

These issues, whether it is prescription drug benefits under Medicare, Patients' Bill of Rights so doctors make decisions for our health care, an increase in the minimum wage, improvement in education—that will be part of our agenda as we return here next week with the new majority leader, TOM DASCHLE. It is an exciting opportunity.

Having said that, we are still a body of 100 Members where, on a good day, the Democrats can muster a majority of 51 votes. So it is obvious we need bipartisanship; we need cooperation. But I hope this change in the leadership in the Senate will open up our eyes to an array of opportunities that have been missed over the last several years, opportunities to provide better schools, more health care, to give a voice to consumers and families in securing appropriate medical treatment, to give those who are struggling to go to work every day and make a living a chance to succeed in America.

It is a pretty heady agenda; it is pretty challenging; but I think we can rise to that occasion. I look forward to being part of it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order for not to exceed 30 minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

#### REFLECTIONS ON THE SENATE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, seeing the current Presiding Officer, the very distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, in the chair reminds me of the days when I first came to this Chamber. At that time, representing the great State of Illinois was the inimitable Everett Dirksen, with his unruly, one might say unkempt—at least in appearance—hair, his florid and flowery oratory, his mellifluous voice, a master at painting word pictures: Everett Dirksen. I can see him standing there. He was the minority leader. And then on this side of the aisle, in the next row behind me and across the aisle, sat the other Senator from the State of Illinois, Paul Douglas: Learned, also a great orator, very impressive—the two Senators from Illinois.

Illinois is continuing in that tradition of Dirksen and Douglas. It sends to the Senate the Senator who presently presides, RICHARD DURBIN, formerly a Member of the House of Representatives, who served there with distinction on the Appropriations Com-

mittee, who comes to the Senate Chamber very well equipped, indeed, well equipped by experience, well equipped by heredity, a factor never to be overlooked, a factor which in some ways lays out the destiny of each of us ahead of our years, who also is a very fine speaker, one who does his homework, who likes service to the people.

Then there is Senator FITZGERALD. I believe he is the youngest Senator in today's Chamber, who came to the U.S. Senate, I believe, as a former member of the Senate of the State of Illinois. I hope I am correct. If I am not, I hope the Presiding Officer will indicate by nod that I am in error.

In any event, I express appreciation to the Senator who presently presides for his patience in awaiting my tardy arrival.

I sat in the chair earlier today as the President pro tempore of the Senate, having been elected to that honor by my colleagues, first of all, on this side of the aisle, and then all of my colleagues through a Senate resolution.

Senators are not to speak from the chair. If compliments are to be directed to the Chair or criticism is to be directed to the Chair, the Chair is not supposed to respond. The Chair is only to respond when called upon by way of a parliamentary inquiry or, if necessary, to make a ruling on a point of order. And, of course, it is his or her responsibility to maintain order in the chair. The Chair has the responsibility to maintain, or to restore if necessary, order in the galleries, or in the Senate Chamber, without being called upon by a Senator from the floor. It is the Chair's responsibility to maintain order in the Senate, and the Chair should not await a call by a Senator from the floor for order and decorum; the Chair has that responsibility.

As I sat there earlier today—we, of course, can't call attention to visitors in the galleries. But there are visitors in the galleries. And as I sat in the chair earlier today watching the visitors in the galleries, I reflected. It is a good time to reflect when one is in the chair and nothing is going on on the floor at a given moment and when no Senator is speaking. It is an excellent time for reflection. As I reflected on the silent audience that sits every day in these galleries—I reflected upon the fact that there in those galleries sit the people—our auditors—the people who send us here, the people who pay us our salaries. Silently they sit viewing the Senate, pondering what is said by Senators, watching over our shoulders. They are always there.

Sometimes we may be prone to forget that the people are watching, but they are watching. There in the galleries rests the sovereignty of all that is the Government of this Republic.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE STRATEGY AND TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION ACT OF 2001

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this past weekend I noted an article in the

Washington Post that led with these lines:

Administration officials preparing an alternative to the 1997 global warming agreement that President Bush disavowed in March are focusing on voluntary measures for reducing greenhouse gas emissions—an approach unacceptable to most U.S. allies in Europe and Japan.

Mr. President, last month, I came to this floor to urge the Bush administration not to abandon the progress of the multiyear international negotiations on global climate change. In particular, I urged this administration not to endanger many of the gains that the United States has made in recent years as it has tried to forge a workable, responsible international climate change agreement. So I welcome the subsequent announcement by administration officials that they intend to participate in talks on the Kyoto Protocol scheduled to take place in Bonn, Germany, in July. But an insistence on the part of the United States strictly on voluntary measures would certainly place in jeopardy such gains and would, I believe, undermine the credibility of our Nation at the bargaining table in the future. I cannot agree with a strategy that abandons consideration of binding commitments in favor of voluntary efforts alone.

I stand here as the chief author of Senate Resolution 98 in 1997, the measure that many on both sides of the debate paint as a fatal blow to ratification of the Kyoto Protocol. I beg to differ with that depiction. S. Res. 98, in 1997, was the voice of the Senate, the vox populi, the voice of the people through their elected Representatives, providing guidance to the previous administration—the administration at that time—as its negotiators labored to hammer out a climate change proposal among various international players. That resolution, which passed by a vote of 95–0, simply stated that any international treaty on climate change must include binding commitments by the developing nations, especially the largest emitters, and also that it must not result in serious harm to the U.S. economy.

It also called upon the administration to inform the legislative branch, which under the Constitution of the United States is required to approve the ratification of treaties, as to the estimated costs of commitments by the United States. We want to know what these will cost. And to date, that information has not been forthcoming. That is what we were saying. Tell us what it will cost. Don't sign it; don't sign that protocol until the major emitters among the developing nations of the world have also signed on and have come into the boat with us. They need to sign on with respect to restricting the emissions of greenhouse gases. It must not be the United States alone; it must not be the United States and the developed nations, the industrial nations, alone. We all have a responsibility.

So we said we want the developing nations to get into the same boat with us because they are going to be impacted by the pollution that is emitted into the air, into the atmosphere, because it circles the globe. We are not saying they have to sign up for precisely the same limits we place on ourselves, or to that same degree, but they do need to sign on and get into this boat. Also, we want to know what it is going to cost and what kind of an impact it is going to have on U.S. industries. We don't want our industries to go overseas as a result of an unwise signing of the protocol that would require us to continue to strongly limit ourselves in ways that would encourage manufacturers in this country to go abroad and to establish themselves in the developing countries. Let's all get into the same boat together. There must be a level field insofar as our industries are concerned. Let's don't drive American industries overseas.

It is a little like smoking a cigar in a room. I used to smoke cigars. I smoked for 35 years. I gave up the habit. I said, "I am quitting." The point is that, even though I might have been the only person in the room holding a lighted cigar in my hand, everybody else in the room was inhaling the fragrance of that cigar. And it is the same way with greenhouse gases. They do circle the globe. Everybody breathes the same air, not only the emitters, but also those who are not the emitters.

Had the Senate merely sat on its hands in that instance and allowed an untenable treaty to be submitted for approval, it would have been rejected. That would have been the fatal blow.

The effect of that Senate resolution was not to kill the negotiations—that was not my desire to kill the negotiations—but to help shape them, to strengthen the hand of our negotiators as they tried to reach an agreement that would be acceptable to the American people. No treaty of such magnitude stands any real chance of success in this Nation without the backing of the American people. Our friends in foreign nations surely understand that.

There are also some who do not believe the proliferation of scientific reports that have been produced in recent years concerning climate change. But the body of evidence tells us that something is occurring in our atmosphere at a proportion that is changing our climate and that the human hand has played a role in affecting that change.

"I have lived a long time", as Benjamin Franklin said when he stood before the Constitutional Convention, "and the longer I live, the more convincing proof I see that God still governs in the affairs of men." And so the longer I live, I see that also.

One of the "affairs of men" that I see changing is the atmosphere, the circumstances in which we live every day and every night. As one who has lived more than 83½ years, I have seen some

changes taking place out there in the cosmos and around the globe.

I cannot explain those changes. I am not a scientist. But I know that the changes are taking place. The storms are more violent. The storms are more frequent today than they were when I was a lad walking the hills of Wolf Creek in Mercer County, West Virginia. The floods are more frequent. The droughts are more severe, with far more costly results and more often. The forest fires are more frequent, more costly.

The winters have changed. No longer do I experience the snows that I experienced as a boy in southern West Virginia in the mountains and hills. There is still a great deal of snow there, but not like it was 50 years ago, 60 years ago, 70 years ago.

The rains are not as they were. There is something going on out there. The ice masses at the two poles to the north and to the south are diminishing. They are melting. As they melt, conditions change around the globe. The waters of the seas grow higher. There is something going on out there—I know, and I am concerned about it.

We can waste valuable time debating and quibbling over measurements, methodology, findings, and conclusions, or we can accept the simple reality that is right before our eyes—we feel it, we see it, we hear it, we read about it, we appropriate more moneys because of it—the reality that global warming is occurring.

Today, Mr. President, I am introducing the Climate Change Strategy and Technology Innovation Act of 2001. Senator TED STEVENS, the senior Senator from Alaska, a State that is almost halfway across the globe from where we stand today, has agreed to join me in this effort. This legislation calls for a comprehensive strategy underpinned by credible science and economics that will guide U.S. efforts to address the multifaceted problem of global climate change. This legislation also establishes a major research and development effort intended to develop the bold breakthrough technologies that our country will need to address the challenge of climate change.

This legislation is intended to supplement, rather than replace, other complementary proposals to deal with climate change in the near term on both a national and international level. I also note that this bill is technology neutral. This is not a bill to carve out special benefits for coal or oil or gas or, for that matter, for nuclear, renewables, or any other energy resource or technology. This legislation provides the framework for addressing the climate challenge, reaffirms the ultimate goal of stabilizing atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations, and leaves the technology decisions to energy experts and the marketplace.

An understanding as to why this legislation is necessary must begin with an understanding of the fundamental causes of global climate change. It is

virtually indisputable that atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, CO<sub>2</sub>, are rising and that mankind is contributing to this rise.

CO<sub>2</sub> has never changed. Like H<sub>2</sub>O, it never changes. H<sub>2</sub>O, two atoms of hydrogen and one of oxygen constitute water. Water was the same in the beginning when Adam and Eve strolled the paths of that Earthly paradise. Water was H<sub>2</sub>O, and carbon dioxide was the same, CO<sub>2</sub>. Neither has changed. There are some things that do not change. That is the reason why I say history repeats itself. Human nature does not change. Cain slew Abel in the heat of a sudden rage, and men are still slaying one another.

These rising concentrations drive global climate change, and they are growing as a result of increasing emissions of greenhouse gases. I don't believe I need a scientist to tell me something is going on there. Disturbingly, most greenhouse gases have a very long life span in the atmosphere, ranging from decades to hundreds of years. This means that what is emitted today is added to what was emitted in the 20th century. For example, much of the CO<sub>2</sub>, much of the carbon dioxide, emitted during the Second World War is still with us today, and, with each passing year, the concentration is projected to grow to ever-higher levels. So, even if it were possible to stop emitting greenhouse gases today, that would amount to a very small chip in an iceberg of a problem.

It is also important to note that as the concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> grow, the economic impact of the problem significantly increases. This is an extremely important point, because if we wait until every last bit of uncertainty is resolved, it may well be too late to prevent adverse consequences to the climate system, and it will be very difficult, if not impossible, to take cost-effective action.

Conversely, taking action can be costly. Fossil fuels, such as coal, which emit carbon dioxide are the heart of our economic engine. Thus, as our economy grows, we use more fossil fuels. The President came into West Virginia in the election and advocated spending \$2 billion, I believe, on clean coal technology. You are looking at the daddy of clean coal technology. I started that in 1985 with the authorization of \$750 million. So I welcome the President's support of clean coal technology.

But there is another side to that coin. I said to the President, I hear they may provide for the costs of additional clean coal technology research by taking it out of fossil fuel research. Please don't do that. That would be robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Yet, that is exactly what happened. The President's budget provides that some of the moneys in fossil fuels research—which means coal, oil, and gas—will be redirected. "Redirected" is the word—that is the key word—redirected to clean coal technology. We are

going to change that, however, and put those moneys back into fossil fuel research. As our economy grows, we use more fossil fuel. Stopping those emissions, even just limiting those emissions, can have the effect of putting the breaks on a purring economy. And that is not just true of the United States, but of other nations as well, particularly in developing nations where economic growth is steep.

In order to solve the problem, we must develop new and cleaner technologies to burn fossil fuels as well as new methods to capture and sequester greenhouse gases, and we must develop renewable technology that is practical and cost-effective. Such an effort will require visionary leadership. Where there is no vision, the people perish. We need, therefore, to muster the strength and the political courage to tackle the climate change challenge in innovative ways.

So the legislation I offer today, co-sponsored by my friend, the erstwhile chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, calls for the creation of a national strategy to define how we can meet these objectives, and it organizes national research efforts and authorizes funding to accomplish these goals.

Moreover, the legislation would establish a regime of responsibility and accountability in the Federal sector for the development of a national climate change response strategy. The strategy includes four key elements that collectively represent a new paradigm to deal with climate change.

The first element defines a range of emission mitigation targets and implementation dates to achieve stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level and at a rate that would prevent dangerous interference with the climate system. The strategy would also evaluate how each of the range of targets could achieve reductions in an economically and environmentally sound manner.

The second element calls for substantially increased private- and public-sector investment in bold, innovative energy technologies.

The third element calls for greater research to understand how we may have already altered the climate and how we can adapt to these changes in the future. It would help us understand, for example, how the changing climate may be affecting farming, in Illinois, farming in Florida, farming on the verdant hills of West Virginia—where there might be flooding or drought and how we could best address it.

The fourth element in the paradigm calls for continuing research on the science of climate change to resolve the remaining uncertainties.

To carry out this strategy, this legislation provides for the creation of an administrative structure within the Federal government to accomplish these elements. It creates an office in

the White House to coordinate and implement the strategy, and a new office in the Department of Energy that will work on long-term research and development of a type that is not pursued in more conventional research and development programs. The DOE office will focus on breakthrough technological solutions and work in cooperation with existing basic science and applied technology programs to bring an increased focus to the climate change problem. To ensure that these goals are achieved, this bill creates an independent review board that will report to the Congress. Finally, the bill authorizes appropriations for these goals.

This is the greatest nation in the world, the greatest nation the world has ever seen. It is the greatest nation when it comes to putting our talents to the task of advancing revolutionary change. I am confident that the United States possesses the talent, the wisdom, the drive, and the courage to lead a global solution to the climate change challenge that we in Congress and those in the executive branch can rise to meet this challenge. It will task our courage, it will task our energy, it will task our determination, our foresight, and certainly our vision. We not only have the opportunity here, but we also have the responsibility to act now on behalf of those who live today, but even more important, on behalf of those of the unborn who are not even yet knocking at the gates. We hold their future in our hands, and we should understand that. We cannot wait until my children or my grandchildren are standing in these Chambers, standing in the offices of power in Washington or elsewhere. The responsibility is right in our hands now and the future is right in our faces.

I am sure these are matters that will be of some controversy, but we must pause to think of those of our forefathers who responded to the needs of the hour when it was their time to act on behalf of their generation and their children. The responsibility is heavy, but it must be met.

I take this opportunity to thank Senator STEVENS for his support, for his cosponsorship, and for the very great strength which he will add to the effort. It will be a continuing effort. It is going to take a long time. It is a big, big problem, but we can't avoid it because of its bigness. We have to meet it.

Mr. President, I will welcome, as well as Mr. STEVENS, any cosponsors who wish to add their names to this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). The Senator from Florida, Mr. BILL NELSON, is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I have been spellbound by the remarks of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, addressing a problem facing planet Earth that all too often we have ignored. Yet as he so cogently has expressed, indeed, it is a

problem. There is something happening out there.

It has been my concern that the present administration, for whatever reason, has chosen not to approach addressing the issue of global climate change through the Kyoto accords. And because the administration has so decided, it is all the more important for leaders such as Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS to speak out on a phenomenon that, in fact, is occurring.

The scientific community is fairly unanimous. It is not totally unanimous. Because of that, that is used as an excuse for others to say that global warming is not upon us. That counters all of the scientific evidence and the testimony of a vast majority of the scientific community that it has happened.

We also know that there is, in fact, a correlation, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has stated, between the production of CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere and global warming. I commend the Senator from West Virginia for offering this legislation to try to get the Nation's mind focused on the problem and a comprehensive effort of trying to determine what we are going to do about it before it is too late.

In my previous governmental capacity, in the position of Insurance Commissioner of the State of Florida, I tried to sound the alarm bell, and it was very difficult to get people to pay attention, especially insurance companies that would have a great deal to lose because global warming will cause the rise of the seas. When you come from a State such as mine, that has enormous implications since most of our 16 million population is along the coast of Florida. The increase of global temperature will also cause the intensity of storms to increase, as well as their frequency.

Florida is a land that we call paradise, but it happens to be a peninsula sticking down into the middle of something known as Hurricane Highway. Hurricanes are a part of our life, and global warming foretells, for us, an increased intensity of hurricanes and an increased frequency of hurricanes. That has enormous implications on not only our lifestyles but our economic activity—particularly in a State such as Florida that has so many miles exposed to water.

Increased global warming also portends, for the entire globe, the increased likelihood of pestilence and disease, all of which have tremendous impacts on us as a nation if this phenomenon occurs.

The Senator is so kind to stay and listen to my remarks which in large part are directed to him in my affection and appreciation for him and his comments and his legislation. But allow me to divert to the recesses of my memory and to my mind's eye.

In 1986, as I looked out the window of the spacecraft *Columbia*, high above the Earth, in Earth orbit, looking back at home that suddenly, over the course

of days in space, is not Florida or America but home becomes the planet, this beautiful blue and white ball suspended in the middle of nothing—and space is nothing. Space goes on and on. It is an airless vacuum that goes on and on for billions of light-years. There in its midst, suspended, is this wonderful creation called planet Earth, our home. As I would look at the rim of the Earth, I could see what sustains all of our life. I could see the atmosphere. As I would look further, I would start to see how we are messing it up.

For example, in a ground track coming across South America, I could look out the window of the spacecraft to the west and, because of the color contrast, even from that altitude I could see the destruction of the rain forest in the upper Amazon region.

Then, in the same window of the spacecraft, I could look to the east at the mouth of the Amazon River and could see the result of the destruction of the trees for the waters of the Atlantic which were discolored from the silt for hundreds of miles from the mouth of the Amazon. That was a result of the destruction of the trees hundreds of miles upriver.

I came away from that experience becoming more of an environmentalist. I came away from that experience with a profound sense of obligation to become a better steward for our planet Earth.

The legislation that the Senator has offered is another step in attempting to get this Nation and this planet to recognize that something is changing; that we best use the best minds, the best science, and the best technology to address how we can stop what seems to be the inevitable march of warming the temperature of this planet to the point at which it could cause great destruction.

I thank the President for his recognition. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his statement today and for offering this legislation. I thank him for his very kind indulgence to listen to my remarks, which are complimentary to him for what he was offered here today.

Thank you, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I seek recognition for only a brief statement.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for his observations today. He comes to the Senate as one who is different from the rest of us—different in that his experiences include that of being a former astronaut. My name is BYRD, B-Y-R-D. I don't have the wings of a bird. But I have the imagination that can fly uninhibited through the unlimited bounds of space.

As the Senator from Florida spoke, I found myself traveling with him and looking out of the windows of his spacecraft in wonder at what has happened to planet Earth, the planet that we call home.

I thank him for taking the floor today to tell us about his thoughts and

about his experiences in that regard. I think he has opened up a new window of understanding—certainly, to me. I thank him.

I look forward to hearing from Senator NELSON on future occasions and to working with him as we attempt to attack this growing problem. It is one which is going to be costly. It is going to take money. We are severely limited at this time. But I welcome his remarks and always in association with my own.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the bill and ask for its referral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be appropriately referred.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Climate Change Strategy and Technology Innovation Act of 2001 asks for a commitment of the 107th Congress to Develop bold, innovative technologies to better understand global climate change. I thank my friend Senator BYRD for introducing this Bill and I am proud to be an original co-sponsor.

On May 29, I chaired an Appropriations Committee field hearing in Fairbanks, AK on the impact of global climate change on the arctic environment. Witnesses included Dan Goldin, the Head of the National Aeronautic and Space Administration; Scott Gudes, the acting head of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Dr. Rita Colwell, the Director of the National Science Foundation, Charles Groat, the Director of the U.S. Geological Survey; and experts from the International Arctic Research Center and the University of Alaska's Geophysical Institute. Many of the Witnesses noted that recent climate change activity likely stems from a number of factors, including natural variances and human activity.

The degree to which any particular phenomenon or activity is contributing to climate change is not well understood. However, regardless of cause, there has been a dramatic warming trend in the arctic areas of Alaska. Pack ice that usually insulates our coastal villages from winter storms has shrunk by 3 percent a year since the 1970's. Increased storm activity has caused significant beach erosion that may displace entire communities. Sea ice is also thinner than it was 30 years ago. The northwest passage has been ice free for the last three years. Forests appear to moving farther north and west as the permafrost melts. We need better research capabilities to understand global climate change, better planning capabilities to react to climate change impact, and better energy technology infrastructure to keep pace with America's growing energy needs.

Senator BYRD's bill will create a process for the United States to seriously and responsibly address the climate change issue. I look forward to working closely with him to pass this important legislation.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to applaud the leadership

shown by Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS with their introduction of the Climate Change Strategy and Technology Innovation Act of 2001. Senator BYRD has shown great courage by taking action to address global warming in such a forthright and courageous manner. As Livy once wrote of the great general Hannibal, Senator BYRD is preferred "in any action which called for vigor and courage, and under his leadership the men"—or in this case his colleagues in the Senate—"invariably showed the best advantage of both dash and confidence." Senator BYRD's vigor and wisdom in introducing this bill are on historic parallel with the acts of Hannibal.

I have been informed that the bill will likely be referred to the Government Affairs Committee, and as chairman of that committee, I look forward to reviewing it in detail. As I understand it, this legislation will create an aggressive comprehensive effort within the executive branch that will provide the scrutiny and creative thought that global warming requires. I hope that it will be the tree off of which other climate change measures will branch. As Senator BYRD has said, it is meant to complement, not replace, other mitigation measures—measures that must include binding targets for emissions reductions.

The timing for the introduction of this bill could not be better. On Wednesday, the National Academy of Sciences released their latest report on climate change at the request of the White House. The White House asked the questions, and the answer was clear: global warming is "real," is caused by human activity, and has potentially disastrous consequences. Now, as President Bush prepares to go to Europe next week, he must heed these disturbing findings and propose meaningful, binding measures to address climate change.

The mandate is clear, we must take action and take action now to stop the overheating of our planet. We must be aggressive and we must be creative. We must harness one of our great American traditions, which is an unparalleled capacity for innovation, and lead the world in doing so. We must use flexible market structures in order to allow that innovation to flourish, we must set the strict caps on emissions that are necessary to drive that innovation.

As I understand their bill, Senators STEVENS and BYRD have laid out a program that will provide the framework for the United States to address the dire problem of climate change. We must accept this challenge and begin to take serious measures to reverse this troubling trend, or future generations will suffer the consequences and remember us with disappointment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

THE RETIRED PAY RESTORATION  
ACT OF 2001

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would like to proceed in morning business to talk about some legislation that I sponsored. It is called the Retired Pay Restoration Act or 2001.

I introduced this bill last Congress. Out of the 100 percent of the things we needed to do on behalf of veterans, we maybe did 1 or 2 percent. There is still 98 percent to do.

This legislation addresses a 110-year injustice against over 560,000 of our Nation's veterans. We now have 64 cosponsors to S. 170. It clearly illustrates bipartisan support for this legislation.

My disappointment, though, is that this legislation passed was part of the budget. It was stripped out of the so-called "conference" that took place on this bill. That is unfair.

Every day in America—today, tomorrow, and the next day—1,000 World War II veterans die. This legislation is meant to help them.

What does this legislation do? We in Congress have repeatedly forced the bravest men and women in our Nation—retired career veterans—to forego receipt of a portion of their retired pay if they happen to also receive disability pay from an injury that occurred in the line of duty.

If you are an old veteran and you have a service-connected disability and you retired from the military, you cannot draw your disability pension. Is that fair? No, it is not fair. S. 170 will permit retired members of the Armed Services who also have a service-connected disability to receive military retirement pay and also the disability compensation. That seems fair to me.

Also, if a veteran who had a service-connected disability retired from some other aspect of the Federal Government—from the Congress, from the Department of Energy, or from the Interior Department—they could draw both pensions. But if you retire from the military, you can't. That doesn't seem fair to me.

We are currently losing, as I have indicated, over 1,000 World War II veterans every day. Every day we delay acting on this legislation means that we have denied fundamental fairness to thousands and thousands of our gallant armed service men and women. They will never have the ability to enjoy their well-deserved pensions. They earned them. If they spent 20 or more years in the military and were shot, or in some way hurt as a result of the service-connected disability, they earned that. That is an understatement.

As to the budget which we have heard so much about, the "budgeeteers" should be ashamed of themselves. They took this out of the budget. It was passed on the floor, and they stripped it from the budget.

I want everyone to know that we have 64 cosponsors. It is bipartisan. I am going to look for ways of having this legislation adopted by the Congress and sent to the President.

Everyone should be alerted—Senator LEVIN, Senator WARNER—that I am going to do everything I can to make sure it is on the Defense authorization bill. I am going to do everything I can—I say to Senator INOUYE and Senator STEVENS—to make sure it is on the military appropriations bill. It is just unfair.

This legislation should be passed. Every day 1,000 people are denied basic fairness in this country.

Today we have about 1.5 million of our finest serving in the defense of this Nation. The United States military is unmatched in power, training, and ability. This great Nation is recognized as the world's only superpower—a status which is largely due to the sacrifices that veterans made during the last century. But rather than honoring their commitment and bravery, the Federal Government has instead chosen to perpetuate a 110-year-old injustice.

Quite simply, that is disgraceful. It is an injustice. It has existed for far too long. We must correct it. I am going to do everything I can to make sure that this passes in some form and is sent to the President to be signed.

## COMMENDING SENATE PAGES

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate, I rise to bid farewell to our current class of Senate pages, who have served the Senate with distinction over the last five months. On behalf of the entire Senate, I would like to thank them for their fine work and tireless efforts to help the Senate run smoothly.

This class of pages has served during an historic time in the United States Senate. When they arrived, we were still in the midst of a close presidential election, one that held the fate of the Senate in balance. When the election was decided, they served in an unprecedented evenly divided Senate. And as they leave, they have been witness to a change in who is the majority. They've even served during a rare weekend session. And through all of these challenges, they have maintained excellent academic records.

Most people do not know of the rigorous nature of a Senate page's life. On a typical day, the pages rise early and are in school by 6:00 a.m. After several hours of classes, they come to the Capitol to prepare the Senate Chamber for the day's session by providing each Senator with a copy of the Senate Legislative and Executive Calendars, the legislation under consideration, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as well as any other document a Senator might request.

During the remainder of the day, they run numerous errands and perform a myriad of tasks, including providing Senators with the appropriate bills and resolution under consideration, obtaining documents one of us may want to refer to during a debate, running errands between the Capitol

and the Senate Office Buildings, and helping out at our weekly caucus lunches.

The pages stay here as long as we're here, no matter how late. Once the Senate has concluded business for the day, the pages return to their dorm to prepare for the next day's classes, and, we hope, to get some much-needed sleep. Despite the hectic schedule, they perform their duties cheerfully and efficiently.

The presence of the pages on the Senate floor serves as a constant reminder to all of us here that the legislative work we perform is not just for our generation, but for the children and young people of our Nation as well.

It is my hope that we have given the pages some insight into the need for individuals to become involved in community and civic activities. The future of our nation strongly depends on the generation who will follow up in this august body. Perhaps a number of the current group of pages will one day return here to serve as members of the United States Senate.

These young men and women have been an integral part of our daily life here in the Senate and they have faced quite a few challenges in this historic year.

Again, we wish the pages a fond farewell. I hope that they will take their experiences here and return to their hometowns as better citizens with a greater appreciation for public service. Speaking on behalf of the Senate, we wish them well in whatever endeavors they choose.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the current class of pages be printed in the RECORD.

The list follows:

## SENATE PAGES

Libby Benton, Michigan; Steve Hoffman, Vermont; Alexis Gassenhuber, Wisconsin; Kelsey Walter, South Dakota; Michael Henderson, South Dakota; Kathryn Bangs, South Dakota; Tristan Butterfield, Montana; Lyndsey Williams, Illinois; Joshua Baca, New Mexico; Andrew Smith, Texas.

## CHILDREN NEED CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, the National Association of Children's Hospitals and Related Institutions recently released a new report titled "All Children Need Children's Hospitals" that explores how essential children's hospitals are to the health of all children. The report highlights the fact that—whether they ever enter a children's hospital or not—all children benefit from the far-reaching work of children's hospitals.

In the clinical care area, freestanding children's hospitals—which make up less than 1 percent of all hospitals—treat a disproportionately large share of children with highly specialized or complex conditions. For example, 46 percent of children with cancer, 45 percent of the children with cystic fibrosis, and 52 percent of children needing