don't think we have ever had that, traditionally, in this body. We should address this issue on its merits, not proceed to activities associated with the threat of a filibuster.

I encourage Members to reflect a little bit about just what the folks back home will read into that kind of a vote. They will read the filibuster has been on a procedural motion, not on the merits of the issue. They will read it is in defiance of the veterans who have spoken time and time again, in defiance of the position of organized labor, in defiance of the position of our President.

I don't know whether there is an effort to ensure the President does not win on this issue. Is that what we are talking about? I hope that is not the case.

But to have this matter ignored, to have this matter taken away from the committee of jurisdiction by the Democratic leader at least warrants an explanation, and we cannot seem to get an explanation. The Democratic leader is a good friend of mine. We have had some conversations. He has been very responsive to hearing me out. But now it is time we had an opportunity to hear him out because he has simply ignored this. I want to tell the Democratic leader the pressure is going to become more intense. There is no reason this issue should not be addressed in an expeditious manner.

I noted in the Boston Herald an article. I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Boston Herald, Nov. 6, 2001]

ENERGY A SECURITY ISSUE

President Bush urged Congress to get an energy bill on his desk before it adjourns for the year, making the case that a sound energy policy is vital to national security.

Speaking to business leaders recently, the president observed, "It's in our national interest that we develop more energy supplies at home." And Interior Secretary Gale Norton added, "Every day the United States imports 700,000 barrels of oil from Saddam Hussein."

The House has passed an energy bill which would allow drilling in portions of Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. But Senate Democrats have promised the environmental lobby that they will block ANWR development, and Massachusetts Sen. John Kerry has threatened to lead a filibuster.

That made little sense before Sept. 11, and even less since then. In the past 30 years, America has become dangerously dependent on foreign oil. It's estimated ANWR contains between 5.7 billion and 16 billion barrels of oil. Roughly 11 billion barrels would be the equivalent of 20 years of imports from Saudi Arabia. And only a minuscule part of ANWR's 19 million acres would be used.

America will never again be energy self-sufficient. But every barrel this nation doesn't have to import from the Middle East enhances national security. Planes and tanks don't run on recycled environmental cliches.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The article it supports the opening of ANWR and suggests if there wasn't a reason before September 11, there is certainly an even better reason afterward. It mentioned Senator KERRY, who is opposed to this legislation. It indicates in general terms it should be supported because it is in the national interests of the country.

Lest there be any mistaken innuendoes, saying we don't need, really, to open up the ANWR area because there are other areas, that we can look to our friends in Canada—let's just reflect on what Prime Minister Jean Chretien said on November 6. He took a swing at the United States in an interesting way, over soft wood policies. He told the House of Commons:

If the Americans want free trade in oil and natural gas, they should also have free trade in lumber.

He further says:

If they were not to have oil and gas from Canada, then they will need wood to heat their homes.

This is the Prime Minister saying, in effect, don't just rely on an unlimited supply of resources from Canada, there has to be two-way trade.

I will close by outlining the significance of the economic stimulus associated with this single issue. The Department of Labor Massachusetts Survey indicates jobs, direct, 250,000; the Wharton Econometrics Institute at the University of Pennsylvania lists the total employment, indirect, at 735,000 jobs associated with the development of ANWR; jobs in 50 States, 80,000 in California, 48,000 in New York.

We do not make valves. We do not make pipe or welding rod. These things are all going to be made in the United States. Labor is going to come up. We are looking at 200,000 jobs at a minimum, direct.

Federal benefits of opening up ANWR will add up to \$3.2 billion. That is another estimate, in lease sales to the Federal Treasury, and if the oil is produced we are talking about billions more in royalties. It is estimated that ANWR oil has a potential value upwards of \$300 billion. That is from the Energy Information Administration. That is \$300 billion we do not have to spend overseas. That is \$300 billion that will travel through the economy, being taxed here in America. As I indicated, the Jones Act mandates the oil move in U.S.-flag vessels.

Nineteen new supertankers will be needed at a cost of about \$200 million. What will that do for American shipbuilding? Construction alone will generate 5,000 new jobs in American shipbuilding during the next 10 to 15 years.

Finally, each day we write a \$12 million check to the Iraqi Government for their oil. That is more than \$4.4 billion a year. I think it is time to put that money in our backyard instead of in the backyard and into pocket indirectly of Bin Laden.

I thank the Chair for his attention. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Recently, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, called to my attention the work he is doing in Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is advised that we are under an order to vote at this time.

Mrs. CLINTON. Then we should vote, Mr. President.

DISASTER VICTIMS RELIEF FUNDS

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, one of the greatest comforts to me personally in the terrible aftermath of September 11 has been the immediate and overwhelming generosity of the American people in providing relief to the thousands who have been directly and indirectly affected. Our first priority must be to ensure that the victims and the families of the victims of the September 11 attack receive the financial relief they have been promised.

There is a tremendous amount of work going on in New York to ensure that families get their assistance. Many families have expressed their gratitude to me, to my staff, to FEMA, to the city, and the centralized support that was established at Pier 94. The fund that the mayor created to aid families, the Twin Towers Fund, has announced that it will get aid to families prior to Thanksgiving.

I am particularly grateful to the attorney general, Eliot Spitzer, who has led in trying to eliminate the bureaucratic redtape that can delay or prevent families from receiving the help they need in a timely manner. Working with the attorney general as he tries to create centralized databases of charitable organizations and families in need of services, I have joined him in calling for all charities to establish a uniform application that will help achieve the goal of simplifying the process of applying for necessary assistance.

I am sure many in this Chamber have seen the reports or perhaps seen on television some of the victims' family members who have been overwhelmed trying to work their way through the myriad of services available and who have to spend hours going from one place to the next until they could get some kind of answer, who say that not only have they been victimized but they have been made to feel like beggars. That is just unacceptable.

Like so many New Yorkers, we are concerned about those families who may not have the time to go stand in line and fill out endless application forms, who may not have the experience to permit them to navigate this maze, who do not have the stamina, and who, frankly, are still suffering.

I have met and talked with a number of people who lost loved ones, particularly widows who are having a very difficult time being able to do what is required to take care of their children and go about their daily business. They need help going through this charitable and governmental process.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 1:55 p.m. having arrived, the question is, Shall the bill, H.R. 2883, as amended, pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 332 Leg.]

YEAS—100

Akaka	Durbin	McCain
Allard	Edwards	McConnell
Allen	Ensign	Mikulski
Baucus	Enzi	Miller
Bayh	Feingold	Murkowski
Bennett	Feinstein	Murray
Biden	Fitzgerald	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Graham	Nickles
Boxer	Gramm	Reed
Breaux	Grassley	Reid
Brownback	Gregg	Roberts
Bunning	Hagel	Rockefeller
Burns	Harkin	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hatch	Santorum
Campbell	Helms	Schumer
Cantwell	Hollings	Sessions
Carnahan	Hutchinson	Shelby
Carper	Hutchison	Smith (NH)
Chafee	Inhofe	Smith (OR)
Cleland	Inouye	Snowe
Clinton	Jeffords	Specter
Cochran	Johnson	Stabenow
Collins	Kennedy	Torricelli
Conrad	Kerry	Stevens
Corzine	Kohl	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Crapo	Landrieu	Thurmond
Daschle	Leahy	DeWine
Dayton	Levin	Voinovich
DeWine	Lieberman	Warner
Dodd	Lincoln	Wellstone
Domenici	Lott	Wyden
Dorgan	Lugar	

The bill (H.R. 2883), as amended, was passed, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 2883) entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.", do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE*.—This Act may be cited as the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002".

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS*.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. *Short title; table of contents.*

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 101. *Authorization of appropriations.*

Sec. 102. *Classified schedule of authorizations.*

Sec. 103. *Personnel ceiling adjustments.*

Sec. 104. *Community Management Account.*