

These new accounts are essential to demonstrate the Department's commitment to safety, the environment, and responsible use of its facilities.

Finally, on the issue of ballistic missile defense, the committee responsibly cut back the President's \$8.3 billion request for research, development and testing of a ballistic missile defense system by \$1.3 billion. The administration's request was clearly in excess of what the Ballistic Missile Defense Office could have reasonably allocated in the coming year, and the committee was right to give priority to other military programs. The committee also took a strong stand against testing that would violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

It makes no sense to rush forward prematurely with tests that will violate the treaty, or with deployment of a missile defense system, when there are serious doubts about whether it will work. Our European allies and Russia continue to be skeptical about abandoning the ABM Treaty and deploying a missile defense system. We should work with our allies and continue consultations with Russia, not act unilaterally or establish arbitrary deadlines.

It is disappointing that these important ballistic missile defense provisions were removed from the bill we are currently considering. These issues are, and will continue to be, very important.

I commend my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee for their leadership in dealing with the many challenges facing our nation on national and homeland defense. This bill keeps the faith with the 2.2 million men and women who make up our active duty, guard, and reserve forces. This legislation is vital to the Nation's security, and I urge the Senate to approve it.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 1438, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2002. As the ranking Republican on the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee, I would like to thank subcommittee Chairman LANDRIEU and her staff for their cooperation in the preparation of this bill. While I may have some concerns with several issues contained within the legislation, I do support the bill and urge its adoption by the full Senate.

At this time I would like to take a moment to highlight a few important issues which are under the jurisdiction of the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee.

In particular, the legislation continues to build upon the committee's past efforts to strengthen and streamline the Department of Defense's combating terrorism program. As we were tragically reminded by the events on September 11 and last year's bombing of the U.S.S. *Cole*, it is vital that we continue to focus on this growing threat.

As we all know, the threat of attacks on our national and defense informa-

tion systems seem to grow daily. Last year, Senator WARNER proposed an innovative scholarship program to encourage young people to pursue careers with the Federal Government in the information assurance area. I am gratified that our collective efforts this year have increased support for this innovative program, as well as other Departmental efforts to enhance the security of our critical information systems. However, I am concerned that the funding level included in the bill for the scholarship program may not be sufficient.

Since the creation of the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee in 1999, I have worked hard to ensure that our nonproliferation and threat reduction programs in Russia are fulfilling their national security objectives. This year I have worked hard to incorporate the kind of oversight I believe is essential if these nonproliferation programs are going to produce the desired results.

This committee has a long history of supporting a strong and stable science and technology program and I was pleased to see the administration's budget request of \$8.8 billion in this important area. This \$1.2 billion increase over last year's request is the first step towards achieving the Secretary's goal of having science and technology programs make up 3 percent of the overall defense budget. It remains critical that we continue our support of a vibrant science and technology base.

I strongly urge the rapid adoption of this important legislation. Our Nation is faced with a daunting task ahead and now is the time to show our strong support for the men and women in the armed services who so proudly and bravely serve our Nation.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

THE DAY OF NINE-ONE-ONE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Ira Somers was my neighbor and friend when I had my house in McLean, VA. I found Ira to be not only a mental giant but also a spiritual great as well. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a poem written by Ira Somers that loudly outlines Americans' thoughts on the events of September 11, 2001.

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

THE DAY OF NINE-ONE-ONE

This began as a quiet day
Lives were normal in every way.
The sun arose with fullest light

And moved the shadows of the night.
But this was not to last for long,
Two big giants tall and strong
Which seemed to stand for what is good
Were struck by evil where they stood.
'Twas on the day of nine-one-one
That they were lost to everyone.
There they were, and now they're not,
And where they stood's a gruesome spot.
How could these giants of our day
Be brought to naught in such a way,
To leave this mass of jumbled parts
Which tear with grief at all our hearts?
We sensed the feelings of despair
In those who walked most every where
To find the ones that they had lost
And bring them back at any cost.
We were moved by the kindly deed
Of those who toiled for other's needs,
And the many hours they have spent
Clearing rubble from this event.
A vicious crash at the Pentagon
Tore at the souls of every one,
And reports of heroes in the air
Touched hearts of people everywhere.
We all can learn from such great loss
To look at need before the cost
When giving help to anyone,
And not say quit 'till peace has won.—Ira
Somers.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

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

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred August 29, 1993 in Walla Walla, WA. A man believed to be gay was sexually assaulted with a stick, struck by the assailant's truck and abandoned in a remote area. Todd I. Klevgaard, 27, was charged with felony assault.

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

AUTOMATIC MEMBER PAY INCREASE

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, there is a great sense of unity across the Nation as we begin to recover from the events of September 11. The President's speech last week gave both comfort and strength to the American people and to people around the globe.

I have been heartened by the bipartisan unity demonstrated by Congress as it acts to respond to the human and economic devastation, and we will need to maintain that unity as we ask for the sacrifices necessary to end this business.

Given all that has happened and all that will happen, it is all the more inappropriate for Congress to accept a \$4,900 backdoor pay raise.

Of course, I believe the automatic pay raise is never appropriate. As my colleagues are aware, it is an unusual thing to have the power to raise our own pay. Few people have that ability. Most of our constituents do not have that power. And that this power is so unusual is good reason for the Congress to exercise that power openly, and to exercise it subject to regular procedures that include debate, amendment, and a vote on the RECORD.

This process of pay raises without accountability must end. It is offensive. It is wrong. And it is unconstitutional.

In August of 1789, as part of the package of 12 amendments advocated by James Madison that included what has become our Bill of Rights, the House of Representatives passed an amendment to the Constitution providing that Congress could not raise its pay without an intervening election. Almost exactly 212 years ago, on September 9, 1789, the Senate passed that amendment. In late September of 1789, Congress submitted the amendments to the States.

Although the amendment on pay raises languished for two centuries, in the 1980s, a campaign began to ratify it. While I was a member of the Wisconsin State senate, I was proud to help ratify the amendment. Its approval by the Michigan legislature on May 7, 1992, gave it the needed approval by three-fourths of the States.

The 27th amendment to the Constitution now states: "No law, varying the compensation for the services of the senators and representatives, shall take effect, until an election of representatives shall have intervened."

I try to honor that limitation in my own practices. In my own case, throughout my 6-year term, I accept only the rate of pay that Senators receive on the date on which I was sworn in as a Senator. And I return to the Treasury any additional income Senators get, whether from a cost-of-living adjustment or a pay raise we vote for ourselves. I don't take a raise until my bosses, the people of Wisconsin, give me one at the ballot box. That is the spirit of the 27th amendment.

This practice must end, and earlier this year I reintroduced legislation to end the automatic cost-of-living adjustment for congressional pay.

But we should not wait to enact that law to say "no" to the \$4,900 pay raise that will go into effect beginning next year.

To that end, I call upon the leadership of both parties to work together, in the spirit of the bipartisan unity we have seen flourish in recent days, to stop the pay raise that is scheduled to go into effect in 2002.

I very much hope it will not be necessary to fight this issue out on the floor of the Senate. I have an amendment prepared to stop this backdoor pay raise, and am willing to offer it if that becomes necessary, but I want to give our leadership the opportunity to respond and to act together.

We are spending the hard-earned tax dollars of millions of Americans to re-

cover from the horrific events of September 11 and to ensure that it does not happen again.

And right this minute, our Nation is sending the men and women of our Armed Services into harm's way.

This is not the time for Congress to accept a pay raise, and I am confident that upon reflection, Members of the Senate and the other body will want to stop this automatic pay raise from taking effect.

Let's stop this backdoor pay raise right now, and then, let's enact legislation to end this practice once and for all.

THE WORLD SITUATION AFTER THE TERRORIST STRIKE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by a member of the U.S. Court of International Trade, Evan Wallach. A graduate of Cambridge and a Nevadan, this expert international jurist and expert in the law of war, with clarity reviews the world situation, only days after the terrorist strike of September 11, 2001.

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

SPEECH, 21 SEPTEMBER, 2001 HUGHES HALL COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

It is good to be home. Whether it is because we as peoples share the same language and laws, value the same rights of humanity, and pray to the same God, or because I have developed so many ties and deep friendships since I first set foot in these halls some twenty-one years ago, I cannot feel myself a stranger in this house and in this fair land. It is good to be home and to share with you our common hopes and our common tragedy.

When President Richards invited me to speak here some months past, I had in mind a few words about my personal history at Hughes, and some specific thoughts about how much Cambridge has meant to the cause of freedom. I meant to speak about how England stood alone and undaunted in those dark days of May and June, 1940, as the only bulwark between the free world and the dark night of unending barbarism. Long before we Americans were forced into the affair, even before her empire could effectively rally to the colors, this island held the line; and this small town, with its great university, was at the center of that resistance, providing many of its pilots, much of its intelligence apparatus, and a great deal of its military leadership.

My original thought was to come here to thank you yet again, and to speak about the links forged in that crucible of war which bind us still.

That was before Tuesday, September 11.

On that morning I was talking to my secretary Linda Sue as she prepared coffee. When we heard the first explosion I thought it was a bomb. We were relieved when the television said it was an airplane. It had to be an accident. We watched the second aircraft fly into the WTC. In one second it changed everything. We knew we were at war.

New Yorkers reacted very well. They reminded me so much of Londoners in the Blitz. Our court is exactly a half mile from the WTC. There was no panic. People helped someone when they stumbled, urged one another on, and were kind to strangers. It was

as Dickens says, the best of times and the worst of times.

We are much a family, we Americans, a very large, very extended and often very dysfunctional family. When our brothers and sisters come into harm's way we react as does any family; we cry, we grieve, we pray, we hold each other close, and then we go on living.

Make no mistake about it, we will go on. The continental Europeans have a conception of America which has a strong kernel of truth. We are still, somewhat, the vaguely isolationist, happy-go-lucky plough boy who can be insulted by foreign waiters, euchred by a sidewalk grifter, blow his month's pay on a pretty bar girl, and still go home convinced he had a real nice time in the big city.

But when you slap us across the face, we know we've been wronged and it is not in our nature to slap you in return. Rather, our national instinct is to destroy your armies, drive your population into exile, pillage your cities and plow salt into the ground where they stood; in short, to act like Europeans. Then, however, being Americans we pass out chewing gum and foreign aid to help rebuild what we just destroyed.

That baser instinct, however, is fortunately also mitigated by one equally strong which we suckled at the breast of our mother country with the milk of Magna Carta. I refer, of course, to the sanctity of the rule of law. As Edmund Burke said in 1775: "In this character of the Americans a love of freedom is the predominating feature which marks and distinguishes the whole . . . This fierce spirit of liberty is stronger in the English colonies, probably, than in any other people of the earth [because] the people of the colonies are descendants of Englishmen."

We learned our lessons well at your knee. We learned from Entick v. Carrington that though a citizen lives in the rudest hut with no door or window, though the wind may blow through and the rain may pour in, the King of England with all his armies may not pass over his thresh hold without an invitation to enter.

We have taken the rights and liberties of Englishmen and extended them even further. We have enshrined them in a written Constitution and from time to time, as we have done wrong to individuals and learned our lesson from that wrong doing, we have added additional protections.

We have been attacked by people from one particular part of the world. I am not an Arabist or a scholar of that region's history to any great degree but I think I can say those who planned this attack are mistaken about the United States in many ways. I believe they thought to wound us deeply by attacking our national symbols, and that they viewed the WTC as one such symbol. They thought, I imagine, that as a capitalist state, worshipping the almighty dollar, we would reel back, shaken and demoralized, by the loss of this great temple of Mammon. Truly they mistake us.

We reel back, not at the loss of a building, because bricks and mortar can always be restacked; we usually tear down our great edifices every few decades or so anyway, to construct something larger and more modern. What wounded us, what cut us to our souls, what enraged us beyond the comprehension of these bombers, was the loss of five thousand of our sons and daughters, moms, and dads, firemen, policemen, janitors, bankers, doctors and lawyers. For this we shall not forgive the perpetrators; this we shall never forget. They are sadly mistaken.

If I could say one thing to those attackers and to their followers it would be this: "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits . . . Every tree that bringeth not forth