

the payments, which must be made by April 2003. Based on information from the Customs Service, CBO estimates that this provision would increase direct spending by about \$24 million in fiscal year 2002 and by about \$12 million in fiscal year 2003.

Pay-as-you-go considerations: The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act sets up procedures for legislation affecting receipts or direct spending. The net changes in governmental receipts that are subject to pay-as-you-go procedures are

shown in the following table. For the purposes of enforcing pay-as-you-go procedures, only the effects in the current year, the budget year, and the succeeding four years are counted.

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—									
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Changes in receipts	-43	-44	-49	-60	-23	0	0	0	0	0
Changes in outlays	24	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Impact on state, local, and tribal governments: The bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

Previous CBO estimate: On October 10, 2001, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for H.R. 3009 as ordered reported by the House Committee on Ways and Means on October 5, 2001. This estimate reflects changes to several provisions. The alteration of the tariff-rate quota program for imports of canned tuna from ATPA countries, the inclusion of preferential treatment for imports of ceiling fans from Thailand and certain steam or vapor generating boilers, the removal of the provisions affecting the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act and the African Growth and Opportunity Act, and the alteration of the wool import program would further reduce revenues, relative to the earlier version of H.R. 3009, by \$2 million in 2002, would lessen the reduction of revenues by \$29 million over the 2002-2006 period, and would lessen the reduction of revenues by \$45 million over the 2002-2011 period. The alteration of the wool import program would increase direct spending, relative to the earlier version of H.R. 3009, by \$24 million in 2002, and by \$36 million over the 2002-2003 period.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Revenues: Erin Whitaker (226-2720). Wool Refund Program: Mark Grabowicz (226-2860). Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Elyse Goldman (225-3220). Impact on the Private Sector: Paige Piper/Bach (226-2940).

Estimate approved by: G. Thomas Woodward, Assistant Director for Tax Analysis. Robert A. Sunshine, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred August 14, 1991, in St. Petersburg, FL. Two gay men were shot with buckshot fired from a 12-gauge shotgun. The attacker, Christopher Scott Morris, was charged with two counts of aggravated battery in connection with the incident.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today to provide a perspective on the recent Senate confirmation of John Walters to the position of Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy. In the coming months, I intend to raise certain issues with Mr. Walters regarding his stated positions about the priorities of his office as it deals with our country's domestic drug policy, and I hope my colleagues will do the same.

First, I urge President Bush and Mr. Walters to keep their public commitment to focus on the severe addiction problems faced in our own country and to significantly improve the infrastructure of private and public drug and alcohol treatment and prevention programs. On May 10, 2001, President Bush made a firm public commitment to invest an additional \$1.6 billion in new funding for drug and alcohol treatment over the next five years. Investing in drug and alcohol treatment is not only a critically important public health priority that will save the lives of millions Americans across this nation, it will also save tax dollars. Research has shown that health care, child welfare, and criminal justice costs decrease, and the productivity of individuals who receive proper treatment helps improve the health and the economy of our country as they return to work, pay taxes, and care for their families.

In addition to investing in public funding, John Walters and the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy should support the passage of full addiction treatment parity legislation so that private insurance can be the first line of defense for the millions of Americans who are employed, have health care, but are struggling with the disease of addiction, and are routinely denied adequate care. By contrast, federal employees enjoy full treatment parity for addiction treatment, and it is time for the rest of Americans to have this health care benefit as well. President Bush and John Walters should continue the support for improving private insurance coverage by supporting passage of full substance abuse parity legislation.

Strengthening the drug and alcohol treatment and prevention services has taken on greater importance in the aftermath of the tragedies of September 11th. Stress and trauma associated with these event, and the ensuing international events and economic downturn will continue to strain the personal, psychological, and economic

resources of individuals and families across our nation. Unfortunately many of them will turn to drugs and alcohol as a way to cope with these pressures, and may develop serious addiction disorders. In a special report issued in response to the terrorist attacks, the National Institute on Drug Abuse reviewed the research literature and reported that, "Stress is one of the most powerful triggers for relapse in addicted individuals, even after long periods of abstinence. . . . Studies have reported that individuals exposed to stress are more likely to abuse alcohol and other drugs or undergo relapse." Researchers funded by the National Institute on Drug Abuse have reported increases in the street sales of drugs in New York City after the events of September 11th. Reports from drug treatment and prevention providers across the nation have shown an increase in the need for treatment and prevention services following these recent events.

Working to destigmatize the disease of addiction so that individuals who suffer from this disease will seek treatment is imperative. Americans will be looking to the President and John Walters as the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy to provide the leadership and to shape this message to the country that addiction can be successfully treatment, and to support this message by providing adequate funding. I urge John Walters to find innovative ways for the Office of National Drug Control Policy to work closely with recovering communities, national organizations, state associations of treatment and prevention providers, anti-drug coalitions, families, employers, and other community leaders to reduce stigma and promote recovery, treatment, and prevention nationwide.

Finally, President Bush has nominated a highly qualified individual, Dr. Andrea Barthwell, to serve as the Deputy Director for Demand Reduction for the Office of National Drug Control Policy. Dr. Barthwell is extraordinarily qualified for this position and the Administration would be fortunate to have her expertise readily available as the lead White House advisor on domestic drug and alcohol treatment and prevention issues. In addition to being a physician who has long practiced addiction medicine, Dr. Barthwell presently serves as the President of the American Society of Addiction Medicine and is on the board of three federal advisory committees for the National Institute on Drug Abuse, the

Food and Drug Administration, and the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment. Dr. Barthwell also has worked with policy makers at the highest levels of state and federal government. I urge the Senate to confirm Dr. Barthwell's nomination as soon as possible. Her contributions will be invaluable as the White House implements the President's addiction treatment expansion initiative, one which could go a long way to help our country effectively deal with the serious domestic drug addiction problem that it faces.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise to commend the fiscal year 2002 Defense authorization conferees, particularly Senator LEVIN and Senator WARNER, for retaining the language adopted by the Senate with regard to reforming the Federal Prison Industries.

During consideration of the Defense authorization bill, the Senate voted 74-24 to table an amendment that would have removed the Federal Prison Industries reform provision from the bill.

Section 821 of the bill, which has now been endorsed by the conference and adopted overwhelmingly by both the House and the Senate, ends FPI's "mandatory source" status as a supplier of products to the Department of Defense, DOD. When this bill becomes law, FPI will be required to compete for future Department of Defense contracts that have been previously monopolized under FPI's "mandatory source" status dating back to 1934. Most importantly, this provision will enable the Department of Defense to determine, for itself, whether the FPI can best meet the Department's needs in terms of price, quality, and time of delivery. If the DOD determines that the FPI product is not the best one available, the Department can purchase a more competitive product to meet its needs.

I would like to point out that by eliminating the Federal Prison Industries' mandatory source status, this reform affects another controversial marketing scheme that the FPI developed in recent years. As a result of this bill, the FPI will no longer be able to require Defense contractors to use their products. Let me give an example of what this means: when the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, NAVFAC, the Corps of Engineers, Air Force, or any other Defense agency issues a contract for architect-engineer, A/E, services, the A/E firm cannot be forced to specify FPI products, such as office furniture systems, in its designs and specifications. It is my view that architects and engineers should be free to specify products, such as modular office systems, interior design, and other products, that provide the highest quality design, best value, and greatest functionality to the Federal Government. Should the FPI continue to mandate that subcontractors use FPI products it would be in direct con-

flict with the underlying provisions of the Defense authorization language—in effect circumventing congressional intent.

Mr. President, I also want my colleagues to know that there are still a number of issues related to the practices of the Federal Prison Industries that Congress must address in the near future. Senator LEVIN and I have introduced a broader initiative—S. 1295—that seeks to make a number of needed, government-wide reforms affecting the sales and services by FPI. We are also working with the bipartisan team of Representatives HOEKSTRA, FRANK, COLLINS, MALONEY, and SENSENBRENNER of their companion bill, H.R. 1577. It is my hope that when we return in January, Congress will take up comprehensive Federal Prison Industry reform. It is also my strong desire that the Bush administration address this issue administratively. Many of the problems we are experiencing with the FPI have not been the result of legislative action, but rather administrative expansion. I look forward to working with Senator LEVIN and Senator WARNER in oversight of the implementation of this provision in the Defense Department's acquisition regulations.

I have a long record of interest in the issue of unfair government competition with the private sector. When the government needs commercially available products and services, the government should go to the competitive, private sector market to procure those services. Such full and open competition leads to the highest quality, the most fair and reasonable price, and the overall best value for the taxpayer. I am pleased the Congress is taking another step in that direction by enacting the FPI reforms in this bill. Once again, I commend Senator LEVIN and Senator WARNER for their leadership, and I thank them for the cooperation they have extended to me in this matter.

THE PACIFIC SALMON RECOVERY ACT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, Senator BOXER introduced last Thursday, December 13, 2001, the Pacific Salmon Recovery Act that will grant Federal funding for State and Tribal salmon recovery efforts in California, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska. I would like to thank her and her staff for their hard work and for Senator BOXER's determination to have a bipartisan bill on salmon recovery. I also would like to thank my colleague from Idaho, Senator CRAPO, Senators SMITH and WYDEN from Oregon, and Senator FEINSTEIN from California, for their valuable input that clearly helped to create responsible and effective bipartisan legislation to recover salmon. I enjoyed working with all of them and their staff.

For over 20 years, California, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska, have attempted mightily to sustain salmon runs in river basins throughout the

West and, along with the Federal Government, have invested billions of dollars in that effort.

Many individual citizens in my State of Idaho and some special interest groups from around the country have quite frequently criticized justly the expenditures of these large sums of money for salmon recovery. The criticism often pointed to poor coordination among State, Federal, and Tribal fish and wildlife agencies, as well as to ineffective recovery programs developed either by those agencies or under their supervision.

The Pacific Salmon Recovery Act, S. 1825, takes aim at these infirmities and establishes a framework that will ensure better coordination and more effective recovery programs. I am convinced that we'll get better "bang for the buck" if this bill is enacted.

However, salmon recovery is complex. Recent scientific research has underscored the difficulty in finding quick solutions to salmon recovery. Scientists have been candid in stating unequivocally that there is no "silver bullet" that can cure what is causing diminishing salmon returns. The focus on dam removal during the last several years has retarded progress in recovering salmon. The majority of a salmon's life cycle is spent in the ocean. It is there that the salmon nourishes itself and prepares for the arduous journey back to spawning areas. What is becoming increasingly clear from new ocean research is that warm ocean temperature is causing a severe reduction in the ocean's salmon carrying capacity. More research in this area will provide helpful insight as to what can be done to adjust to that devastating fact. The recent change to colder Pacific Ocean temperatures is widely credited for the record salmon returns that the Pacific Northwest has experienced this year. It is my hope that a more open dialogue on ways to approach salmon recovery will ensure continued progress on effective measures that will both recover these fish and protect the economy of the West. It is my belief that this bill will enhance the prospect of achieving that goal.

There are many good provisions in this bill. For example, it authorizes \$350 million a year over the next five years to be spent on salmon recovery, a sizable amount that I hope will be appropriated by Congress each of those years. But I would like to highlight the peer review provisions in particular. Those provisions require each State or Tribal science based recovery activity to undergo scientific peer review before that activity will be funded with Federal money. It is modeled on the very successful peer review requirement contained in the Northwest Power Act for State and Tribal salmon recovery programs that get Pacific Northwest ratepayer money.

Ensuring accountability for large expenditures of taxpayer money is essential to keep the trust of the American taxpayer.