

of pharmacist services under part B of the medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHAFEE (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. CLELAND, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 975. A bill to improve environmental policy by providing assistance for State and tribal land use planning, to promote improved quality of life, regionalism, and sustainable economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 976. A bill to provide authorization and funding for the enhancement of ecosystems, water supply, and water quality of the State of California; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BAUCUS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 977. A bill to amend the Agricultural Market Transition Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make nonrecourse marketing assistance loans and loan deficiency payments available to producers of dry peas, lentils, and chickpeas; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, and Mr. THOMAS):

S. 978. A bill to provide for improved management of, and increased accountability for, outfitted activities by which the public gains access to and occupancy and use of Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BREAUX:

S. Res. 95. A resolution designating August 3, 2001, as "National Court Reporting and Captioning Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. SNOWE):

S. Res. 96. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued to honor Dr. Edgar J. Helms; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DeWINE:

S. Res. 97. A resolution honoring the Buffalo Soldiers and Colonel Charles Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOND:

S. Res. 98. A resolution designating the period beginning on June 11 and ending on June 15, 2001 as "National Work Safe Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. Res. 99. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Olympics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire):

S. Con. Res. 44. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 170

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay by reason of their years of military service and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability.

S. 293

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 293, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable tax credit against increased residential energy costs and for other purposes.

S. 472

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 472, a bill to ensure that nuclear energy continues to contribute to the supply of electricity in the United States.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to foster innovation and technological advancement in the development of the Internet and electronic commerce, and to assist the States in simplifying their sales and use taxes.

S. 538

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 538, a bill to provide for infant crib safety, and for other purposes.

S. 662

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 662, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish headstones or markers for marked graves of, or to other wise commemorate, certain individuals.

S. 670

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 670, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate methyl tertiary butyl ether from the United States fuel supply and to increase production and use of ethanol, and for other purposes.

S. 781

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 781, a bill to amend section 3702 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the authority for housing loans for members of the Selected Reserve.

S. 808

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 808, a bill to amend the

Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the occupational taxes relating to distilled spirits, wine, and beer.

S. 860

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) were added as cosponsors of S. 860, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain expenses of rural letter carriers.

S. 885

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 885, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for national standardized payment amounts for inpatient hospital services furnished under the medicare program.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 892, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to phase out the use of methyl tertiary butyl ether in fuels or fuel additives, to promote the use of renewable fuels, and for other purposes.

S. 924

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 924, a bill to provide reliable officers, technology, education, community prosecutors, and training in our neighborhoods.

S. RES. 92

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 92, a resolution to designate the week beginning June 3, 2001, as "National Correctional Officers and Employees Week."

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 966. A bill to amend the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act to encourage deployment of broadband service to rural America; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, today I rise, along with Senator DASCHLE, Senator JOHNSON, Senator MURRAY, and Senator WELLSTONE to introduce the Rural Broadband Enhancement Act to deploy broadband technology to rural America. As the demand for high speed Internet access grows, numerous companies are responding in areas of dense population. While urban America is quickly gaining high speed access, rural America is, once again, being left behind. Ensuring that all Americans have the technological capability is essential in this digital age. It is not

only an issue of fairness, but it is also an issue of economic survival.

To remedy the gap between urban and rural America, this legislation gives new authority to the Rural Utilities Service in consultation with NTIA to make low interest loans to companies that are deploying broadband technology to rural America. Loans are made on a company neutral and a technology neutral basis so that companies that want to serve these areas can do so by employing technology that is best suited to a particular area. Without this program, market forces will pass by much of America, and that is unacceptable.

This issue is not a new one. When we were faced with electrifying all of the country, we enacted the Rural Electrification Act. When telephone service was only being provided to well-populated communities, we expanded the Rural Electrification Act and created the Rural Utilities Service to oversee rural telephone deployment. The equitable deployment of broadband services is only the next step in keeping America connected, and our legislation would ensure that.

If we fail to act, rural America will be left behind once again. As the economy moves further and further towards online transactions and communications, rural America must be able to participate. Historically, our economy has been defined by geography, and we in Congress were powerless to do anything about it. Where there were ports, towns and businesses got their start. Where there were railroad tracks, towns and businesses grew up around them. The highway system brought the same evolution.

But the Internet is changing all of that. No longer must economic growth be defined by geographic fiat. Telecommunications industries and policymakers are proclaiming, "Distance is dead!" But, that's not quite right: Distance will be dead, only as long as Congress ensures that broadband services are available to all parts of America, urban and rural.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this legislation and give rural America a fair chance to survive.

By Mr. BOND.

S. 967. A bill to establish the Military Readiness Investigation Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a very important matter of national security.

Today many thousands of Americans are spread across the globe defending our national interest and those of our close friends and allies.

While risking their lives to keep America safe, American soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines are not as ready for combat as they should be.

History has taught us that the more prepared we are for war, the less likely potential enemies will be to risk war in

pursuit of their own national objectives.

Our ability to prevail in war is, therefore, one of the most critical elements of our deterrence strategy.

That is why I rise today to introduce legislation that I believe will help us improve the combat readiness of our armed forces. Doing so will strengthen America's standing and security in the world and contribute to global stability.

In recent years the topic of military readiness has received far more words than deeds. In all candor, we have talked this issue to death without being able to deliver for the troops who need our help.

I think I know why. Words are far cheaper than the actions needed to restore a sharp edge to our combat forces.

We know that we have problem with military readiness. It seems that every time we peel back the cheery assessments and closely examine the issue, we find that our military readiness is worse than advertised.

Let me offer just a few examples.

Today, the readiness level of too many of our aviation combat units is being maintained through cannibalization. One plane is striped of parts to keep others flying. The only problem with that is the practice actually accelerates the destruction of our combat readiness. A recent Navy investigation stated "current readiness levels are being achieved through extensive cannibalization and the rates are increasing in every community we visited."

In other words, we have a bunch of hangar queens that have been robbed of parts and are not able to fly to provide the practice or to carry out the missions for which they were intended. Because of a shortage in money, our fliers are going into harm's way with outdated electronic intelligence files. The Navy E-2C Hawkeyes carry intelligence files that, in some case, are between 5 and 9 years old. The electronic intelligence files aboard the EA-6B Prowler planes, our jammers, are updated only on a 2-to-6-year cycle. The missiles we use to kill enemy radars are not being updated with new electronic intelligence parametric files.

The Army's Third Infantry Division based at Fort Stewart Georgia was recently dropped to the second lowest readiness rating. Just over a year ago, two other Army divisions, the 10th Mountain and First Mechanized Division were briefly dropped to the lowest readiness rating—meaning they were unready for war. These are three of the Army's ten active duty divisions.

The Marine Corps cannot replace its antiquated equipment because it has to steal money from its modernization account to keep its combat edge sharp.

Sadly, there is an endless parade of anecdotal evidence. And too often, the anecdotal reports that leak to the press are far more accurate indicators of the true state of military readiness than the Pentagon's own internal reporting system.

The evidence strongly suggests we have not kept faith with our troops who risk their lives for us. And that is our top obligation—to keep up our part of the social compact with our servicemen and women, in exchange for their willingness to risk their lives we promise to equip and train our troops so they may quickly prevail in combat with as few casualties as possible.

While we know all to well the problem we face, we have yet to build a national consensus of the solution. And make no mistake, that is what a problem of this scale requires—a national consensus.

To do that, we need an objective assessment of military readiness conducted by non-partisan, military experts. It would measure the current state of our U.S. military readiness and also examine the effectiveness of the Pentagon's current readiness reporting system.

Much like the CIA required an outside panel of "Team B" experts during the 1970s, I believe the Pentagon desperately needs an outside group of experts to look at the readiness books.

I believe that this review will help senior Pentagon officials obtain the most accurate picture possible of the true state of military readiness today.

Such a measurement will also help Congress build a baseline understanding of military readiness that we must have if we are to begin funding the military's operations and maintenance accounts at a sufficient level.

Let me just say this: Secretary Rumsfeld's decision to reexamine our national military strategy, force structure and procurement strategy is the right thing to do. Indeed, it is long overdue and I commend the administration for its commitment to this effort.

This is very important, but we cannot overlook combat readiness as the most critical index of our Nation's ability to defend itself, our interests and our allies' interests. Strategic competitors pay close attention to reports of deteriorating U.S. military readiness and we must not embolden them by ignoring these reports ourselves.

Many military experts have also contended that many of the military's readiness problems would disappear if the Pentagon dropped its plans to fight and win two major regional wars at one time. However, some say that the Nation's ability to wage major wars on two fronts acts as an important deterrent to potentially hostile states like North Korea. Secretary Rumsfeld's review coupled with a military readiness review panel should enable us for once to answer effectively and address these issues—to come up with the right balance and solutions for our troops and for our Nation.

The readiness system is intended to pinpoint war-fighting deficiencies in every unit's equipment, transportation system, personnel and training. By many accounts this system is arcane

and inflexible and does not accurately depict the true state of readiness. It is time we reviewed this system and developed means to keep it the predictive and useful tool it was designed and intended to be.

While we await the results of Secretary Rumsfeld's reviews, we already know that we have a persistent readiness problem that exacerbates other problems within the U.S. military, like manpower levels and morale.

In a monthly readiness report the defense department sent to Congress in March, there was a list of "strategic concerns" about military readiness. This report indicated that despite some leveling off of declines in wartime preparedness, there is still an uphill battle to be fought to ensure U.S. Forces are ready for major operations. This report states that aviation readiness remains challenged by "reduced aircraft mission-capable rates, parts shortages, and technical surprises and maintenance issues."

Readiness involves very many distinct issues. First, it's making sure that we're providing the resources needed to maintain readiness. Second, it's making sure that we are gathering the right data and information so that we've got true pictures of readiness. Third, it's dealing quickly and effectively with readiness issues when they're detected.

Several weeks ago I released an article describing the legislation I am proposing here. As a result, I have received numerous letters from constituents reiterating the need for this review board and citing examples of why it should be done. One letter was sent by a woman who has a daughter and two friends who are serving on various Navy bases. In her letter she describes a situation where there are not enough spare parts to go around. Nothing new—except this affects her personally and causes her to worry constantly about her family and friends because they are spread too thin and lack the spare parts to do their job, thereby endangering them needlessly.

At the end of the cold war, force structure and personnel end strength were drastically cut in all the services. At the same time, the Nation discovered that the post-cold war world is a complex, dangerous place. As a result, deployments for contingency operations, peacekeeping missions, humanitarian assistance, disaster relief and counter-terrorism operations increased dramatically and our dependence on the armed services for their deployments continues to grow.

While our military forces got smaller, they did not become more ready for combat. In fact, our peak military readiness was reached immediately following Desert Storm in 1991 and has slowly and steadily declined since.

And that is inexcusable for a superpower. We have a responsibility to our citizens and to countless millions around the world whose physical safety and economic and political stability is

guaranteed because of our military strength.

The world looks to us, and so as I review this military readiness problem and search for a solution I am guided by the simple notion that our strength guarantees global peace. Our military strength provides the foundation for the global economy and provides the economic and political stability for so many parts of the world. This understanding must guide our efforts as we seek to rebuild our military to prevail in our next war.

Our own history during this century has shown us that when we try to judge our military by its cost-efficiency during peacetime we invite disaster. This happened at the outset of the Second World War in North Africa. And we saw it again when Task Force Smith was shredded by the North Koreans in 1950.

How many times must we relearn the lesson that the only true measure of military effectiveness is performance in wartime?

I commend to my colleagues a brilliant editorial in the Wall Street Journal by Mark Helprin. He writes of the myopic view of peacetime civilians charged with budgeting their militaries. "God save the American soldier from those who believe that his life can be protected and his mission accomplished on the cheap," wrote Mr. Helprin. "For what they perceive as extravagance is always less costly in lives and treasure than the long drawn-out wars it deters or shortens with quick victories."

I should explain that the bill I have introduced establishes a commission to be appointed by the Secretary of Defense with the concurrence of the chairs and ranking members of the authorizing appropriations committees to look at the issues of readiness and to be sure that they report to the Congress and to the United States, No. 1, on the status of readiness and, No. 2, on the reliability, or lack thereof, in the system set up to determine readiness.

I respect the great work being done by the Readiness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. I have spoken with the chair and ranking members. We want to be a supplement to and a sounding board, perhaps, to provide a louder microphone or megaphone for the information determined in that Readiness Subcommittee.

I hope my colleagues will look at this measure and join me in sponsoring it. I am pleased to ask unanimous consent that the distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Kansas, Mr. ROBERTS, be listed as a cosponsor.

I invite other colleagues who have an interest in this to look at it and join with me. I hope and trust we can have a strong bipartisan effort to achieve something which should be the goal and the objective of all of us.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, April 24, 2001]

THE FIRE NEXT TIME

(By Mark Helprin)

From Alexandria in July of 1941, Randolph Churchill reported to his father as the British waited for Rommel to attack Egypt. In the midst of a peril that famously concentrated mind and spirit, he wrote, "You can see generals wandering around GHQ looking for bits of string."

Apparently these generals were not, like their prime minister, devoted to Napoleon's maxim, "Frappez la masse, et le reste vient par surcroit," which, vis-a-vis strategic or other problems, bids one to concentrate upon the essence, with assurance that all else will follow in train, even bits of string.

Those with more than a superficial view of American national security, who would defend and preserve it from the fire next time, have by necessity divided their forces in advocacy of its various elements, but they have neglected its essence. For the cardinal issue of national security is not China, is not Russia, is not weapons of mass destruction, or missile defense, the revolution in military affairs, terrorism, training, or readiness. It is, rather, that the general consensus in regard to defense since Pearl Harbor—that doing too much is more prudent than doing too little—has been destroyed. The last time we devoted a lesser proportion of our resources to defense, we were well protected by the oceans, in the midst of a depression, and without major international responsibilities, and even then it was a dereliction of duty.

The destruction is so influential that traditional supporters of high defense spending, bent to the will of their detractors, shrink from argument, choosing rather to negotiate among themselves so as to prepare painstakingly crafted instruments of surrender.

A leader of defense reform, whose life mission is to defend the United States, writes to me: "Please do not quote me under any circumstances by name. . . . Bush has no chance of winning the argument that more money must be spent on defense. Very few Americans feel that more money needs to be spent on defense and they are right. The amount of money being spent is already more than sufficient."

More than sufficient to fight China? It is hard to think of anything less appealing than war with China, but if we don't want that we must be able to deter China, and to deter China we must have the ability to fight China. More than sufficient to deal with simultaneous invasions of Kuwait, South Korea, and Taiwan? More than sufficient to stop even one incoming ballistic missile? Not yet, not now, and, until we spend the money, not ever.

For someone of the all-too-common opinion that a strong defense is the cause of war, a favorite trick is to advance a wholesale revision of strategy, so that he may accomplish his depredations while looking like a reformer. This pattern is followed instinctively by the French when they are in alliance and by the left when it is trapped within the democratic order. But to do so one need be neither French nor on the left.

Neville Chamberlain, who was neither, starved the army and navy on the theory that the revolution in military affairs of his time made the only defense feasible that a "Fortress Britain" protected by the Royal Air Force—and then failed in building up the air force. Bill Clinton, who is not French, and who came into office calling for the discontinuance of heavy echelons in favor of power projection, simultaneously pressed for a severe reduction in aircraft carriers, the sine qua non of power projection. Later, he and his strategical toadies embraced the revolution in military affairs not for its virtues

but because even the Clinton-ravished military "may be unaffordable," and "advanced technology offers much greater military efficiency."

This potential efficiency is largely unfamiliar to the general public. For example, current miniaturized weapons may seem elephantine after advances in extreme ultraviolet lithography equip guidance and control systems with circuitry not 0.25 microns but 0.007 microns wide, a 35-fold reduction that will make possible the robotization of arms, from terminally guided and target-identifying bullets to autonomous tank killers that fly hundreds of miles, burrow into the ground, and sleep like locusts until they are awakened by the seismic signature of enemy armor.

Lead-magnesium-niobate transducers in broadband sonars are likely to make the seas perfectly transparent, eliminating for the first time the presumed invulnerability of submarine-launched ballistic missiles, the anchor of strategic nuclear stability. The steady perfection of missile guidance has long made nearly everything the left says about nuclear disarmament disingenuous or uninformed, and the advent of metastable explosives creates the prospect of a single B-1 bomber carrying the non-nuclear weapons load of 450 B-17s, the equivalent of 26,800 100-pound bombs. Someday, we will have these things, or, if we abstain, or potential enemies will have them and we will not.

To field them will be more expensive than fielding less miraculous weapons, which cannot simply be abandoned lest an enemy exploit the transition, and which will remain as indispensable as the rifleman holding his ground, because the nature of war is counter-miraculous. And yet, when the revolution in military affairs is still mainly academic, we have cut recklessly into the staple forces.

God save the American soldier from those who believe that his life can be protected and his mission accomplished on the cheap. For what they perceive as extravagance is always less costly in lives and treasure than the long drawn-out wars it deters altogether or shortens with quick victories. In the name of their misplaced frugality we have transformed our richly competitive process of acquiring weapons into the single-supplier model of the command economies that we defeated in the Cold War, largely with the superior weapons that the idea of free and competitive markets allowed us to produce.

Though initially more expensive, producing half a dozen different combat aircraft and seeing which are best is better than decreeing that one will do the job and praying that it may. Among other things, strike aircraft have many different roles, and relying upon just one would be the same sort of economy as having Clark Gable play both Rhett Butler and Scarlett O'Hara.

Having relinquished or abandoned many foreign bases, the United States requires its warships to go quickly from place to place so as to compensate for their inadequate number, and has built them light using a lot of aluminum, which, because it can burn in air at 3,000 degrees Celsius, is used in incendiary bombs and blast furnaces. (Join the navy and see the world. You won't need to bring a toaster.)

And aluminum or not, there are too few ships. During the EP-3 incident various pinheads furthered the impression of an American naval cordon off the Chinese coast. Though in 1944 the navy kept 17 major carriers in the central Pacific alone, not long ago its assets were so attenuated by the destruction of a few Yugos disguised as tanks that for three months there was not in the vast western Pacific even a single American aircraft carrier.

What remains of the order of battle is crippled by a lack of the unglamorous, costly

supports that are the first to go when there isn't enough money. Consider the floating dry dock. By putting ships back into action with minimal transit time, floating dry docks are force preservers and multipliers. In 1972, the United States had 94. Now it has 14. Though history is bitter and clear, this kind of mistake persists.

Had the allies of World War II been prepared with a sufficient number of so pedestrian a thing as landing craft, the war might have been cheated of a year and a half and many millions of lives. In 1940, the French army disposed of 530 artillery pieces, 830 antitank guns, and 235 (almost half) of its best tanks, because in 1940 the French did not think much of the Wehrmacht—until May.

How shall the United States avoid similar misjudgments? Who shall stand against the common wisdom when it is wrong about deterrence, wrong about the causes of war, wrong about the state of the world, wrong about the ambitions of ascendant nations, wrong about history, and wrong about human nature?

In the defense of the United States, doing too much is more prudent than doing too little. Though many in Congress argue this and argue it well, Congress will not follow one of its own. Though the president's appointees also argue it well, the public will wait only upon the president himself. Only he can sway a timid Congress, clear the way for his appointees, and move the country toward the restoration of its military power.

The president himself must make the argument, or all else is in vain. If he is unwilling to risk his political capital and his presidency to undo the damage of the past eight years, then in the fire next time his name will be linked with that of his predecessor, and there it will stay forever.

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 2001]

RUMSFELD ON HIGH WIRE OF DEFENSE REFORM

(By Thomas E. Ricks)

In his first four months at the Pentagon, Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld has launched a score of secretive studies and posed hundreds of tough questions as he has tried to create a new vision for the American military, looking at everything from missile defenses and global strategy to the flaws of a Truman-vintage personnel system.

Yet, in that short span, he has also rallied an unlikely collection of critics, ranging from conservative members of Congress and his predecessor as defense secretary to some of the generals who work for him. In dozens of interviews, those people expressed deep concern that Rumsfeld has acted imperiously, kept some of the top brass in the dark and failed to maintain adequate communications with Capitol Hill.

"He's blown off the Hill, he's blown off the senior leaders in the military, and he's blown off the media," said Thomas Donnelly, a defense expert at the conservative Project for the New American Century. "Is there a single group he's reached out to?"

The criticism has focused on Rumsfeld's score of study groups, staffed by retired generals and admirals and other experts who are probing everything from weapons programs to military retirement policies. In Pentagon hallways, "the Rumsfeld review," as the studies are collectively called, is mocked by some as a martial version of Hillary Rodham Clinton's health care plan, which failed spectacularly in 1994 when it was offered up to Congress.

"It's arrogant theorists behind closed doors," said one person offering the Clinton analogy, retired Army Lt. Col. Ralph Peters, now a prominent writer on military strategy.

The military is already responding in significant and striking ways. On Thursday, the Joint Chiefs of Staff held a closed-door meeting in the "Tank," their secure conference room at the Pentagon, where they posed scathing questions about Rumsfeld's intentions on strategy and possible cuts to the Army, defense officials said. Yesterday, retired Gen. Gordon Sullivan, a former Army chief of staff, delivered an angry speech assailing the apparent direction of Rumsfeld's reforms as "imprudent."

One point on which both Rumsfeld and his critics agree is the gravity of his reform effort. Reshaping the military to meet the new threats of the 21st century—and to keep the U.S. armed forces by far the stoniest in the world—was a key campaign pledge of President Bush. To be successful, Rumsfeld must not only come up with specific answers but also find enough support in Congress and across the military to fund them and carry them out. The job will be made all the more difficult because the reforms could anger members of Congress by closing bases, terminating major weapons programs and shifting some spending from tanks, ships and aircraft into newer areas such as space and missile defenses.

In an extensive interview in his Pentagon office last week, Rumsfeld argued that his review has been necessary, rational and inclusive, involving more than 170 meetings with 44 generals and admirals. "Everyone who wants to be briefed I think has been briefed," he said. "Everyone cannot be involved in everything."

Far from reaching concrete conclusions behind closed doors, he said, he simply has been posing questions about how to change the military to deal with a world where even Third World nations can buy long-range missiles, terrorists have attacked sites inside the United States, and the American economy is increasingly reliant on vulnerable satellites. "I've got a lot of thoughts, but I don't have a lot of answers," he said.

Overall, Rumsfeld swung in the interview between being conciliatory toward his critics and being dismissive of them. "Is change hard for people? Yeah," he said sympathetically. "Is the anticipation of change even harder? Yeah."

But a moment later he added: "The people it shakes up may very well be people who don't have enough to do. They're too busy getting shook up. They should get out there and get to work."

BRUSQUE STYLE

Rumsfeld, a bright, impatient man who is not a schmoozer by nature, spent years as an executive in the pharmaceutical industry and honed a top-down management style. That approach may be the only way to overhaul America's huge and conservative military establishment. But his brusque manner has exacerbated anxiety about change in the Pentagon and could, in the end, undercut his effort.

Generals who have met with him report that communications tend to be one way. "He takes a lot in, but he doesn't give anything back," one said. "You go and brief him, and it's just blank."

Neither that general nor any other Pentagon official critical of Rumsfeld would agree to be quoted by name. Indeed, one said Rumsfeld's aides would "have my tongue" were it known that he had talked to a reporter.

Many of those interviewed said they are worried that the future of the institution to which they have devoted their adult lives is being decided without them. One senior general unfavorably compared Rumsfeld's stewardship of the Pentagon with Colin L. Powell's performance as secretary of state. "Mr.

Powell is very inclusive, and Mr. Rumsfeld is the opposite," said the general, who knows both men. "We've been kept out of the loop."

Added another senior officer: "The fact is, he is disenfranchising people."

Some noted that the Bush administration came into office vowing to restore the military's trust in its civilian overseers. "Everyone in the military voted for these guys, and now they feel like they aren't being trusted," a Pentagon official said.

The Army, which has the reputation of being the most doggedly obedient of all the services, appears to be closest to going into opposition against the new regime. Army generals are especially alarmed by rumors that they could lose one or two of their 10 active divisions under the new Pacific-oriented strategy that Rumsfeld appears to be moving toward but has not yet unveiled.

At the Joint Chiefs' "Tank" session on Thursday, one defense official said, the Army led the charge against the conclusions of a Rumsfeld study group on conventional weapons that suggested big cuts in Army troops. The service chiefs told their chairman, Gen. Henry H. Shelton, that they could not make sense of that recommendation without knowing precisely what strategy Rumsfeld wants to pursue. "It wasn't just the Army, but [Army officers] took the lead" in the criticism, the official added.

Retired generals often say in public what the active-duty leadership is thinking but can't utter. Sullivan, the former Army chief, appeared to play that role yesterday in a speech to a conference of Army reservists. He said he is worried that Rumsfeld would "propose a world in which we will be able to hide behind our missile defense," which he went on to liken to the expensive but useless Maginot Line that France erected against Germany after World War I.

In another recent talk, Sullivan referred to Rumsfeld's new emphasis on space as a "rat-hole" for defense spending. He also sent an e-mail criticizing Rumsfeld, and that message has circulated widely inside the Army.

WARY GENERALS

The military now appears so wary of Rumsfeld that officers perceive slights where none may have been intended. The generals are especially peeved by what they believe is a pattern of moves by Rumsfeld to reallocate power from the military to himself.

Earlier this month, for example, Rumsfeld dumped his military assistant, a one-star admiral who had been picked for the job just four months earlier, and replaced him with a three-star admiral. "It turned out I made a mistake, just to be blunt about it, thinking that a one-star could, simply because he was in the secretary's office, get the place to move at the same pace that a three-star could or a two-star," Rumsfeld explained. In other words, one flag officer commented, Rumsfeld felt he needed someone who could crack the whip over the top brass.

Rumsfeld also caused a stir in the services by bringing in retired Vice Adm. Staser Holcomb, who was his military assistant during his first term as secretary of defense, under President Gerald R. Ford, to look over the current crop of generals and admirals. Holcomb's queries may indicate that Rumsfeld wants to take over the selection of top generals—one of the last prerogatives left to the service chiefs. The chiefs generally have little say about operational matters, which are the province of the regional commanders, or "CinCs," and they don't have much sway over weapons acquisition, which is a civilian responsibility. But they do get to pick who joins the club of top generals.

Rumsfeld said Holcomb is working on military personnel matters, especially in helping him look at who should become the next

chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff when Shelton steps down later this year. Asked whether he is stepping on the toes of the service chiefs by getting involved in the selection of two- and three-star generals, Rumsfeld grinned and laughed, but said nothing.

Rumsfeld has also been planning to start a new "Crisis Coordination Center" to be overseen by his office, defense officials said. They report that Rumsfeld believes that communications and responsibilities during crises have been handled hazily. Creating such a center—a move that has not previously been reported—almost certainly would diminish the power of the staff of the Joint Chiefs, which oversees operations.

Rumsfeld's views on crisis communications may have been crystallized by an undisclosed foul-up that occurred during the Feb. 16 air strikes against Iraq, the Bush administration's first use of military force. At the last minute, military commanders moved up the timing of the strikes by six hours.

But word somehow didn't get to Bush, said several defense officials. The president had expected the bombs to begin dropping as he headed home from a summit meeting in Mexico. Instead, the strikes started just as he arrived for that meeting, overshadowing his first foreign trip as president and infuriating him, officials said.

Rumsfeld declined to comment on that incident. But he said that, generally speaking, miscommunications are "inevitable when people are new on the job."

TENSIONS WITH CONGRESS

If anything, Rumsfeld's relations with Capitol Hill have been even more tumultuous. The military, after all, ultimately will follow orders. But Congress expects to have a big say in the orders.

"There really could be a huge collision between Rumsfeld, the services and Congress," predicted Harlan Ullman, a defense analyst at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. "There's an iceberg out there, and there's a Titanic."

Ullman said he thinks Rumsfeld has done a fairly good job, considering how understaffed the top of the Pentagon has been, with only a few senior officials in place.

But he also said that the Bush White House has badly miscalculated on the politics of defense. "I don't think the administration understands how much political capital it will take to change the U.S. military," he said. He and others warn that defense isn't a major issue on the Hill, and that no clear constituency exists for military reform. At the same time, there is a clear bloc against change, consisting of members of Congress who worry that bases and weapons plants in their districts could be closed.

Rumsfeld said he has devoted enormous effort to congressional relations, holding about 70 meetings with 115 lawmakers over the past four months. "I am on the hill frequently," he said. "I frequently have breakfasts and lunches down here that include members."

But the view from the Hill appears to be different. "There are lots of members concerned about the lack of communications," a Senate staffer said last week.

One warning sign has been a spate of "holds" placed on Rumsfeld's nominees by angry senators. These holds, which prevent a confirmation vote from taking place, aren't made public. But it is striking that Republican senators appear to have held up some of the nominees of a Republican administration. The Senate majority leader, Trent Lott (R-Miss.), controlled two of the holds—on the nominees to be the Pentagon's general counsel and assistant secretary for public affairs—that were lifted late Thursday.

Rumsfeld's predecessor as defense secretary, William S. Cohen, took the unusual step last week of publicly criticizing Rumsfeld's handling of Congress. "However brilliant the strategy may be, you cannot formulate a strategy and mandate that Congress implement it," Cohen, a former Republican senator, told a group of reporters.

"The less they're involved in the beginning," Cohen warned, "the more they'll be involved in the end, and not necessarily in a positive way."

Rumsfeld appears to have strong backing not only from Bush but also from Vice President Cheney, his former protégé when Rumsfeld was a White House counselor and then chief of staff in the Ford administration. Earlier this month, a senior White House official said: "The vice president indicated to the secretary that he would be as helpful as he could. As a former defense secretary, he has a special interest in the Pentagon."

Where the White House stands on Rumsfeld's efforts should become clearer this Friday, when Bush is scheduled to speak about U.S. military strategy in a commencement address at Annapolis.

In the following weeks, Rumsfeld will engage Congress in hearings, then will begin making critical decisions on high-profile weapons systems and on whether to cut the size of the military to pay for new weapons. Every one of those decisions could antagonize members of Congress.

Rumsfeld said he looks forward to working with lawmakers to find the right answers. "Hell, I know what I can do and I can't do," he said. "I can do some things, but I can't simply stick a computer chip in my head and come out with a perfect answer to big, tough important questions like that for the country. Even if you could, change imposed is change opposed."

By Mrs. CLINTON:

S. 968. A bill to establish Healthy and High Performance Schools Program in the Department of Education and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, today, I introduce legislation to help our schools become more energy efficient.

Each year, America's schools spend more on energy costs than they do on books and computers combined.

As we continue to debate education spending, there is at least one way to save on education costs: energy efficiency measures could save America's schools \$1.5 billion. And we can reinvest those dollars into educational resources—like books, computers or more training for our teachers—that can make a real difference for our children's futures.

Typically, nearly one-third of the energy used in a U.S. school goes to waste because of outdated technology, old equipment and poor insulation. The least energy-efficient schools, many of which are in desperate need of upgrades and repair, use almost four times as much energy per square foot as the most energy-efficient ones.

Over half of our the country's K-12 schools are more than 40 years old and in need of renovation to reach standards of efficiency and comfort. And it's estimated that 6,000 new schools will be needed in the next 10 years because of the growing student population.

The U.S. Department of Energy estimates that schools could save 25 to 30 percent of the money they spend on energy—\$1.5 billion—through better building design, use of energy-efficient and renewable energy technologies and improvements to operations and maintenance.

Unfortunately, school districts may not be aware of the things they can do to be more energy efficient, improve indoor environments, and save money. That is why the legislation that I am introducing today is so important. The Healthy and High Performance Schools Act of 2001 would create a program within the Department of Education to provide grants to states to help school districts make their buildings healthier and more energy efficient. It will help our schools improve the indoor air quality, make smart energy efficient upgrades and take advantage of new, energy efficient technology. And this will save our schools money.

There are some basic things that every school can do to reduce energy use. If schools adopt energy management systems to coordinate heating, ventilation and air conditioning they can help ensure rooms are heated and cooled only while being used.

And simply closing doors to keep heated or cooled air from escaping can save money. Schools can add insulation to walls, floors, attics and ceilings or use shades, films and screens to better secure windows. Using some type of window treatment in the summer can greatly reduce the need for air conditioning. Energy-efficient fixtures, bulbs and lamps can make a big difference too. And installing occupancy sensors to control lighting when rooms are empty is smart and efficient.

So much of the energy used by schools—approximately fifteen percent—is for cooking, refrigeration, and heating hot water. Simply maintaining food service equipment in schools can mean large energy savings.

Energy use by computers and office equipment is one of the fastest-growing sources of electricity consumption in schools, businesses and homes. And it is expected to grow by as much as 50 percent in the next decade. If schools use products with an ENERGY STAR label—the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's, EPA, label for energy efficient appliances—they can save as much as 50 percent in energy costs.

And I'm proud to report that many schools in New York are already leading the way.

The Smithtown School District on Long Island recently became the first school district in New York State to receive the Energy Star label. The District completed an extensive lighting modification project using the latest energy-efficient technologies in three of its elementary schools. Three schools, Smithtown Elementary, Mount Pleasant Elementary and Dogwood Elementary, will display the bronze plaque with the Energy Star logo in their buildings. The district

now uses more than five million kilowatts less than it did in the 1970's.

The Kingston School District in Ulster County, New York, made drastic improvements in the energy performance of all the schools in the district by replacing many of the windows, installing new boilers, and making other energy efficient upgrades. In 2000, the school district saved more than \$395,000 through its energy-efficiency upgrades and in 2001, received an Energy Star Partner of the Year Award.

Sachem Central School District on Long Island was awarded the Energy Start Partner of the Year Award in 2000. The District installed energy-efficient lighting fixtures and new boilers that resulted in savings of almost 300,000 gallons of oil and more than 2.9 million kWh. Special building automation system helps measure, monitor and manage energy use.

Other New York Energy Star School Partners are Connetquot Central School District, East Rockaway Public Schools, Fordham Preparatory School, Patchogue Medford Schools, Rochester City School District, Rye City School District and Wantagh Union Free School District.

I am pleased to join my colleague in the House of Representatives, MARK UDALL from Colorado, the sponsor of the High Performance Schools Act of 2001, H.R. 1129, as well as the co-sponsors, including my fellow New Yorkers, SHERWOOD BOEHLERT and MAURICE HINCHEY.

I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will join me in supporting this legislation, which has bipartisan support in the House, so that we can provide our schools with the tools that they need to save money on their energy costs, and reinvest that money into much-needed education resources that can help our children reach their goals.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 968

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Healthy and High Performance Schools Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) American kindergarten through grade 12 schools spend over \$6,000,000,000 annually on energy costs, which is more than is spent on books and computers combined.

(2) Approximately 25,000,000 students are attending schools with at least 1 unsatisfactory environmental condition.

(3) Educators teach and students learn best in an environment that is comfortable, healthy, naturally lit where possible, and in good repair, and studies have indicated that student achievement is greater and attendance higher when those conditions are met.

(4) Over half of our Nation's kindergarten through grade 12 schools are more than 40 years old and in need of renovation to reach

such standard of efficiency and comfort, and 6,000 new schools will be required over the next 10 years to accommodate the growing number of students.

(5) Inadequate ventilation in school buildings, poor lighting and acoustical quality, and uncomfortable temperatures can cause poor health and diminish students' capacity to concentrate and excel.

(6) Inefficient use of water, either in consumption or from poorly maintained systems, is prevalent in older schools.

(7) Using a whole building approach in the design of new schools and the renovation of existing schools (considering how materials, systems, and products connect and overlap and also how a school is integrated on its site and within the surrounding community) will result in healthy and high performance school buildings.

(8) Adoption of whole building concepts has been shown to result in dramatic improvements in student and teacher performance.

(9) Adopting a whole building approach usually results in a lower life cycle cost for the school building than for a conventionally designed and built building.

(10) Systematic use of energy conservation in school construction and renovation projects can save at least one quarter of current energy costs, leaving more money for teachers and educational materials.

(11) The use of renewable energy sources such as daylighting, solar, wind, geothermal, hydropower, and biomass power in a building already designed to be energy-efficient can help meet the building's energy needs without added emissions.

(12) Using environmentally preferable products and providing for adequate supplies of fresh air will improve indoor air quality and provide healthful school buildings.

(13) Most school districts do not have the knowledge of cutting-edge design and technologies to integrate optimum efficiency and environmentally healthy designs into new school construction or into school renovations.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to assist local educational agencies in the production of high performance elementary school and secondary school buildings that are healthful, productive, energy-efficient, and environmentally sound.

SEC. 3. PROGRAM ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION.

(a) PROGRAM.—There is established in the Department of Education the High Performance Schools Program (in this Act referred to as the "Program").

(b) GRANTS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, may, through the Program, award grants to State educational agencies to permit such State educational agencies to carry out subsection (c).

(c) STATE USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) SUBGRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A State educational agency receiving a grant under this Act shall use the grant funds made available under section 4(a)(1) to award subgrants to local educational agencies to permit such local educational agencies to carry out the activities described in subsection (d).

(B) LIMITATION.—A State educational agency shall award subgrants under subparagraph (A) to local educational agencies that have made a commitment to use the subgrant funds to develop healthy, high performance school buildings in accordance with the plan developed and approved pursuant to subparagraph (C)(i).

(C) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(i) PLANS.—A State educational agency shall award subgrants under paragraph (1) only to local educational agencies that, in

consultation with the State educational agency and State offices with responsibilities relating to energy and health, have developed plans that the State educational agency determines to be feasible and appropriate in order to achieve the purposes for which such subgrants are made.

(ii) **SUPPLEMENTING GRANT FUNDS.**—The State educational agency shall encourage qualifying local educational agencies to supplement their subgrant funds with funds from other sources in the implementation of their plans.

(2) **ADMINISTRATION.**—A State educational agency receiving a grant under this Act shall use the grant funds made available under section 4(a)(2)—

(A) to evaluate compliance by local educational agencies with the requirements of this Act;

(B) to distribute information and materials to clearly define and promote the development of healthy, high performance school buildings for both new and existing facilities;

(C) to organize and conduct programs for school board members, school district personnel, architects, engineers, and others to advance the concepts of healthy, high performance school buildings;

(D) to obtain technical services and assistance in planning and designing high performance school buildings; and

(E) to collect and monitor information pertaining to the high performance school building projects funded under this Act.

(3) **PROMOTION.**—Subject to section 4(a), a State educational agency receiving a grant under this Act may use grant funds for promotional and marketing activities, including facilitating private and public financing, working with school administrations, students, and communities, and coordinating public benefit programs.

(d) **LOCAL USE OF FUNDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A local educational agency receiving a subgrant under subsection (c)(1) shall use such subgrant funds for new school building projects and renovation projects that—

(A) achieve energy-efficiency performance that reduces energy use to at least 30 percent below that of a school constructed in compliance with standards prescribed in Chapter 8 of the 2000 International Energy Conservation Code, or a similar State code intended to achieve substantially equivalent results; and

(B) achieve environmentally healthy schools in compliance with Federal and State codes intended to achieve healthy and safe school environments.

(2) **EXISTING BUILDINGS.**—A local educational agency receiving a subgrant under subsection (c)(1) for renovation of existing school buildings shall use such subgrant funds to achieve energy efficiency performance that reduces energy use below the school's baseline consumption, assuming a 3-year, weather-normalized average for calculating such baseline and to help bring schools into compliance with health and safety standards.

SEC. 4. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—A State receiving a grant under this Act shall use—

(1) not less than 70 percent of such grant funds to carry out section 3(c)(1); and

(2) not less than 15 percent of such grant funds to carry out section 3(c)(2).

(b) **RESERVATION.**—The Secretary may reserve an amount not to exceed \$300,000 per year from amounts appropriated under section 6 to assist State educational agencies in coordinating and implementing the Program. Such funds may be used to develop reference materials to further define the principles and criteria to achieve healthy, high performance school buildings.

SEC. 5. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct a biennial review of State actions implementing this Act, and shall report to Congress on the results of such reviews.

(b) **REVIEWS.**—In conducting such reviews, the Secretary shall assess the effectiveness of the calculation procedures used by State educational agencies in establishing eligibility of local educational agencies for subgrants under this Act, and may assess other aspects of the Program to determine whether the aspects have been effectively implemented.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this Act—

(1) \$250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005; and

(2) such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND SECONDARY SCHOOL.**—The terms “elementary school” and “secondary school” have the same meanings given such terms in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

(2) **HEALTHY, HIGH PERFORMANCE SCHOOL BUILDING.**—The term “healthy, high performance school building” means a school building which, in its design, construction, operation, and maintenance, maximizes use of renewable energy and energy-efficient practices, is cost-effective on a life cycle basis, uses affordable, environmentally preferable, durable materials, enhances indoor environmental quality, protects and conserves water, and optimizes site potential.

(3) **LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.**—The term “local educational agency” has the same meaning given such term in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

(4) **RENEWABLE ENERGY.**—The term “renewable energy” means energy produced by solar, wind, geothermal, hydroelectric, or biomass power.

(5) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Education.

(6) **STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.**—The term “State educational agency” has the same meaning given such term in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 970. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 39 Tremont Street, Paris Hill, Maine, as the Horatio King Post Office Building; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce legislation to honor one of the great contributors to our national postal system, Horatio King, by naming after him the Paris Hill Post Office in Paris, ME, the town of his birth. My colleague from Maine, Senator SNOWE, joins me in this effort.

Horatio King had a long career serving the public as a newspaper publisher and postal employee, eventually working his way through the ranks to become Postmaster General under President Buchanan. All told, he served under three Presidents.

His career with the Postal Service began in 1839, when he was appointed by then Postmaster General Kendall to a postal position that required him to

leave Maine and reside in Washington, DC. In 1850, he became affiliated with the foreign mail service and was instrumental in developing this aspect of our postal system. His efforts were recognized in 1854 when he was appointed first assistant Postmaster General, a post he would hold until becoming Postmaster General in 1861, shortly before the outbreak of the Civil War.

Horatio King did not end his service, however, after reaching this pinnacle. In 1863, President Lincoln recognized his steadfast devotion to the Union and, although King was of the opposite political party, named him to a commission charged with carrying out the Emancipation Proclamation in the District of Columbia.

King was also a man of letters, and was well known for his literary evenings which did much to elevate the culture in Washington at a time when it was a much smaller and less diverse town than the one of today. He would frequently publish newspaper and magazine articles and lectures, and even published a book of travel sketches upon returning from a tour of Europe.

Today, the birthplace of Horatio King remains well preserved and cared for by my constituents, Janice and Glenn Davis, as the lovely King's Hill Inn.

Horatio King served Maine well by serving America well. It is appropriate that Congress recognize his contributions by naming the Post Office in the town of his birth for him and, along with Senator SNOWE, I am delighted to have the opportunity to introduce legislation to accomplish this.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 971. A bill to expand the availability of oral health services by strengthening the dental workforce in designated underserved areas; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my good friend and colleague from Wisconsin, Senator RUSS FEINGOLD, in introducing legislation to improve access to oral health care by strengthening the dental workforce in our nation's rural and underserved communities.

Oral and general health are inseparable, and good dental care is critical to our overall physical health and well-being. Dental health encompasses far more than cavities and gum disease. The recent U.S. Surgeon General report Oral Health in America states that “the mouth acts as a mirror of health and disease” that can help diagnose disorders such as diabetes, leukemia, heart disease, or anemia.

While oral health in America has improved dramatically over the last 50 years, these improvements have not occurred evenly across all sectors of our population, particularly among low-income individuals and families. Too many Americans today lack access to dental care. While there are clinically proven techniques to prevent or delay

the progression of dental health problems, an estimated 25 million Americans live in areas lacking adequate dental services. As a consequence, these effective treatment and prevention programs are not available in too many of our communities. Astoundingly, as many as eleven percent of our nation's rural population has never been to a dentist.

This situation is exacerbated by the fact that our dental workforce is graying and the overall ratio of dentists to population is declining. In Maine, for example, there currently are 393 active dentists, 241 of whom are 45 or older. More than 20 percent of dentists nationwide will retire in the next ten years, and the number of dental graduates by 2015 may not be enough to replace these retirees.

As a consequence, Maine, like many States, is currently facing a serious shortage of dentists, particularly in rural areas. While there is one general practice dentist for every 2,286 people in the Portland area, the numbers drop off dramatically in western and northern Maine. In Aroostook County, where I am from, there's only one dentist for every 5,507 people. Moreover, at a time when tooth decay is the most prevalent childhood disease in America, Maine has fewer than ten specialists in pediatric dentistry, and most of these are located in the southern part of the state.

This dental workforce shortage is exacerbated by the fact that Maine currently does not have a dental school or even a dental residency program. Dental schools can provide a critical safety net for the oral health needs of a state, and dental education clinics can provide the surrounding communities with care that otherwise would be unavailable to disadvantaged and underinsured populations. Maine is just one of a number of predominantly rural states that lacks this important component of a dental safety net.

Maine, like many States, is exploring a number of innovative ideas for increasing access to dental care in underserved areas. In an effort to supplement and encourage these efforts, we are introducing legislation today to establish a new State grant program designed to improve access to oral health services in rural and underserved areas. The legislation authorizes \$50 million over 5 years for grants to States to help them develop innovative dental workforce development programs specific to their individual needs.

States could use these grants to fund a wide variety of programs. For example, they could use the funds for loan forgiveness and repayment programs for dentists practicing in underserved areas. They could also use them to provide grants and low- or no-interest loans to help practitioners to establish or expand practices in these underserved areas. States, like Maine, that do not have a dental school could use the funds to establish a dental residency program. Other States might

want to use the grant funding to establish or expand community or school-based dental facilities or to set up mobile or portable dental clinics.

To assist in their recruitment and retention efforts, States could also use the funds for placement and support of dental students, residents, and advanced dentistry trainees. Or, they could use the grant funds for continuing dental education, including distance-based education, and practice support through teledentistry.

Other programs that could be funded through the grants include: community-based prevention services such as water fluoridation and dental sealant programs; school programs to encourage children to go into oral health or science professions; the establishment or expansion of a State dental office to coordinate oral health and access issues; and any other activities that are determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The National Health Service Corps is helping to meet the oral health needs of underserved communities by placing dentists and dental hygienists in some of America's most difficult-to-place inner city, rural, and frontier areas. Unfortunately, however, the number of dentists and dental hygienists with obligations to serve in the National Health Service Corps falls far short of meeting the total identified need. According to the Surgeon General, only about 6 percent of the dental need in America's rural and underserved communities is currently being met by the National Health Service Corps.

In my State, approximately 173,000 Mainers live in designated dental health professional shortage areas. While the National Health Service Corps estimates that it will take 33 dental clinicians to meet this need, it currently has only three serving in my State.

The bill we are introducing today would make some needed improvements in this critically important program so that it can better respond to our nation's oral health needs.

First, it would direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop and implement a plan for increasing the participation of dentists and dental hygienists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs.

It would also allow National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment program recipients to fulfill their commitment on a part-time basis. Some small rural communities may not have sufficient populations to support a full-time dentist or dental hygienist. This would give the National Health Service Corps additional flexibility to meet the needs of these communities. Moreover, some practitioners may find part-time service more attractive to them. This particularly may be the case for a retired dentist who may want to practice only part-time, allowing this feasibility could in

turn improve both recruitment and retention in these communities.

Last year, after a 6-year hiatus, the National Health Service Corps began a two-year pilot program to award scholarships to dental students.

This is a step in the right direction, however, these scholarships are only being awarded to students attending certain dental schools, not one of which is located in New England. Moreover, the pilot project requires the participating dental schools to encourage Corps dental scholars to practice in communities near their educational institutions. The problem is obvious. If none of these programs are in New England, and yet there is a requirement that the dentists participating in these programs practice in the surrounding communities, this is of no benefit to a State such as Maine that does not have a dental school and does not have a qualifying program. As a consequence, this program will do nothing at all to help relieve the dental shortage in Maine and other areas of New England.

The legislation we are introducing today would address this problem by expanding the National Health Service Corps Pilot Scholarship Program so that dental students attending any of the 55 American dental schools can apply and require that placements for these scholars be based strictly on community need, not on whether or not they surround the dental school.

It would also improve the process for designating dental health professional shortage areas and ensure that the criteria for making such designations provide a more accurate reflection of oral health needs, particularly in our rural areas where the problem is most acute.

And finally, taxing the scholarships and stipends of students adversely affects their financial incentive to participate in the National Health Service Corps and to provide health care services in underserved communities. Our legislation would, therefore, exclude from Federal income tax the fees and related educational expenses to individuals who are participating in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs.

The Dental Health Improvement Act will make critically important oral health care services more accessible in our Nation's rural and underserved communities. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supportin this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that letters endorsing my bill from the American Dental Association and the American Dental Education Association be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 25, 2001.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of the American Dental Association and our 144,000 member dentists, I am delighted to endorse

the "Dental Health Improvement Act," which you introduced today. The Association is proud that the oral health of Americans continues to improve, and that Americans have access to the best oral health care in the world.

Having said that, we agree that dental care has not reached every corner of American society to the extent it has reached the majority of Americans. For those Americans who are unable to pay for care, and those with special needs, such as disabled individuals, those with congenital conditions, and non-ambulatory patients, obtaining dental care can be difficult.

Your legislation recognizes several of these problems and goes a long way towards addressing them in a targeted and meaningful way. The section on grant proposals offers states the opportunity to be innovative in their approaches to address specific geographical dental workforce issues. You recognize the need to provide incentives to increase faculty recruitment in accredited dental training institutions, and your support for increasing loan repayment and scholarship programs will provide the appropriate incentives to increase the dental workforce in "safety net" organizations.

The ADA is very grateful for your leadership on these issues. Thank you for introducing this legislation. We want to continue to work with you on dental access issues in general and on this legislation as it moves through the Congress.

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. ANDERTON,
D.D.S., J.D., LL.M., *President.*

AMERICAN DENTAL
EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 23, 2001.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS, I am writing on behalf of the dental education community to commend you for developing and introducing the Dental Health Improvement Act. This legislation, when enacted into law, will expand the availability of oral health care services for the nation's underserved populations, strengthen the dental workforce, as well as maintain the ability of dental schools to produce the necessary manpower to provide oral health care to all Americans.

The American Dental Education Association (ADEA) represents the nation's 55 dental schools, as well as hospital-based dental and advanced dental education programs, allied dental programs and schools, dental research institutions, and the faculty and students at these institutions. ADEA's member schools are dedicated to providing the highest quality education to their students, conducting research and providing oral health care services to Americans from medically underserved and underserved areas, the majority of whom are uninsured or who are from low-income families. Recent downward trends in student enrollment and a growing shortage in dental faculty have caused ADEA serious concern about our ability to fully and competently address these responsibilities.

Therefore, I was delighted to see that the Dental Health Improvement Act directly responds to many of these concerns. If implemented, the Act would expand access to oral health care to thousands of Americans for the first time. When enacted, the provisions of the bill can be instrumental in helping the more than 31 million Americans living in areas that lack access to adequate oral health care services. It can provide much needed help to dental education institutions as we seek to address faculty shortages.

As you know, dental education institutions face a major crisis in the graying of its fac-

ulty which threatens the quality of dental education, oral, dental and craniofacial research, and ultimately will adversely impact the health of all Americans. Currently, there are approximately 400 faculty vacancies. Retirements are expected to accelerate in both private practice as well as teaching faculties in the nation's 55 dental schools. There is a significant decrease in the number of men and women choosing careers in dentistry, teaching and research. Your personal experience in Maine is a perfect example.

Educational debt has increased, affecting both career choices and practice location. Your bill will provide funds to help with recruitment and retention efforts and helps expand dental residency training programs to the 27 states that do not currently have dental schools.

Also important are the incentives you have proposed to expand or establish community-based dental facilities linked with dental education institutions. The need for this is obvious. More than two-thirds of patients visiting dental school clinics are members of families whose annual income is estimated to be \$15,000 or below. About half of these patients are on Medicare or Medicaid, while more than a third have no insurance coverage or government assistance program to help them pay for their dental care.

Dental academic institutions are committed to their patient care mission, not only by improving the management and efficiency of patient centered care delivery at the dental school, but through increasing affiliations with and use of satellite clinics. All dental schools maintain at least one dental clinic on-site, and approximately 70% of U.S. dental schools have school-sponsored satellite clinics. Delivering patient care in diverse settings demonstrates professional responsibility to the oral health of the public.

Dental schools and other academic dental institutions provide oral health to underserved and disadvantaged populations. Yet more than 11 percent of the nation's rural population has never been to see a dentist. This bill can have a positive impact on this population by establishing access to oral health care at community-based dental facilities and consolidated health centers that are linked to dental schools. 100 million Americans presently do not have access to fluoridated water. The bill provides for community-based prevention services such as fluoride and sealants that can cause a dramatic change for nearly a third of the nation's population.

Thank you again for taking such a leadership role in the area of oral health. Please be assured that ADEA looks forward to working closely with you to bring the far-reaching potential of the Dental Health Improvement Act to fruition.

Sincerely,

RICHARD W. VALACHOVIC,
D.M.D., M.P.H., *Executive Director.*

Ms. COLLINS. Finally, Mr. President, I thank my principal cosponsor of this legislation, Senator FEINGOLD of Wisconsin, for his contributions to this bill. We found that Maine and Wisconsin have many similar problems in ensuring that there is an adequate supply of dentists in our more rural parts of our State.

It is our hope that this legislation will be considered and enacted this year.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to join my friend from Maine, Senator COLLINS, to introduce the Dental Health Improvement Act. This leg-

islation will improve access to dental services by strengthening the dental workforce in under-served areas.

While the scope of the dental access problem is very wide reaching, this legislation takes an important step in the right direction by improving the dental workforce in under-served areas.

According to the Surgeon General, an estimated 25 million Americans live in areas lacking adequate dental care services, and as many as 11 percent of our Nation's rural population have never been to a dentist.

This problem will only get worse since more than 20 percent of dentists will retire in the next 10 years, and the number of dental graduates by 2015 may not be enough to replace these retirees. While dentists have increased their productivity, they are still distribution problems in specific geographic areas.

For too long, oral health has been overlooked and excluded from important public policy discussions of how to improve health and health care around the country. Some contend that oral health care has been a lower priority because advances in dentistry—most notably the expanded use of sealants and fluoridated water—are such that we are nearly a "cavity free society." Yet the truth is that while oral health has certainly improved dramatically among those who are insured, and those who have reliable access to a dentist, there is a tragic disparity in health status between the haves and the have nots.

This disparity between the poor and everyone else exists in general medical health measures, such as infant mortality, low birth weight, blood lead levels and so on. But what I have learned since I first became interested in this issue is that the disparity is disturbingly stark in oral health.

Surgeon General David Satcher framed this issue well at his May 2000 release of his report, *Oral Health in America*, that "Tooth decay remains the single most common chronic disease of childhood—five times more common than asthma."

While this fact is certainly true—that the prevalence of dental disease remains high among children—its burden within the population of US children has shifted dramatically.

I would like to make sure that my colleagues are aware of this horrifying statistic that helps to outline the scope of the problem: 80 percent of dental disease is found in the poorest 25 percent of children.

This figure helps to illustrate the broad scope of the problem. And we all know that the problem is even more disturbing when we look at the ways these vulnerable children suffer from lack of dental care.

Preschoolers living in poverty have twice the odds of having decaying teeth, twice the extent of decay when they have disease, and twice the pain experience of their most affluent peers.

These children are already at a disadvantage in so many ways. And just

the most basic dental care could make a difference in their lives. But our health care system allows this problem to fall through the cracks.

Over the past few years these and similar statistics have been chronicled by numerous entities including the Surgeon General, the General Accounting Office, and the National Institutes of Health.

This legislation will help strengthen the dental workforce that delivers vital oral health care services by improving the workforce in under-served areas. By providing States and communities with sufficient flexibility to address the unique needs of their under-served areas, I believe that this legislation will take an effective approach to meeting the needs of communities in Wisconsin and across the Nation.

The first part of this legislation would establish a new State-based grant program to help states explore innovative ideas for increasing access to dental care in under-served areas.

This grant program would be directed through the Health Resources and Services Administration at the Department of Health and Human Services and support the efforts of States to develop and implement innovative programs to address the dental workforce shortage that are appropriate to their individual needs.

For example, States could tailor loan forgiveness and repayment programs for dentists practicing in areas designated as dental health professional shortage areas by either the Federal Government or the State.

This program could also help with recruitment and retention efforts by providing grants or low interest loans to help practitioners in designated dental health professional shortage areas equip a dental office or share in the overhead costs of an operation.

The second component of our legislation would increase participation of the dental workforce in the National Health Service Corps.

According to the U.S. Surgeon General, the number of dentists and dental hygienists with obligations to serve in the National Health Service Corps falls far short of meeting the total identified need: only about 6 percent of the dental need is currently being met by this program, and outreach and development are critical to future opportunities for strengthening the dental workforce in designated under-served areas.

Our legislation would develop and implement a plan for increasing the participation of dentists and dental hygienists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs and report back to Congress on their progress after three years.

This legislation follows a series of recommendations by the American Dental Association and the American Dental Educators Association, who both strongly support this legislation.

I hope my colleagues will join the Senator from Maine and me in our on-

going efforts to increase access to dental care and promote greater oral health.

We must change America's approach to oral health, especially when it comes to some of the most vulnerable members of our communities—low income children. These kids deserve quality dental care. Right now, too many kids are suffering. It is my hope that Congress will work on a bipartisan basis to promote greater oral health.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

S. 972. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve electric reliability, enhance transmission infrastructure, and to facilitate access to the electric transmission grid; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation that will add stability to the Nation's electric power grid. I am pleased to be joined by Senators, BREAUX, THOMPSON, and JEFFORDS in this effort that reflects a compromise that was reached last year by the investor owned and municipal electric power generators. Identical legislation has been introduced in the House, H.R. 1459.

In the past year, there has been a great deal of controversy over the concept of electric deregulation because of the chaos that has occurred in California. Unfortunately, California is not a useful model of a deregulated environment because California only deregulated the wholesale part of the industry while retaining price controls at the retail level. Coupled with the State's failure to build new generation in more than 10 years, the California model was bound to collapse.

However, I believe that the successes we have seen in deregulating electricity, most notably in states like Pennsylvania, suggest that ultimately the entire industry will be deregulated and consumers of electric power will see significant benefits from such deregulation. In order to facilitate the day when competition comes to the industry, we must update the tax laws that were written in day when electricity was a regulated utility.

One of the major problems that the current tax rules create is to undermine the efficiency of the entire electric system in a deregulated environment because these rules effectively preclude public power entities from participating in State open access restructuring plans, without jeopardizing the exempt status of their bonds.

No one wants to see bonds issued to finance public power become retroactively taxable because a municipality chooses to participate in a state open access plan. That would cause havoc in the financial markets and could undermine the financial stability of many municipalities.

Our legislation resolves this problem by allowing municipal systems to elect to terminate the issuance of new tax

exempt bonds for generation facilities in return for grandfathering existing bonds.

Our bill also modifies current rules regarding the treatment of nuclear decommissioning costs to make certain that utilities will have the resources to meet future costs and clarifies the tax treatment of the funds, if a nuclear facility is sold. The bill also provides tax relief for utilities that spin off or sell transmission facilities to independent participants in FERC approved regional transmission organizations.

This bill will not resolve all of the tax issues surrounding the deregulation of the industry. One participant in the industry, the tax-exempt cooperatives also have tax problems associated with deregulation—they may not participate in wheeling power through their lines because of concern that they will violate the so-called 85-15 test which could endanger their tax exempt status. It is my hope that the coops will sit down with the other utilities and reach an accord so that when we consider this legislation, the coops will be included in the tax bill.

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

S. 973. A bill to expedite relief provided under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act for commercial fishery failure in the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery, to improve fishery management and enforcement in that fishery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined today by my good friend and colleague from Oregon, Senator SMITH, in introducing the Pacific Coast Commercial Fishery Preservation Act of 2001.

The West Coast groundfish fishery is in crisis, and many fishermen are facing bankruptcy. This legislation will help fishermen get through the crisis, and move the fishery toward a more sustainable future.

Sustainable management of this resource is long overdue and in January 2000, the Secretary of Commerce declared the West Coast groundfish fishery a disaster. This bill will put the right number of fishers out there, at the right time, catching the right number of fish.

Catching the right number of fish should mean using the fish that are caught. Fish that are caught in excess of a fisher's trip limit are called "regulatory discards" or "overages," and thousands of pounds of fish are wasted every year when they are thrown overboard. This bill authorizes fishermen to retain those extra fish and donate them to charitable organizations.

The right number of fishers is key to a sustainable fishery. There are currently too many fishers in the West Coast groundfish fishery to sustain the resource. This bill authorizes the Secretary to administer and implement a

capacity reduction or "buyback" plan to ease the transition to the right number of fishers. In a survey distributed by the author of the buyback plan, 70 percent of recipients completed and returned their survey and a majority of them were interested in participating in the buyback program. A buyback plan has been developed by Oregonians, in consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Pacific Fishery Management Council, and this bill incorporates key elements of it.

This is not a Federal handout. Half the funding will come from the industry and half from the Federal government. The industry portion will be a government-backed loan which will be repaid by the fishers who stay. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements in California, Washington and Oregon to collect the fees that will be used to repay the industry portion of the buyback fund.

Another way we seek to ease the transition away from fishing is through reform of the Capital Construction Fund. Currently, the fund allows fishers to put pre-tax funds aside for the construction of a new boat, or for upgrading their old one. It was effective in building America's fishing fleets, but in these days of dwindling stocks and fisheries disasters it is crucial that the fisheries have an alternative use for their money, such as retirement. This bill amends the Merchant Marine Act and the Internal Revenue Code to allow funds currently trapped in the Capital Construction Fund to be rolled over into a retirement account without adverse consequences to either taxpayers or the account holders.

Ultimately, sustainable fisheries are a result of government regulation and management. When federal management fails, the government has a responsibility to help fishers and their families in a timely fashion. It has taken 18 months for the recent fishery disaster funding to hit Oregon. When you are an out-of-work groundfisher, 18 months is way too long to wait. This bill requires the Secretary of Commerce to recommend legislative or administrative changes to the existing law that would enable disaster funding to reach fishers more expeditiously.

This plan is supported by the West Coast Seafood Processors, the Fishermen's Marketing Association, the Pacific Federation of Fishermen, the Pacific Conservation Council, and the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 973

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Preservation Act".

SEC. 2 PILOT PROJECT FOR CHARITABLE DONATION OF BYCATCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall initiate a pilot project under which fishermen in a commercial fishery covered by the West Coast groundfish fishery are permitted to donate bycatch, or regulatory discards, of fish to charitable organizations rather than discard them. The pilot project shall incorporate a means, through the requirement of on-vessel observers or other safeguards, of ensuring that the opportunity to donate such fish does not encourage or permit the evasion of pre-vessel trip limits, total allowable catch limits, or other fishery management plan measures.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIATION.—The Secretary shall notify the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act and before the pilot project is implemented, of—

(A) the fishing season in which the pilot project will be conducted; and

(B) the period during which the pilot project will be conducted.

(2) FOLLOW-UP.—Within 90 days after the pilot project terminates the Secretary shall submit to the Committee a report containing findings with respect to the pilot project and the Secretary's analysis of the ramifications of the pilot project based on those findings.

SEC. 3. REPORT ON DISASTER ASSISTANCE FOR PACIFIC COAST GROUND FISH FISHERY.

The Secretary shall report to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation no later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act the action or actions taken under section 312(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1861a(a)) to provide disaster relief to fishing communities affected by the commercial fishery failure in the Pacific Coast groundfish fishery. The Secretary shall include in the report any recommendations the Secretary deems appropriate for additional legislation or changes in existing law that would enable the Department of Commerce to respond more expeditiously in the future to fisheries disasters resulting from commercial fishery failures.

SEC. 4. CAPACITY REDUCTION IN THE PACIFIC COAST GROUND FISH FISHERY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall, after notice and an opportunity for public comment, adopt regulations to implement a fishing capacity reduction plan for the Pacific Coast Groundfish fishery under section 312(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1861a(b)) that—

(1) has been developed in consultation with affected parties whose participation in the plan is required for its successful implementation;

(2) will obtain the maximum sustained reduction in fishing capacity at the least cost through the use of a reverse auction process in which vessels and permits are purchased;

(3) will not expand the size or scope of the commercial fishery failure in that fishery or into other fisheries or other geographic regions;

(4) except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, meets the requirements of that section; and

(5) incorporates the components described in subsection (c) of this section.

(b) EXPEDITED ADOPTION OF PLAN.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary—

(1) shall publish notice in the Federal Register within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act of implementation of the fishing capacity reduction plan;

(2) provide for public comment for a period of 60 days after publication; and

(3) adopt final regulations to implement the plan within 45 days after the close of the public comment period under paragraph (2).

(c) PLAN COMPONENTS.—The fishery capacity reduction plan shall—

(1) provide for a significant reduction in the fishing capacity in the Pacific Coast groundfish fisheries;

(2) permanently revoke all State and Federal fishery licenses, fishery permits, area and species endorsements, and any other fishery privileges for West Coast groundfish, Pacific pink shrimp, Dungeness crab, and Pacific salmon (troll permits only) issued to a vessel or vessels (or to persons on the basis of their operation or ownership of that vessel or vessels) for which a Pacific Coast groundfish fisheries reduction permit is issued under section 600.1011(b) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations;

(3) ensure that the Secretary of Transportation is notified of each vessel for which a reduction permit is surrendered and revoked under the program, with a request that such Secretary permanently revoke the fishery endorsement of each such vessel and refuse permission to transfer any such vessel to a foreign flag under subsection (f) of this section;

(4) ensure that vessels removed from the Pacific Coast groundfish fisheries under the program are made permanently ineligible to participate in any fishery worldwide, and that the owners of such vessels contractually agree that such vessels will operate only under the United States flag or be scrapped as a reduction vessel pursuant to section 600.1011(c) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations;

(5) ensure that vessels removed from the Pacific Coast groundfish fisheries, the owners of such vessels, and the holders of fishery permits for such vessels forever relinquish any claim associated with such vessel, permits, and any catch history associated with such vessel or permits that could qualify such vessel, vessel owner, or permit holder for any present or future limited access system fishing permits in the United States fisheries based on such vessel, permits, or catch history; and

(6) notwithstanding section 1111(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1279f(b)(4)), establish a repayment period for the reduction loan of not less than 30 years.

(d) FUNDING FOR BUYBACK OF VESSELS AND PERMITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be available to the Secretary to complete the purchase of vessels and permits under the fishery capacity reduction plan the sum of \$50,000,000, of which—

(A) \$25,000,000 shall be from amounts appropriated to the Secretary for this purpose (the appropriation of which is hereby authorized for fiscal year 2002, with any amounts not expended in fiscal year 2002 to remain available until expended); and

(B) \$25,000,000 shall be from an industry fee system established under subsection (e).

(2) ADVANCE OF INDUSTRY FEE PORTION.—The industry fee portion under paragraph (1)(B) for fiscal year 2002 and thereafter shall be financed by a reduction loan under sections 1111 and 1112 of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1279f and 1279g).

(e) INDUSTRY FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the fishery capacity reduction plan, the Secretary shall establish an industry fee system under section 312(d) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1861a(d)) to generate revenue to repay the loan provided under subsection (d)(2).

(2) ALLOCATION OF FEES.—The Secretary shall allocate the fees payable under the industry fee system among—

(A) holders of Pacific Coast groundfish permits,

(B) holders of Washington, Oregon, and California pink shrimp fishing permits,

(C) holders of Washington, Oregon, and California salmon trolling permits, and

(D) holders of Washington, Oregon, and California Dungeness crab fishing permits,

so that the percentage of the revenue generated by the fee system from holders of each kind of permit will correspond to the percentage of the total amount paid under buyback program for that kind of permit.

(f) DUTIES OF SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION.—

(1) The Secretary of Transportation shall, upon notification and request by the Secretary, for each vessel identified in such notification and request—

(A) permanently revoke any fishery endorsement issued to such vessel under section 12108 of title 46, United States Code; and

(B) refuse to grant the approval required under section 9(c)(2) of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 U.S.C. App. 808(c)(2)) for the placement of such vessel under foreign registry or the operation of such vessel under the authority of a foreign country.

(2) The Secretary shall, after notice and opportunity for public comment, adopt final regulations not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, to prohibit any vessel for which a reduction permit is surrendered and revoked under the fishing capacity reduction program required by this section from engaging in fishing activities on the high seas or under the jurisdiction of any foreign country while operating under the United States flag.

(g) REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY.—Any requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, or any Executive order that would, in the opinion of the Secretary, prevent the Secretary from meeting the deadlines set forth in this section shall not apply to the fishing capacity reduction program or the promulgation of regulations to implement such program required by this section.

SEC. 5. COLLECTION OF INDUSTRY FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the States of California, Oregon, and Washington to collect program fees paid under the system established under section 4(e).

(b) WITHHOLDING FEE FROM PURCHASE PRICE.—The fee for each vessel required to pay a program fee under that system shall be deducted by the first ex-vessel fish purchaser from the proceeds otherwise payable to the seller and forwarded to the appropriate State at the same time and in the same manner as other fees or taxes are forwarded to that State.

(c) STATE TO COLLECT AND FORWARD FEES.—Upon receipt of program fees forwarded by fish purchasers under subsection (b), the State shall forward the fees to the Secretary in the manner provided for in the agreement established under subsection (a).

(d) FISH-PROCESSING VESSELS TREATED AS PURCHASERS.—A vessel which—

(1) both harvests and processes fish; or

(2) receives fish from a harvesting vessel and processes that fish on board, shall be considered to be the first ex-vessel fish purchaser with respect to the fish processed on the vessel and shall forward the appropriate fees to the appropriate State at the same time and in the same manner as other fees or taxes are forwarded to that State.

SEC. 6 AMENDMENT OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, TO EXPAND PURPOSES OF CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 607(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1177(a)) is amended by striking “of this sec-

tion.” and inserting “of this section. Any agreement entered into under this section may be modified for the purpose of encouraging the sustainability of the fisheries of the United States by making the termination and withdrawal of a capital construction fund a qualified withdrawal if done in exchange for the retirement of the related commercial fishing vessel and related commercial fishing permits.”.

(b) NEW QUALIFIED WITHDRAWALS.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936.—Section 607(f)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1177(f)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking “for:” and inserting “for—”;

(B) by striking “vessel,” in subparagraph (A) and inserting “vessel;”;

(C) by striking “vessel, or” in subparagraph (B) and inserting “vessel;”;

(D) by striking “vessel.” in subparagraph (C) and inserting “vessel;”;

(E) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) the payment of an industry fee authorized by the fishing capacity reduction program under section 312(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1861a(b));

“(E) in the case of any such person or shareholder for whose benefit such fund was established or any shareholder of such person, a rollover contribution (within the meaning of section 408(d)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) to such person’s or shareholder’s individual retirement plan (as defined in section 7701(a)(37) of such Code); or

“(F) the payment to a person or corporation terminating a capital construction fund for whose benefit the fund was established and retiring related commercial fishing vessels and permits; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) The Secretary by regulation shall establish procedures to ensure that any person making a qualified withdrawal authorized under subparagraph (F) retires the related commercial use of fishing vessels and commercial fishery permits.”.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—Section 7518(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to purposes of qualified withdrawals) is amended—

(A) by striking “for:” and inserting “for—”;

(B) by striking “vessel, or” in subparagraph (B) and inserting “vessel;”;

(C) by striking “vessel,” in subparagraph (C) and inserting “vessel;”;

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) the payment of an industry fee authorized by the fishing capacity reduction program under section 312 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1861a);

“(E) in the case of any person or shareholder for whose benefit such fund was established or any shareholder of such person, a rollover contribution (within the meaning of section 408(d)(3)) to such person’s or shareholder’s individual retirement plan (as defined in section 7701(a)(37)); or

“(F) the payment to a person terminating a capital construction fund for whose benefit the fund was established and retiring related commercial fishing vessels and permits.”;

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“The Secretary by regulation shall establish procedures to ensure that any person making a qualified withdrawal authorized by subparagraph (F) retires the related commercial use of fishing vessels and commercial fishery permits.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to with-

drawals made after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 974. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of pharmacist services under part B of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to be able to introduce legislation, known as the Medicare Pharmacist Services Coverage Act, that will provide for important patient safety and health care quality improvements in the Medicare program. This legislation will reform Medicare by recognizing qualified pharmacists as health care providers within the Medicare program and make available to beneficiaries important drug therapy management services that these valuable health professionals can and do provide. These services, which are coordinated in direct collaboration with physicians and other health care professionals as authorized by State law, help patients make the best possible use of their medications.

The members of this body know very well the vital role that today’s powerful and effective medications play in the maintenance of health and well-being of our nation’s seniors. The substantial and important discussion now underway on how best to craft and implement a prescription drug benefit for Medicare beneficiaries is an explicit recognition of this vital role. But access to the medications, even at the most affordable prices possible, is only one part of the equation in achieving the kinds of health care outcomes that patients and their health care providers desire. That is where today’s pharmacists play a pivotal role.

But members of this body may not be as aware of the tremendous changes in pharmacy practice and education that have taken place in the past decade that have resulted in an expansion of pharmacists’ capabilities and responsibilities. Fortunately for my office Dr. Brian Kaatz, a clinical pharmacist and faculty member of the College of Pharmacy at South Dakota State University was able to spend 6 months with us here in Washington last year as we studied and evaluated the many policy issues and concerns related to a Medicare prescription drug benefit. In the course of that time it became clear to me and to members of my staff that pharmacists are critical in assuring safer and more effective medication use by our nation’s seniors.

In addition to the important and continuing responsibility for assuring accurate, safe medication dispensing, compounding, and counseling, pharmacists now provide a much more comprehensive range of clinical, consultative, and educational services. Thirty States, the Veterans Administration, and the Indian Health Service, among others, all recognize the value of collaborative drug therapy management services as a way to provide optimal

patient care using the specialized education and training of pharmacists. Unfortunately, Medicare does not.

Indeed, payment for prescription drugs in almost all types of health plans and programs focuses on payment for the product and the associated costs of its distribution to patients. The logical financial incentive therefore is to dispense more medications, not fewer. Payment to the pharmacist for time spent in reducing the number of medications the patient is taking or enhancing the patient's ability to understand and more properly use the medications they do need is provided only by some forward-thinking payers and programs. Unfortunately, Medicare is not among them.

Access to pharmacists' collaborative drug therapy management services is particularly important right now, while many Medicare beneficiaries are struggling to pay substantial out-of-pocket costs for their prescription medications. On average, persons aged 65 and older currently take 5 or more medications each day. These medications are often prescribed by several different physicians for concurrent chronic and acute conditions. Recently published research has indicated that drug-related problems cost the U.S. health care system as much as \$177 billion each year, an amount equal to the ten-year cost projections for some of the more modest Medicare prescription drug coverage proposals now being discussed. A substantial portion of this expense is preventable through collaborative patient care services provided by pharmacists working with patients and their physicians.

With careful examination of a patient's total drug regimen, pharmacists can eliminate unnecessary or counterproductive treatments. For example, pharmacists working closely with the health care team can identify or prevent duplicate medications, drugs that cancel each other out, or combinations that can damage hearts or kidneys. Pharmacists may also find that a newer multi-action drug may be exchanged for two older drugs or a slightly more expensive drug may be substituted for a less expensive alternative that causes side effects and results in the patient either taking additional medication or stopping their medication with the result that their medical condition worsens.

The overuse of medications is particularly common in the elderly, who tend to have more chronic conditions that call for drug treatment. In addition, physiological changes that occur naturally in the aging process diminish the body's ability to process medications, increasing the likelihood of medication-related complications.

The pharmacist's specialized training in drug therapy management has been demonstrated repeatedly to improve the quality of care patients receive and to control health care costs associated with medication complications. As a precursor to a prescription drug ben-

efit, it makes sense to take this proven initial step to improve the medication use process. This will help Medicare beneficiaries immediately by ensuring that each precious dollar spent out-of-pocket is spent wisely on a streamlined and effective drug therapy regimen. This is an important benefit that we can deliver now while Congress works to address the more difficult economic and political issues impacting a prescription drug benefit.

In addition, the quality improvement and cost-control resulting from this benefit establishes a critical infrastructure element for whatever Medicare prescription drug benefit is ultimately put in place. By supporting pharmacists who are working to improve the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of medication regimens, as well as reducing preventable medication-related complications and adverse drug events that result in unnecessary health care expenditures, we can enhance the prospects of achieving an affordable Medicare drug benefit that will bring real value to beneficiaries and taxpayers alike.

Recognition of qualified pharmacists as providers within the Medicare program is the logical and very affordable first step in establishing the essential infrastructure of a Medicare prescription drug benefit. As the Institute of Medicine report "To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System" stated: "Because of the immense variety and complexity of medications now available, it is impossible for nurses and doctors to keep up with all of the information required for safe medication use. The pharmacist has become an essential resource . . . and thus access to his or her expertise must be possible at all times." This legislation will empower Medicare to catch up on this important health care quality issue. Pharmacists' collaborative drug therapy management services can and will make a real difference in the lives of Medicare beneficiaries. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give this proposal their serious consideration.

By Mr. CHAFEE (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. CLELAND, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 975. A bill to improve environmental policy by providing assistance for State and tribal land use planning, to promote improved quality of life, regionalism, and sustainable economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Community Character Act of 2001, together with Senators BENNETT, SPECTER, JEFFORDS, CLELAND, LEVIN, BINGAMAN, and LIEBERMAN. This legislation provides Federal assistance to States and Indian tribes to create or update statewide or tribal land use planning legislation.

Up-to-date planning legislation empowers States and local governments to spur economic development, protect the environment, coordinate transportation and infrastructure needs, and preserve our communities.

America has grown from East to West, as well as from an urban setting to suburban one. The Nation's sweeping growth can be attributed to many things, including a strong economy and transportation and technology advancements that allow people to live greater distances from work. Due in part to inadequate planning, strip malls and retail development catering to the automobile have become the trademark of the American landscape.

In the wake of the post-World War II building boom, my hometown of Warwick, RI had experienced the type of development that too often offends the eye and saps our economic strength. Due to a lack of planning, incremental and haphazard development occurred through a mixture of incompatible zoning decisions. Industrial and commercial facilities and residential homes were frequently and inappropriately sited next to each other. The local newspaper described the city as a "suburban nightmare". However, we learned that proper approaches to planning would help every state meet its challenges, whether it is preserving limited open space in the East or protecting precious drinking water supplies in the West.

The Community Character Act will benefit each community and neighborhood by providing \$25 million per year to States and tribes for the purpose of land use planning. The bill recognizes that land use planning is appropriately vested at the state and local levels, and accords States and tribes flexibility in using their money. Importantly, the legislation also recognizes that the Federal Government should play a role in financing these activities. Through enactment of transportation, housing, environmental, energy, and economic development laws and requirements, Congress has created a demand for state and local planning. In fact, the Community Character Act should be viewed as providing the federal payment for an unfunded mandate whose account is overdue.

The Senators who have sponsored this bill represent geographically diverse states, from Rhode Island to New Mexico and from Georgia to Utah. This bipartisan bill represents a small investment in our communities, but one that will yield large dividends to communities in each corner of the nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, a summary of the bill, and letters of support for the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 975

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Community Character Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) inadequate land use planning at the State and tribal levels contributes to—

(A) increased public and private capital costs for public works infrastructure development;

(B) environmental degradation;

(C) weakened regional economic development; and

(D) loss of community character;

(2) land use planning is rightfully within the jurisdiction of State, tribal, and local governments;

(3) comprehensive land use planning and community development should be supported by Federal, State, and tribal governments;

(4) States and tribal governments should provide a proper climate and context through legislation in order for comprehensive land use planning, community development, and environmental protection to occur;

(5) many States and tribal governments have outmoded land use planning legislation; and

(B) many States and tribal governments are undertaking efforts to update and reform land use planning legislation;

(6) the Federal Government and States should support the efforts of tribal governments to develop and implement land use plans to improve environmental protection, housing opportunities, and socioeconomic conditions for Indian tribes; and

(7) the coordination of use of State and tribal resources with local land use plans requires additional planning at the State and tribal levels.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **LAND USE PLAN.**—The term "land use plan" means a plan for development of an area that recognizes the physical, environmental, economic, social, political, aesthetic, and related factors of the area.

(2) **LAND USE PLANNING LEGISLATION.**—The term "land use planning legislation" means a statute, regulation, executive order, or other action taken by a State or tribal government to guide, regulate, or assist in the planning, regulation, and management of—

(A) environmental resources;

(B) public works infrastructure;

(C) regional economic development;

(D) current and future development practices; and

(E) other activities related to the pattern and scope of future land use.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development.

(4) **STATE.**—The term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(5) **TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.**—The term "tribal government" means the tribal government of an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)).

SEC. 4. GRANTS TO STATES AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS TO UPDATE LAND USE PLANNING LEGISLATION.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish a program to award grants to States and tribal governments eligible for funding under subsection (b) to promote comprehensive land use planning at the State, tribal, and local levels.

(2) **GRANT APPLICATIONS.**—

(A) **SUBMISSION.**—A State or tribal government may submit to the Secretary, in such form as the Secretary may require, an application for a grant under this section to be used for 1 or more of the types of projects authorized by subsection (c).

(B) **APPROVAL.**—The Secretary shall—

(i) not less often than annually, complete a review of the applications for grants that are received under this section; and

(ii) award grants to States and tribal governments that the Secretary determines rank the highest using the ranking criteria specified in paragraph (3).

(3) **RANKING CRITERIA.**—In evaluating applications for grants from eligible States and tribal governments under this section, the Secretary shall consider the following criteria:

(A) As a fundamental priority, the extent to which a State or tribal government has in effect inadequate or outmoded land use planning legislation.

(B) The extent to which a grant will facilitate development or revision of land use plans consistent with updated land use planning legislation.

(C) The extent to which development or revision of land use plans will facilitate multistate land use planning.

(D) The extent to which the area under the jurisdiction of a State or tribal government is experiencing significant growth.

(E) The extent to which the project to be funded using a grant will protect the environment and promote economic development.

(F) The extent to which a State or tribal government has committed financial resources to comprehensive land use planning.

(b) **ELIGIBILITY.**—A State or tribal government shall be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a) if the State or tribal government demonstrates that the project, or the goal of the project, to be funded by the grant promotes land use planning activities that—

(1) are comprehensive in nature and, to the maximum extent practicable—

(A) promote environmental protection (including air and water quality);

(B) take into consideration—

(i) public works infrastructure in existence at the time at which the grant is to be made; and

(ii) future infrastructure needs, such as needs identified in—

(I) the needs assessments required under sections 516(2) and 518(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1375(2), 1377(b)) and subsections (h) and (i)(4) of section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12); and

(II) the State long-range transportation plan developed under section 135(e) of title 23, United States Code;

(C) promote sustainable economic development (including regional economic development) and social equity;

(D) enhance community character;

(E) conserve historic, scenic, natural, and cultural resources; and

(F) provide for a range of affordable housing options;

(2) promote land use plans that contain an implementation element that—

(A) includes a timetable for action and a definition of the respective roles and responsibilities of agencies, local governments, and other stakeholders;

(B) is consistent with the capital budget objectives of the State or tribal government; and

(C) provides a framework for decisions relating to the siting of infrastructure development, including development of utilities and utility distribution systems;

(3) result in multijurisdictional governmental cooperation, to the maximum extent practicable, particularly in the case of land use plans based on watershed boundaries;

(4) encourage the participation of the public in the development, adoption, and updating of land use plans;

(5) provide for the periodic updating of land use plans; and

(6) include approaches to land use planning that are consistent with established professional land use planning standards.

(c) **USE OF GRANT FUNDS.**—Grant funds received by a State or tribal government under subsection (a) may be used for a project—

(1) to carry out, or obtain technical assistance with which to carry out—

(A) development or revision of land use planning legislation;

(B) research and development relating to land use plans, and other activities relating to the development of State, tribal, or local land use plans, that result in long-term policy guidelines for growth and development;

(C) workshops, education of and consultation with policymakers, and participation of the public in the land use planning process; and

(D) integration of State, regional, tribal, or local land use plans with Federal land use plans;

(2) to provide funding to units of general purpose local government to carry out land use planning activities consistent with land use planning legislation; or

(3) to acquire equipment or information technology to facilitate State, tribal, or local land use planning.

(d) **PILOT PROJECTS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.**—A State may include in its application for a grant under this section a request for additional grant funds with which to assist units of general purpose local government in carrying out pilot projects to carry out land use planning activities consistent with land use planning legislation.

(e) **AMOUNT OF GRANTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amount of a grant to a State or tribal government under subsection (a) shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

(2) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.**—The Secretary may award a State up to an additional \$100,000 to fund pilot projects under subsection (d).

(f) **COST SHARING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal share of the cost of a project funded with a grant under subsection (a) shall not exceed 90 percent.

(2) **GRANTS TO TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.**—The Secretary may increase the Federal share in the case of a grant to a tribal government if the Secretary determines that the tribal government does not have sufficient funds to pay the non-Federal share of the cost of the project.

(g) **AUDITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Inspector General of the Department of Commerce may conduct an audit of a portion of the grants awarded under this section to ensure that the grant funds are used for the purposes specified in this section.

(2) **USE OF AUDIT RESULTS.**—The results of an audit conducted under paragraph (1) and any recommendations made in connection with the audit shall be taken into consideration in awarding any future grant under this section to a State or tribal government.

(3) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Commerce shall submit to Congress a report that provides a description of the management of the program established under this section (including a description of the allocation of grant funds awarded under this section).

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2006.

(2) AVAILABILITY FOR TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.—Of the amount made available under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, not less than 5 percent shall be available to make grants to tribal governments to the extent that there are sufficient tribal governments that are eligible for funding under subsection (b) and that submit applications.

SEC. 5. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may develop voluntary educational and informational programs for the use of State, tribal, and local land use planning and zoning officials.

(b) TYPES OF PROGRAMS.—Programs developed under subsection (a) may include—

- (1) exchange of technical land use planning information;
- (2) electronic databases containing data relevant to land use planning;
- (3) other technical land use planning assistance to facilitate access to, and use of, techniques and principles of land use planning; and
- (4) such other types of programs as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(c) CONSULTATION AND COOPERATION.—The Secretary shall carry out subsection (a) in consultation and cooperation with—

- (1) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;
- (2) the Secretary of Transportation;
- (3) the Secretary of Agriculture;
- (4) the heads of other Federal agencies;
- (5) State, tribal, and local governments; and
- (6) nonprofit organizations that promote land use planning at the State, tribal, and local levels.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2006.

COMMUNITY CHARACTER ACT OF 2001—
SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY
SUMMARY

The Community Character Act of 2001 seeks to provide much needed funding to State and tribal governments for the development and revision of land use planning tools. Up-to-date statewide planning statutes and guidelines will allow state and local governments to meet future growth demands while preserving the economic, natural, cultural, and historic resources of our communities.

SECTION BY SECTION

Section 1

Short Title.—the Community Character Act of 2001.

Section 2

Provides Congressional findings regarding the benefits of planning at the State, local, and tribal levels.

Section 3

Provides definitions of key terms in the legislation. "Land use planning legislation" is defined as a statute, regulation, executive order or other action taken by a State or tribal government to guide, regulate, or assist in the planning, regulation, and management of environmental resources, public works infrastructure, regional economic development, and development practices and other activities related to the pattern and scope of future land use.

Section 4

This section authorizes the Economic Development Administration to establish a pro-

gram to provide grants to States and tribal governments on a competitive basis for the development or revision of land use planning legislation. States and tribal governments are eligible for grants if their land use planning activities promotes certain elements, such as environmental protection, public works infrastructure, and sustainable economic development.

States and tribes that receive these grants may use them to develop or revise land use planning legislation, conduct research and development relating to land use plans, or funding to local governments to carry out land use planning activities consistent with state planning legislation. This section also provides for local government pilot projects related to land use planning.

The bill provides \$25 million each year for fiscal years 2002–2006 and caps grants at \$ 1 million (\$1.1 million if funding local pilot projects), subject to a 10 percent match. Five percent of the annual authorization is set aside for tribal governments to the extent that there are sufficient eligible applications.

Section 5

This section authorizes the Economic Development Administration to provide voluntary educational and informational programs for the use of State, local, and tribal land use planning and zoning officials. The bill authorizes \$1 million per year for five years for this purpose.

AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 24, 2001.

Hon. LINCOLN CHAFEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CHAFEE: The American Planning Association is pleased to endorse the Community Character Act of 2001. APA is heartened by the introduction of this legislation and the assistance it would provide to the numerous states and communities struggling with the consequences of change, whether it be growth and development or economic decline. This legislation recognizes that the federal government can, and should, be a constructive partner with those communities seeking innovative solutions to improving local quality of life through better planning and land use. APA, with more than 30,000 members, is the largest private organization working to promote planning for communities that effectively meets the needs of our people, now and in the future.

Planning is the single most effective way to deal with growth issues facing states and communities. Passage of the Community Character Act is among the most important and beneficial things Congress could do to help promote local solutions to such pressing issues as downtown revitalization, traffic congestion, urban sprawl and open space protection.

This legislation responds to widespread citizen interest in smart growth by providing critical resources to help state and local political leaders, business and environmental interests, and others manage change. In a recent national voter survey, APA found that an overwhelming majority of Americans, regardless of political affiliation, geographic locale, or demographic group, believe Congress should take action to support state and local smart growth initiatives. Seventy-eight percent of those surveyed believe it is important for the 107th Congress to help communities solve problems associated with urban growth. Moreover, three-quarters of voters also support providing incentives to help promote smart growth and improve planning.

The Community Character Act provides vital assistance to meet the serious chal-

lenge of reforming outdated planning statutes and supporting planning as the basis for smart growth. Currently, more than half the states are still operating under planning statutes devised in the 1920s. And, even in those states with updated planning laws, communities are struggling to find and implement tools to grow smarter and in ways consistent with the values and vision of the citizens. Thus far in 2001, twenty-seven governors have initiated some type smart growth proposals and there is pending legislative or executive activity related to planning, growth and land use in twenty-two states. This if happening in states as diverse as Oklahoma and New York, Montana and Massachusetts.

We believe this bill will support an array of state, regional and local efforts to promote improved quality of life, economic development and community livability through better planning. Grants could be used to obtain technical assistance and support for a state's review and implementation of growth and planning laws. Activities such as researching and drafting state policies, conducting workshops, holding public forums, promoting regional cooperation and supporting state planning initiatives would qualify for federal assistance. We also believe provisions allowing grants for acquiring new information technology to facilitate planning, pilot projects to support innovative planning at the local level and the development of technical assistance programs through the Economic Development Administration would provide important and needed assistance for local governments and communities.

This legislation promotes smart growth principles and encourages states to create or update the framework necessary for good planning. It creates a federal partnership with communities through incentives, not mandates. The bill does not mandate that states implement specific changes but rather seeks to support and inform that process once it is underway. This program is a modest investment that will bring substantial dividends in improving the livability of cities, towns, and neighborhoods throughout the nation.

The American Planning Association applauds your outstanding leadership and vision in introducing the Community Character Act and urges the Senate to enact this legislation.

Sincerely,
BRUCE McCLENDON,
President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS®,
Washington, DC, May 24, 2001.

Hon. LINCOLN D. CHAFEE,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CHAFEE: On behalf of its more than 760,000 members, the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS® (NAR) supports your introduction of the Community Character Act, which provide grants to assist state governments in developing or updating their land use planning legislation.

NAR supports this bill because it:
Recognizes that land use planning is rightfully a State and local government function;
Provides needed assistance to states and localities to better plan for inevitable growth;

Requires that planning performed under this Act must provide for housing opportunity and choice and promote affordable housing;

Promotes improved quality of life, sustainable economic development, and protection of the environment.

In adopting our Smart Growth principles, NAR recognized that property owners, homebuyers, and REALTORS® have a great deal

at stake in the debate over livability and growth. REALTORS® are outspoken advocates for policies that preserve housing choice and affordability while protecting and improving the quality of the life of our communities.

It is our experience that when communities have not planned for growth, they may overreact to growth pressures by adopting excessive regulations that distort real estate markets and make homeownership less attainable. Planning in advance to accommodate growth and protect the quality of life is the better approach, and the Community Character Act would promote this needed planning.

We commend your efforts in introducing the Community Character Act and we look forward to working with you toward its adoption.

Sincerely,

LEE L. VERSTANDIG,
Senior Vice President.

THE TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND,
Washington, DC, May 24, 2001.

Hon. LINCOLN D. CHAFEE,
*Chair Subcommittee on Superfund, Waste Control, and Risk Assessment, Committee on Environment and Public Works,
Senate Dirksen Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR CHAFEE: I am writing to advise you of the Trust for Public Land's unqualified support for the Community Character Act of 2001.

The legislation you are introducing today will provide communities across the nation with an important and adaptive new tool to address the land-use challenges they face. More than ever, states and localities are seeking innovative ways to balance their economic development and environmental protection needs. The Community Character Act will provide much-needed support to the many state and local jurisdictions working to craft this vital balance through their land-use planning processes. This visionary bill aptly recognizes the inextricable links between public infrastructure, private development, and open space preservation, and its competitive-grant approach will allow for appropriate incentive-based federal assistance to state and local planning efforts. The Trust for Public Land particularly appreciates the on-the-ground successes your legislation will spawn through local pilot projects; the inclusion of tribal governments as eligible grant recipients, and the benefits these funds will afford to Indian land management; and the broader effects that enhanced land-use planning will bring to the American landscape.

We look forward to timely enactment of the Community Character Act, and to hearing from you as to how we might be of assistance in your efforts.

Sincerely,

ALAN FRONT,
Senior Vice President.

SMART GROWTH AMERICA,
Washington, DC, May 24, 2001.

Hon. LINCOLN CHAFEE,
*U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR CHAFEE: Smart Growth America would like to commend you on the introduction of the Community Character Act of 2001. We support both the bill and your efforts to assist states, multi-state regions and tribal governments in their efforts to revise their land use planning legislation and develop comprehensive plans.

Planning for future growth and directing development so that it strengthens existing communities while building upon their physical, cultural and historical assets is integral

to smart growth. We applaud your foresight and willingness to help these entities in their ongoing efforts to achieve smart growth by coordinating transportation, housing and education infrastructure investments while conserving historic, scenic and natural resources.

The Community Character Act makes the federal government a partner with states, regions and tribal governments that want to plan for future growth. We thank you for your leadership and look forward to working with you to pass this timely legislation.

Sincerely,

DON CHEN,
Director.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 976. A bill to provide authorization and funding for the enhancement of ecosystems, water supply, and water quality of the State of California, to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, yesterday Congressman KEN CALVERT from Riverside, CA, and I held a press conference so each of us could introduce a bill, Mr. CALVERT in the House and I in the Senate.

This bill I am going to introduce today for reference to committee addresses a very complicated and complex problem in California, and that is water. It is my very strong belief that the energy crisis that we see taking place in California is a forerunner of what is going to happen with water.

The only question is when. California has a population of 34 million people. It is bigger than 21 other States and the District of Columbia put together. It is expected to grow to 50 million in 20 years.

Our State has the same water infrastructure that it had in 1970 when we were about 16 million people, and every year California grows from 700,000 to 1 million people. It was 800,000 this past year.

We are the sixth largest economy, not in the Nation, but in the world. We are the No. 1 agricultural producing State in the Nation. We are the leading producer of dairy products, wine and grapes, strawberries, almonds, lettuce, tomatoes, and the list goes on and on. All of these need water.

We are a growing high-tech State with an increasing need for access to high-quality water. We have more endangered species than any other State except Hawaii. And, of course, California, again, has this large population. Our water needs are tremendous. So we need to get ready for the future, and we need to do this in an environmentally sensitive way.

If there is one lesson we can learn from California's energy crisis, it is that the time to address a crisis is not while it is happening but before it happens. California is now struggling to build more powerplants while also doing everything possible to reduce demand through increased efficiency and conservation. But because we started so late, we are likely going to have some serious problems this summer, and that is why it is even more impor-

tant that we fix the water problem before it, too, becomes a crisis.

Ecosystem restoration, water conservation, and improved efficiency can be combined with new environmentally responsible off-stream storage. This would allow us to improve the ecosystem and store water from the wet years and use it in the dry years to benefit people, the environment, and farmers.

I began writing this bill last December with the aim of finding something to which all of the major stakeholders could agree—the large urban water users, the city of San Jose, the city of Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco, all of the agricultural water contractors, and a myriad of environmental leaders.

I have come to the conclusion that it is impossible, after 7 years of trying, to get them all on the same page, let alone the same line. So either we do nothing and sit back and wait for a water crisis or we try to do the moderate, the prudent, and the effective thing.

The bill I am sending to the desk for reference to committee is a 7-year authorization bill. It essentially authorizes the record of decision of a program known as CALFED. In California, there are two big water projects. One is the Central Valley Water Project owned by the Federal Government. That is the Federal interest. The Federal Government built it and owns it. The other is the California Water Project owned by the State of California, built by Governor Pat Brown back in the 1960s.

This is, in essence, a State-Federal effort to improve the water infrastructure, to clean up the ecosystems, and to begin to build an infrastructure that can handle the demands of the next 50 years.

The bill authorizes the ecosystem restoration program, and it fully authorizes all of the environmental projects listed in the record of decision. This includes improving fish passages, restoring streams, rivers, and habitats, and improving water quality.

The bill authorizes 580,000 acre feet of water in the first year through the environmental water account, and the bill essentially authorizes the first three storage projects, off-stream water storage, listed in stage 1 of the record of decision: Enlarging the Los Vaqueros Reservoir, subject to a vote of the people of Contra Costa County; raising Shasta Dam; and constructing the delta wetlands project which involves flooding two delta islands for storage and using the other two islands for ecosystem protection. The end result of these three storage projects will be 2.3 million acre feet of new water storage.

Some reporting and financial analysis must still be completed. CALFED expects these projects will have no adverse impacts, so we need to get started to make sure they can get in the line and get going.

I do not believe we can meet all of our future water needs without increased water storage, water storage that is environmentally benign, that is off stream, and that provides flexibility in the system for us to increase water supply, improve water quality, and enhance ecosystem restoration.

Recharging groundwater, water recycling and reuse, conservation, and smarter use of the big pumps in the system are all tools we can use to help us meet our water needs.

I am concerned this may not even be enough. We live in an area, though, where large new dams are extraordinarily controversial. So there is one thing left, and that is to take water from the wet years and store it in an environmentally sound way to use during the dry years.

The bill I am presenting is balanced. It says, in essence, that the storage projects go ahead at the same time as the environmental projects. I believe very strongly that we are not going to be able to solve the problem just with environmental measures, that we need additional water storage as well.

This is not a flash in the pan. I did not just arrive at this. A native-born Californian, I have watched this for years and years, and for the last 7 years in the Senate I have spent an enormous amount of time—probably 50, 60 meetings—with the stakeholders on all sides of this issue. It is my judgment that we must have this additional storage in addition to the ecosystems work.

It is not going to be a perfect bill. It is a big bill. It is a State-Federal partnership. In my view, water and energy are the two essentials that can keep the California economy alive and keep its people flourishing. I hope it will have a favorable response in the committee and in this Chamber.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BAUCUS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 977. A bill to amend the Agricultural Market Transition Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make nonrecourse marketing assistance loans and loan deficiency payments available to producers of dry peas, lentils, and chickpeas; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the "Dry Pea, Lentil, and Chickpea Marketing Assistance Loan Act," a bill to authorize a marketing loan program and loan deficiency payments, or LDPs, for pulse crops which include peas, lentils, and chickpeas. I am pleased that Senators BURNS, BAUCUS, CANTWELL, CONRAD, CRAPO, DASCHLE, DORGAN, JOHNSON and MURRAY have joined as original cosponsors.

Pulses are grown across the northern tier of the United States. Traditionally pulses have been grown as a rotation

crop that provides benefit to the soil, by fixing nitrogen, breaking weed and disease cycles, and reducing the need for field burning. Dryland farmers in northern Idaho for years have rotated wheat, canola, and dry peas, lentils or chickpeas. As prices have dropped for all commodities, including pulses, we have seen a shift in production patterns which have decreased the production of dry peas and lentils.

Current wheat prices are no better than dry pea prices, pound for pound, but a banker will lend money to a grower of wheat and oilseeds because there is a loan program and LDP. The depressed markets have forced dryland farmers across the northern tier of the United States to abandon pulses in favor of traditional farm program crops like wheat, oilseeds, and barley.

This bill attempts to remedy this situation by creating a loan rate for dry peas, lentils, and chickpeas with support equivalent to the loan programs for spring wheat and canola. The bill mirrors existing statutory authority for the loan programs established for other crops by creating floor prices based from 85 percent of a five-year Olympic average. The approximate cost of the bill, and benefits to pulse growers, would be about \$8.5 million annually.

When we passed the last farm bill, the goal was to have farmers farm the land and not the programs. As prices have dropped, we are again seeing planting decisions made based on the programs available, which has made pulse crops less attractive in a rotation. As we begin the process of reauthorizing the farm bill, we will work to make sure that pulses are included so that farmers will be competitive with other crops grown in the area.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today as a proud cosponsor of this amendment to the Agricultural Market Transition Act. It would require the Secretary of Agriculture to make nonrecourse marketing assistance loans and loan deficiency payments available to producers of dry peas, lentils, and chickpeas.

This amendment will go a long way toward giving producers of these commodities an equal opportunity to obtain the same financial opportunities as other producers now receive.

We encourage our producers to grow what is often referred to as alternative crops. Producers have listened and they are successfully marketing these crops. The actions of this bill will now provide these innovative producers with the same economic benefits as producers of other crops. These farmers have dared to try something different and the least we can do is support them for they're daring.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this legislation.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, and Mr. THOMAS):

S. 978. A bill to provide for improved management of, and increased accountability for, outfitted activities by which the public gains access to and occupancy and use of Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today in conjunction with my colleagues, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. THOMAS, the Outfitter Policy Act of 2001.

This legislation is very similar to legislation I introduced in past congresses. As that legislation did, this bill would put into law many of the management practices by which Federal land management agencies have successfully managed the outfitter and guide industry on National Forests, National Parks and other Federal lands over many decades.

The bill recognizes that many Americans want and seek out the skills and experience of commercial outfitters and guides to help them enjoy a safe and pleasant journey.

The Outfitter Policy Act's primary purpose is to ensure accessibility to public lands by all segments of the population and maintain the availability of quality recreation services to the public. Outfitters and guides across the nation provide opportunities for outdoor recreation for many families and groups who would otherwise find the backcountry inaccessible.

Previous hearings and discussions on prior versions of this legislation helped to refine the bill I am introducing today. This process provided the intended opportunity for discussion. As well as it allowed for the examination of the historical practices that have offered consistent, reliable outfitter services to the public.

Congress has twice addressed this issue with respect to the National Park System permits, originally establishing standards for Park Service administration of guide/outfitter permits on their lands in 1965 and amending that system in 1998. Therefore, it is appropriate to set similar legislative standards for other public land systems such as Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands. However, these and other land management agencies are now without Congressional guidance, and instead rules, permit terms and conditions and other intricacies are often left to local agency personnel. The Outfitter Policy Act would alleviate the discord involved in land management permitting, providing consistent guidance on the administration of guide/outfitter permits for the other Federal land management agencies.

The Outfitter Policy Act provides the basic terms and conditions necessary to sustain the substantial investment often needed to provide the level of service demanded by the public. However, the bill provides the agencies

ample flexibility to adjust use, conditions, and permit terms. All of which must be consistent with agency management plans and policies for resource conservation. The Outfitter Policy Act strives to provide a stable, consistent regulatory climate which encourages qualified entrants to the guide/outfitting business, while giving the agencies and operators clear directions.

The Outfitter Policy Act is a measure that will facilitate access to public lands by the outfitted public, while providing incentives to outfitters to provide the high quality services over time. It is necessary to ensure that members of the public who need and rely on guides and outfitters for recreational access to public lands will continue to receive safe, quality services. I look forward to considering this legislation in the coming session of the 107th Congress.

STATEMENTS ON SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 95—DESIGNATING AUGUST 3, 2001, AS “NATIONAL COURT REPORTING AND CAPTIONING DAY”

Mr. BREAUX submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 95

Whereas for millennia, individuals have wanted the spoken word translated into text to record history and to accomplish this task have relied on scribes;

Whereas the profession of scribe was born with the rise of civilization;

Whereas in Ancient Egypt, scribes were considered to be the literate elite, recording laws and other important documents and since that time, have served as impartial witnesses to history;

Whereas scribes were present with our Nation's founding fathers as the Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights were drafted;

Whereas President Lincoln entrusted scribes to record the Emancipation Proclamation;

Whereas since the advent of shorthand machines, these scribes have been known as “court reporters” and have had a permanent place in courtrooms;

Whereas court reporters are present in Congress, preserving Members' words and actions;

Whereas court reporters are responsible for the closed captioning seen scrolling across television screens, bringing information to more than 28,000,000 hearing impaired Americans every day;

Whereas court reporters and captioners translate the spoken word into text and preserve our history; and

Whereas whether called the scribes of yesterday, court reporters of today, or real time captioners of tomorrow, the individuals that preserve our Nation's history are truly the guardians of the record: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates August 3, 2001, as “National Court Reporting and Captioning Day”; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 96—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT A COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP SHOULD BE ISSUED TO HONOR DR. EDGAR J. HELMS

Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. SNOWE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 96

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT A COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP SHOULD BE ISSUED TO HONOR DR. EDGAR J. HELMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Dr. Helms was born in a wilderness lumber camp in upstate New York on January 19, 1863, and passed away on December 23, 1942, at the age of 79.

(2) Dr. Helms established the Church of All Nations in Boston's troubled South End to provide a spiritual haven and a center for job training for the poor and destitute.

(3) In 1902, Dr. Helms founded Goodwill Industries, Inc. (in this section referred to as “Goodwill”), a nonprofit organization established to collect unwanted clothing and household goods from Boston's wealthy citizens to allow poor immigrants to repair them for resale, thereby giving employment to relatively unskilled people as well as giving them a source of inexpensive clothing and other goods.

(4) Dr. Helms often denied himself basic comforts to save money for larger purposes.

(5) In the mid-1930's, Goodwill changed from a work relief organization to one that primarily served people with disabilities.

(6) Goodwill played a key role during World War II by providing workers who produced many basic necessities for the war effort.

(7) Goodwill serves people with physical, mental, and emotional disabilities, and those who face extraordinary barriers to employment such as those who are in poverty, including those who receive public assistance or who are homeless, and those without any work experience.

(8) Goodwill provided services for more than 440,000 people in 2000, and more than 77,000 of them became employed as a result of the assistance Goodwill provided.

(9) For almost 100 years, Goodwill has benefited millions of Americans by fulfilling the mission set out by Dr. Helms in his message of “Not Charity But a Chance”.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that a commemorative postage stamp be issued in 2002 to honor Dr. Edgar J. Helms.

SEC. 2. TRANSMITTAL TO CITIZENS' STAMP ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the chairperson of the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I introduce today a resolution proposing a commemorative stamp honoring Dr. Edgar J. Helms and the 100th anniversary of the founding of Goodwill Industries. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by my good friends Senators LUGAR, DURBIN, KENNEDY, and SNOWE.

Next year marks the 100th anniversary of the founding of Goodwill Industries. This non-profit organization was founded in Boston's South End by Dr. Edgar Helms who began Goodwill to

provide “Not a charity, But a Chance” for those in need. Goodwill began by collection donated clothing and household goods and having them repaired by the disabled and the extremely poor. This work is still central to Goodwill's operations. For four decades, Dr. Helms labored to provide opportunities for those in need, telling his employees to “be dissatisfied with [their] work until every handicapped and unfortunate person in [their communities had] an opportunity to develop to his fullest usefulness and to enjoy a maximum of abundant living.”

Today, Goodwill is an international movement, providing services for over 440,000 people each year in almost every state in the nation, as well as more than 50 countries. In 2000, more than 77,000 people found employment as a result of the assistance provided by Goodwill. Goodwill has been commended by every U.S. President since Truman, and the first full week of May is traditionally proclaimed “Goodwill Industries Week.” Dr. Helms's foundation remains an exceptional example of how capitalism and community activism can work together to improve life for all segments of society. In honor of the 100th anniversary of Goodwill in 2002 and of Dr. Helms's long-lasting contributions to the nation's poor and disabled, I am proud to offer this resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States Postal Service issue a commemorative Stamp honoring Dr. Edgar J. Helms.

SENATE RESOLUTION 97—HONORING THE BUFFALO SOLDIERS AND COLONEL CHARLES YOUNG

Mr. DEWINE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 97

Whereas the 9th and 10th Horse Cavalry Units, (in this resolution referred to as the ‘Buffalo Soldiers’) have made key contributions to the history of the United States by fighting to defend and protect our Nation;

Whereas the Buffalo Soldiers maintained the trails and protected the settler communities during the period of westward expansion;

Whereas the Buffalo Soldiers were among Theodore Roosevelt's Rough Riders in Cuba during the Spanish-American War, and crossed into Mexico in 1916 under General John J. Pershing;

Whereas African-American men were drafted into the Buffalo Soldiers to serve on harsh terrain and protect the Mexican Border;

Whereas the Buffalo Soldiers went to North Africa, Iran, and Italy during World War II and served in many positions, including as paratroopers and combat engineers;

Whereas in the face of fear of a Japanese invasion, the Buffalo Soldiers were placed along the rugged border terrain of the Baja Peninsula and protected dams, power stations, and rail lines that were crucial to San Diego's war industries;

Whereas among these American heroes, Colonel Charles Young, of Ripley, Ohio, stands out as a shining example of the dedication, service, and commitment of the Buffalo Soldiers;

Whereas Colonel Charles Young, the third African-American to graduate from the