

entry last year, Hartsfield received no new positions. There are other notable disparities. For example, Atlanta conducts 70 percent more inspections than Boston, but has only 30 percent more inspectors. The number of passengers processed annually per inspector in Atlanta is 35,782. In comparison, Miami has a higher ratio of inspectors per passenger than Atlanta, and, as a consequence, the average inspector in Miami processes 10,000 fewer passengers each year. Honolulu inspects less passengers than does Atlanta, but has twice as many inspectors. And because Hartsfield generates between \$18 million and \$19 million in user fees each year with less than \$8 million spent at Hartsfield there is concern that the Atlanta Airport is subsidizing inspections at other airports in the Nation.

In addition, the airlines serving Hartsfield are planning major expansions in their international service. Furthermore, recent census data reflects tremendous population growth in metro Atlanta over the past 10 years. This dynamic population increase, second only to that of New York, will cause ever greater demand for international travel. Given the time it takes to hire and train new inspectors, it is critical that INS address the shortfall at Hartsfield now, or we will lose our ability to attract international passengers, and the economic development of the region will suffer.

Mr. HOLLINGS. As chairman of the Commerce Committee, I am very aware of the increase in the number of flight delays at the Nation's airports. We have held numerous hearings on the increase in domestic and foreign travel and it is clear that additional INS agents are needed at the Nation's busiest airports. United States airports have experienced significant growth over the last several years and additional INS agents are needed to address the increased demand not only at the Atlanta airport but throughout the Nation's airports, including in my home State of South Carolina. I will continue to work with Senator CLELAND to ensure that the nation's business airports, Hartsfield Atlanta International Airport, receive the additional INS agents that it needs.

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I thank you for your support and attention to this matter and I look forward to working with you in the future on this issue of national importance.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I was unavoidably detained and therefore was unable to cast my vote on the motion to table the Smith-Harkin amendment No. 1538 to H.R. 2500. Had I been present, I would have voted against the motion to table.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for a period not to extend beyond 10 minutes each.

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

THE CRIME VICTIMS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on March 26, 2001, my friend Senator KENNEDY and I introduced S. 783, the Crime Victims Assistance Act of 2001. This legislation represents the next step in our continuing efforts to afford dignity and recognition to victims of crime. Among other things, it would enhance the rights and protections afforded to victims of Federal crime, establish innovative new programs to help promote compliance with State victim's rights laws, and vastly improve the manner in which the Crime Victims Fund is managed and preserved.

Senator KENNEDY and I first introduced the Crime Victims Assistance Act in the 105th Congress, and we reintroduced it in the 106th Congress. Like many other deserving initiatives, however, this much-needed legislation took a back seat to the debate over a proposed victims' rights constitutional amendment. I have on several occasions noted my concern that we not dissipate the progress we could be making by focusing exclusively on efforts to amend the Constitution. Regrettably, I must note again that the pace of victims legislation has slowed noticeably and many opportunities for progress have been squandered.

This year, we have a golden opportunity to make significant progress toward providing the greater voice and rights that crime victims deserve. The Crime Victims Assistance Act of 2001 enjoys broad support from victims groups across the country, including the National Center for Victims of Crime, the National Organization for Victim Assistance, and the National Association of Crime Victim Compensation Boards. Regardless of their views on the proposed constitutional amendment, these organizations recognize that our legislation can make a difference in the lives of crime victims right now.

When I spoke about the Crime Victims Assistance Act earlier in the year, I expressed the hope that Democrats and Republicans, supporters and opponents of a constitutional amendment, would join me in advancing this bill through Congress. This should be a bipartisan effort, and in this closely divided Senate, it must be a bipartisan effort. I want to thank our eight Democratic cosponsors: Senators CORZINE, DASCHLE, FEINGOLD, HARKIN, JOHNSON,

KERRY, MURRAY, and SCHUMER. And I want once again to urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to step up to the plate and support this important victims' legislation.

When it comes to recognizing the rights of victims of crime, there is no majority, no minority, and no middle ground. As Americans, we share the common desire to help victims and provide them the greater voice and rights that they deserve. The Crime Victims Assistance Act proposes some basic, common-sense reforms to our federal crime victims laws, and would help provide the resources necessary to assist the states in giving force to their own locally-tailored statutes and constitutional provisions. What a shame if this legislation stalls again this year, because we could not work together on an issue on which we share so much common ground.

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I think it is important to state my reasons for voting against S. 149, the Export Administration Act. I do so because I think there is too much deference to commercial interests at the expense of limiting exports which may threaten national security.

I cast my vote late in the rollcall when there were 77 votes in favor of the bill, which eventually turned out to be an 85 to 14 vote, so that I knew the bill was going to pass by overwhelming numbers.

Legislation on this subject is of great importance and is long overdue. I was tempted to vote in favor of the bill on the proposition that the best frequently is the enemy of the good. Had my vote been decisive so that it might have been a matter of having a bill which vastly improved the current situation, which is the absence of legislation, then I might have voted differently. I think the number of negative votes are important as a protest signal that this subject should be monitored closely and perhaps reviewed sooner rather than later.

For example, my concerns about the elevation of commercial interests over potential national security risks are illustrated by the foreign availability and mass market status this Act provides controlled items. The foreign availability component of the act would make the U.S. Government unable to control the sale of items that are also manufactured by other countries. Such lack of control would allow U.S. firms to sell anthrax to Saddam Hussein because of anthrax's dual-use in vaccine production. Additionally, the mass-market status in this bill would enable export of controlled items without a license if the item were mass produced for different industrial uses. An example of this mass-market status would be glass and carbon fibers that can be used in the manufacture of both golf clubs and also ballistic missiles.

These are only illustrations of problems which, I believe, should yet be corrected in conference or in later legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am very pleased that S. 149, the Export Administration Act of 2001, passed the U.S. Senate by such an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 85-14. This important law reforms our export controls of dual-use items to reflect the vast geopolitical, technological and commercial changes that have occurred since the old law was enacted back in 1979. While we must remain ever-vigilant to protect our nation from security threats, we must at the same time recognize that our security depends in large measure on a vibrant economy, and in particular on our ability to continue innovating in the high technology sector. Ensuring that American producers have the ability to participate in the global marketplace is critical to this effort.

The hard work that contributed to the overwhelming support for S. 149 cannot be overstated, and I was especially gratified by the spirit of cooperation that dominated the discussion. This bill, and the quality of its provisions, owe a great deal to the thoughtful participation of a variety of players on both sides of the aisle. In some cases, too many cooks spoil the broth. In this case, however, a variety of players made very thoughtful improvements to the bill. I extend my thanks and gratitude to the core group of sponsors, which included Senator MIKE ENZI, Republican of Wyoming, Chairman PAUL SARBAKES from Maryland, Senator PHIL GRAMM from Texas, and also to so many others contributed to an improved final product.

In particular, I would be remiss in not mentioning the important and dedicated efforts of Senator MARK DAYTON, my Democratic colleague from Minnesota. Senator DAYTON and his staff worked tirelessly to ensure that S. 149 protects the interests of the agricultural community relative to export controls. While there are many legitimate reasons to restrict the export of certain items abroad, especially where the export of such items could pose a threat to America's national security, there is to my mind absolutely no acceptable logic for imposing restrictions on the export of food.

The export of food can never pose a national security threat to this Nation, and Senator DAYTON, along with his Republican colleague from Kansas Senator PAT ROBERTS, put together an amendment that eliminated the possibility that this government ever restrict the export of food for a purported national security threat. I look forward to continuing to work with Senator DAYTON on agricultural issues, and I know that the farm community is grateful to the Senator for his work in this area. I also wish to commend Senator DAYTON's staff, in particular Jack Danielson, Sarah Dahlin and Lani Kawamura.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, a consensus emerged during the 1990s with regard

to the national security of the United States. That consensus was and remains that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction—nuclear, chemical and biological—and their means of delivery constitute the most important threat to our national security. There is also widespread acknowledgment that a number of rogue nations, and particularly China, represent the new national security challenge for the United States.

Yet, this body, the U.S. Senate, is about to pass with overwhelming support a major piece of legislation that stands in direct contradiction to the objectives of U.S. national security policy—to limit the spread of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

This is not hyperbole; it is a simple statement of fact. I acknowledge that the administration has endorsed S. 149. A campaign pledge has been kept. But the long-term ramifications of the vote we are about to take should not be underestimated. S. 149 received the strong opposition of the former chairmen, now ranking members, of each committee and subcommittee with responsibility for national security. It can in no way be considered to represent a prudent balance between commerce and national security. It is, in fact, heavily weighted in favor of the former, with scant regard for the latter.

The list of exports with which we have traditionally been concerned, the Commerce Control List, has 2,400 items on it. It is important to note that exports of these items are licensed, not prohibited. Contrary to the rhetoric of some, it also is not the shopping list of someone making a Sunday trip to Radio Shack. It is, rather, a compilation of esoteric items that have military applications, including for the construction of nuclear weapons and ballistic and cruise missiles. The amount of commerce at issue is minuscule relative both to the amount of U.S. exports and to the size of the gross domestic product. Restrictions or limitations on the export of items on the Commerce Control List do not now, nor have they ever had a deleterious effect on the U.S. economy, or on U.S. competitiveness. They do, however, represent the regulatory manifestation of our national security requirements and the role our moral values should play in the conduct of foreign and trade policies.

Some of us who oppose this bill support permanent normal trade relations with China. And, yet, we oppose this bill. We oppose it because it will, by design, open the door to the export without government oversight of the very items and technologies that contribute to the threats to our security that justifies a defense budget of over \$300 billion per year. When we debate national missile defense over the months ahead, we should not hesitate to reflect on the connection between what we do here today, and what those of us who support missile defenses hope to do tomorrow.

NICS—KEEPING GUNS OUT OF CRIMINAL HANDS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Brady law mandated the establishment of the National Instant Criminal Background Check System to allow federally licensed gun sellers to establish whether a prospective gun buyer is disqualified from purchasing a firearm. The NICS system is working. In its first 25 months of operation, more than 156,000 felons, fugitives and others not eligible to purchase a gun have attempted to do so and have been denied by an FBI NICS check. At the same time, NICS has not placed unreasonable constraints on law-abiding citizens' ability to buy a gun. In fact, the Department of Justice reports that more than 7 out of 10 NICS background checks are completed immediately and 95 percent are completed within 2 hours.

But I'm concerned that recent action by Attorney General Ashcroft could limit the effectiveness of NICS and hamper law enforcement efforts to keep guns out of the hands of criminals. Regulations issued in January allowed the FBI to keep NICS data for 90 days following a check. The 90-day period is critical to law enforcement's ability to audit the NICS system for errors, search for patterns of illegal or false sales, such as purchasers using fake ID's, and screen for gun dealers who may abuse the system. But in June, the Attorney General announced plans to reduce the length of time that law enforcement agencies can retain NICS data to 24 hours. The 24-hour period is insufficient and would severely restrain law enforcement's ability to target illegal purchasers and corrupt gun sellers.

After reviewing Attorney General Ashcroft's action, I decided to cosponsor S. 1253, a bill introduced by Senators KENNEDY and SCHUMER to maintain the 90-day period for law enforcement to retain NICS data. The bill takes a common sense approach to keeping guns out of the hands of criminals without compromising the privacy rights of law-abiding citizens. It is a good bill and the right remedy to the Attorney General's regrettable action.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

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

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred July 25, 1994 in Dana Point, CA. A man allegedly beat two gay men and threatened to kill them after yelling anti-gay slurs. Bradley Jason Brown, 22, was charged with assault with a deadly weapon and committing a hate crime.