

of title 5, United States Code, to include Federal prosecutors within the definition of a law enforcement officer, and for other purposes.

S. 1922

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1922, a bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to expand and intensify programs with respect to research and related activities concerning elder falls.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1945, a bill to provide for the merger of the bank and savings association deposit insurance funds, to modernize and improve the safety and fairness of the Federal deposit insurance system, and for other purposes.

S. 2003

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) were added as cosponsors of S. 2003, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the applicability of the prohibition on assignment of veterans benefits to agreements regarding future receipt of compensation, pension, or dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 2026

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2026, a bill to authorize the use of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for projects and activities to address proliferation threats outside the states of the former Soviet Union, and for other purposes.

S. 2051

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2051, a bill to remove a condition preventing authority for concurrent receipt of military retired pay and veterans' disability compensation from taking affect, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 109

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 109, a resolution designating the second Sunday in the month of December as "National Children's Memorial Day" and the last Friday in the month of April as "Children's Memorial Flag Day."

S. RES. 209

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 209, a

resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding prenatal care for women and children.

S. RES. 219

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 219, a resolution expressing support for the democratically elected Government of Colombia and its efforts to counter threats from United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BAUCUS:

S. 2075. A bill to facilitate the availability of electromagnetic spectrum for the deployment of wireless based services in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I rise today to introduce the Rural Spectrum Access Act, RESA, of 2002. Wireless communications is revolutionizing the way we communicate. It allows us to place calls from anywhere in the world to anywhere in the world. We can check our favorite websites, and even stay in touch with family and friends through email, all without a phone line. It's empowering to know that we can do all this and more while sitting on top of a mountain in Montana.

However, these services require spectrum, the wireless waves that give us this freedom. Due to the way the FCC distributes spectrum, rural America is finding it more and more difficult to get quality wireless service. The current system distributes spectrum on very large geographic areas, which in effect, inhibits certain carriers from participating in wireless auctions. Since the geographic licensing areas are so large and the price for the spectrum is equally as large, rural carriers often find it difficult bidding on the spectrum. My legislation will correct this inequity.

RESA requires the Federal Communications Commission, in future auctions, to distribute spectrum on smaller geographic levels. It does not favor one type of carrier over another, or pick which carrier can serve which areas. Rather, it simply allows carriers to bid on spectrum that they find difficult under today's system.

It is my hope that this bill will allow more of our rural telecommunication carriers to participate in future auctions. The RESA Act will bring more choices, better service and lower prices for those of us living in rural America.

By Mr. DORGAN:

S. 2076. A bill to prohibit the cloning of humans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, the Senate will soon start debating the issue of human cloning. I want to state unequivocally that I am against the cloning of a human being. The cloning

of a human being raises serious moral and ethical questions about society's perception of human life.

Today, I am introducing legislation that prohibits the cloning of a human being. It is a simple bill, but it reflects my view and a view that is held by almost everyone. My bill reflects the common ground that we can all agree to in this debate. My legislation makes it illegal to clone a human being and imposes strict penalties against anyone who violates this prohibition.

I urge my colleagues to support a ban on the cloning of a human being, and encourage their cosponsorship of my legislation.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 2077. A bill to make grants to improve public safety in order to prepare for and respond to terrorist threats; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, today I am introducing the Securing Our States Act. As the tragic terrorist attacks of September 11 taught us all too well, our Nation is not as prepared for widespread emergencies as it should be. The legislation I am introducing today, Securing Our States Act, or SOS Act, will help make our Nation more secure by strengthening our first line of defense, the first responders in our States and communities.

As the Presiding Officer is well aware, when a terrorist attack or other disaster occurs, it is the State and local police, firefighters, and emergency medical personnel who are first on the scene. Nearly 2 million State and local police, firefighters, emergency medical personnel, and others are closest to these challenges. They understand best what is needed to respond effectively, and they tell me they need improved training, more and better equipment, greater coordination, and more exercises. They need them as soon as possible. They are the ones who are always on the front lines when disaster strikes.

Properly trained and equipped, first responders have the greatest potential to save lives and limit casualties after a terrorist attack. Currently, however, our capabilities for responding to a terrorist attack vary widely from community to community, State to State, across this great country. Many areas simply have very little capacity to respond to a terrorist attack. In fact, most localities could not respond effectively to a terrorist attack if weapons of mass destruction were used. Even the best prepared States and communities do not possess adequate resources to respond to the full range of possible terrorist attacks.

This legislation I am introducing will help by providing much needed resources. The SOS Act, which is consistent with the first responders proposal in President Bush's budget, will provide \$4 billion in critically needed funding, an increase of more than 1,000 percent in Federal resources that will flow to State and local governments.

This bill is designed to accomplish the following objectives: First, more resources to States and communities to conduct important planning and exercises, purchase equipment, and better train their personnel.

Second, it would provide flexibility for States and localities to address whatever the needs of their particular locality may be. States differ in their preparedness, and this would allow flexibility in the use of funds.

Third, another important feature of this bill is its simplicity. We need to speed the disbursement of Federal funds to States and communities without further delay.

Fourth, this legislation is designed to promote cooperation across the Nation so local, State, Federal, and volunteer networks can operate together effectively.

To achieve these objectives, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, known as FEMA, will implement a streamlined and simple procedure designed to speed the flow of resources to States and communities. The funds may be used for a variety of activities, including planning to develop comprehensive plans to prepare for and respond to a terrorist attack; equipment to respond more effectively to terrorist attack, including personal protective equipment, chemical, and biological detectors and interoperable communications gear.

We want to make sure our emergency personnel can communicate with one another. We have learned from the lessons of September 11 that can be a devastating problem.

The legislation would also allow funds to be used for more training to enable firefighters, police officers, and emergency medical professionals to respond and operate in a chemical or biological environment, even a very dangerous environment.

We need to have more exercises to improve response capabilities, practice mutual aid and assess operational improvements and deficiencies.

The legislation I am introducing will help make our Nation safer. Nearly 2 million first responders are always there, willing to put their lives at risk to save the lives of others and to make our country safer. This bill will help these brave men and women do their jobs better and will help all of our communities be more secure. The benefits of the Securing Our States Act are immediate and widespread and the goal is one we can all embrace, the goal of making our Nation safer from terrorist attacks while also bolstering everyday response capabilities.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

I yield the floor.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 2078. A bill to amend section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate notification and return re-

quirements for State and local political committees and candidate committees and avoid duplicate reporting by certain State and local political committees of information required to be reported and made publicly available under State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, today I am pleased to again be offering legislation that will solve a significant issue for State and local legislators and candidates across the country and which I know is of serious concern.

Two years ago, Congress enacted the Full and Fair Political Activities Disclosure Act of 2000, Public Law 106-230, a law that imposed new IRS reporting requirements on political organizations claiming tax-exempt status under Section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code. The purpose of this law was to uncover so-called "stealth PACs," tax-exempt groups which, prior to the enactment of this law, did not have to disclose any contributions or expenditures and were free to influence elections in virtual anonymity. While Public Law 106-230 was intended to target "stealth PACs," it has had the unintended consequence of imposing burdensome and duplicative reporting requirements on State and local candidates who are not involved in any federal election activities. In many States like Texas, state and local candidates already file detailed reports with their state election officials.

To correct this problem, I have worked closely with Senator LIEBERMAN, among others, to develop legislation that would exempt state and local candidates from some of the IRS reporting requirements of Public Law 106-230. We have done this in a way that solves the problem but without creating new loopholes that would allow "stealth" organizations to re-emerge. This legislation is the product of bipartisan and I would like to thank those who have supported our efforts, including Senator MCCAIN, Senator FEINGOLD, and Senator LEVIN who join me and Senator LIEBERMAN on this bill today. I originally offered legislation on this issue last year and it was included in the tax cut bill, the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001. Unfortunately, our provision was dropped from the bill in conference.

Since then, P.L. 106-230 has created an increasingly heavy burden on local and State candidates. This is exacerbated by the fact that many candidates were not aware of the notification requirements and could now face severe penalties. It is time to take action and get this issue resolved. The bill we introduce today solves this problem while also addressing some issues that have been raised since we first made this effort last year. The deadline for the most burdensome reporting requirements is fast approaching in May. Congress has delayed too long. I again urge my colleagues to support this bill

and to solve the problem that we created and to do so now.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 2079. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to facilitate and enhance judicial review of certain matters regarding veterans' benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I am today introducing legislation which responds to concerns relating to judicial review of VA benefits expressed by the authors of the Independent Budget for Veteran's Programs for fiscal year 2003. I am doing this in order to provide a vehicle for further discussion on these and related matters.

The Independent Budget, the IB, is the collaborative effort of a coalition of four veterans service organizations, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and Veterans of Foreign Wars, which is endorsed by dozens of other veterans' groups and others. This is the sixteenth year that the these organizations have drafted an independent budget to advocate for the funding that they feel is necessary to properly provide care and benefits to our veterans.

This bill proposes three amendments to title 38, United States Code, and a free-standing provision relating to the Equal Access to Justice Act. Section 1 of this legislation would amend section 502 of title 38 to allow the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, the Federal Circuit, to review and set aside VA changes to the schedule for rating disabilities found to be arbitrary and capricious or in violation of statute. Section 2 would amend section 7261 of title 38 to specify that the United States Court of Appeals for Veteran Claims, the CAVC, shall apply a preponderance of the evidence standard when reviewing findings of fact made by the Board of Veterans Appeals. Section 3 would amend section 7292 of title 38 to permit the Federal Circuit to review CAVC decisions on questions of law. The final section of this legislation would allow the CAVC, when awarding attorneys fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act to award compensation to qualified non-attorney representatives before the CAVC.

Current section 502 of title 38, provides for judicial review of VA rules and regulations in the Federal Circuit, but expressly precludes review of VA actions relating to the adoption or revision of the so called "rating schedule" made pursuant to section 1155 of title 38. This rating schedule is the system by which VA categorizes types and levels of disability by percentages and, as noted by the IB authors, this preclusion of review was based on the view that VA has specific expertise in this area, an expertise not found in most courts. However, while the IB authors recognize the importance of VA's particularly informed judgment in this

area, they are concerned that, "without any constraints or oversight whatsoever, VA is free to promulgate rules to rating disabilities that do not have as their basis reduction in earning capacity." To remedy this concern, the authors of the IB propose an amendment to section 502 of title 38 which would authorize Federal Circuit review of rating schedule decisions. This is the intent of section 1 of this bill.

A second concern of the authors of the IB relates to the scope of review applied by the CAVC to factual determinations of the Board of Veterans' Appeal. Under current law, section 5107(b) of title 38, VA is required to give a claimant the benefit of the doubt when "there is an approximate balance of positive and negative evidence regarding the merits" of an issue material to the claim. However, as noted in the IB for fiscal year 2003, the CAVC, in reviewing a VA decision on a factual issue, is required to apply a "clearly erroneous" standard. Under this standard, which is the same as applied by Federal appellate courts in their review of factual determinations of trial courts, if there is a plausible basis for a factual finding, it can not be clearly erroneous. This results in the CAVC having to accord significant deference to findings of fact made by the Board. As the IB authors note, this approach of requiring the CAVC to uphold a Board decision based on only the lower "plausible basis" undermines the statutory "benefit of the doubt" rule. Section 2 of this legislation would protect the "benefit of the doubt" rule by amending section 7261 of title 38 to specify that the CAVC is to apply a preponderance of the evidence standard when reviewing factual determinations of the Board.

Another concern of the IB authors is the present limit on Federal Circuit's authority to review CAVC precedential decisions on questions of law. Under section 7292 of title 38, the Federal Circuit is authorized to review CAVC findings on questions of statutory or regulatory interpretation, but is not authorized to review such decisions based on questions of law not rooted on a constitutional, statutory, or regulatory interpretation. In a 1992 case, *Livingston v. Derwinski*, 959 F.2d 224, the Federal Circuit has described this limitation as follows: "The interpretation of the board's decision is unquestionably a matter of law, but that is not enough to bring the appeal within this court's statutory jurisdiction. In the absence of a challenge to the validity of a statute or a regulation, or the interpretation of a constitutional or statutory provision or a regulation, we have no authority to consider the appeal." The IB authors express the concern that this "unavailability of Federal Circuit review, has, in many instances, undesirable consequences" and urge that the law be amended to give the Federal Circuit jurisdiction to review all CAVC decisions on questions of law. Section 3 would modify section

7292 of title 38 to accomplish that result.

A final issue raised by the authors of the Independent Budget is not one of procedural fairness, but rather of equality of access to the administrative and judicial structures of the veterans' appeals process. Currently, veterans who enlist the aid of attorneys, and non-attorney practitioners supervised by attorneys, who are successful in their claims and satisfy the other requirements, can avail themselves of the benefits of the Equal Access to Justice Act, the EAJA. The EAJA shifts the burden of attorney fees from the citizen to the government in cases where the citizen successfully challenges an unreasonable government action. In the case of VA claims, however, claimants often turn to qualified, non-attorney representatives of the many veterans service organizations to represent them, up to and through the CAVC. Based upon the prior long standing limitation on paying attorney fees in veterans' benefits cases, there had not been an active veterans' bar. As a result, veterans service organizations developed expertise to enable them to effectively represent claimants before VA. VA does not require that these representatives be attorneys, only credentialed by a VA-recognized veterans service organization. Therefore, when the court was created, certain non-attorney practitioners were allowed to represent appellants at the court. However, as currently interpreted, these non-attorney practitioners are not eligible to receive compensation under the EAJA, despite the fact that they are doing the same work as their attorney counterparts. The authors of the Independent Budget, representatives of the organizations which are affected by this limitation, ask that unsupervised, non-attorneys be given access to fee compensation under the EAJA. They believe that this change would allow veterans organizations to represent even more veterans. Section 4 of the bill would provide for this change.

As a new generation is called to sacrifice in service of our country it is imperative that we ensure the fairness and accessibility of the benefits that they so richly deserve and it is for this reason that I introduce this bill. As I noted earlier in my statement, I am doing so in order to provide a vehicle for detailed discussion of these and other issues related to the judicial review of VA claims. I look forward to working with my colleagues on these matters in the months ahead.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 2080. A bill to designate a United States courthouse to be constructed in Fresno, California, as the "Robert E. Coyle United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I am pleased to introduce legislation to name the Federal courthouse building

to be constructed at Tulare and "O" Streets in downtown Fresno, CA the "Robert E. Coyle United States Courthouse."

It is fitting that the Federal courthouse in Fresno be named for Senior U.S. District Judge Robert E. Coyle, who is greatly respected and admired for his work as a judge and for his foresight and persistence which contributed so much to the Fresno Courthouse project. Since prior to 1994, Judge Coyle has been a leader in the effort to build a new courthouse in Fresno. In the course of his work, Judge Coyle, working with the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Eastern District, conceived and founded a program called "Managing a Capitol Construction Program" to help others understand the process of having a courthouse built. This Eastern District program was so well received by national court administrators that it is now a nationwide program run by Judge Coyle. In addition to meeting the needs of the court for additional space, the courthouse project has become a key element in the downtown revitalization of Fresno. Judge Coyle's efforts, and those in the community with whom he worked, produced a major milestone when the groundbreaking for the new courthouse took place earlier this month.

Judge Coyle has had a distinguished career as an attorney and on the bench. Appointed to California's Eastern District bench by President Ronald Reagan in 1982, Judge Coyle has served as a judge for the Eastern District for 20 years, including 6 years as senior judge. Judge Coyle earned his law degree from University of California, Hastings College of the Law in 1956. He then worked for Fresno County as a Deputy District Attorney before going into private practice in 1958 with McCormick, Barstow, Sheppard, Coyle & Wayte, where he remained until his appointment by President Reagan. He is very active in the community and has served in many judicial leadership positions, including: Chair, Space and Security Committee; Chair, Conference of the Chief District Judges of the Ninth Circuit; President of the Ninth Circuit District Judges Association; Member of the Board of Governors of the State Bar of California and President of the Fresno County Bar. My hope is that, in addition to serving the people of the Eastern District as a courthouse, this building will stand as a reminder to the community and people of California of the dedicated work of Judge Robert E. Coyle.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (by request):

S.J. Res. 34. A joint resolution approving the site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, for the development of a repository for the disposal of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel, pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, yesterday, the Governor of the State of

Nevada submitted to the Senate and to the House of Representatives a notice of disapproval of the proposed nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain, pursuant to section 116 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. The notice was duly referred in the Senate to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. Under section 115 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, it is my duty, as the chairman of the committee to which the notice of disapproval was referred, to introduce, by request, a resolution of repository siting approval not later than the first day of session following the day on which the Governor's notice of disapproval was submitted.

In accordance with the statutory requirement, I am today introducing the resolution of repository siting approval. The text of the resolution is prescribed by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. The resolution will be referred to committee for a period of up to 60 days. Under the terms of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, the Governor's notice of disapproval will stand, and the Department of Energy will be prohibited from applying for a license to develop a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain, unless both Houses of Congress pass the resolution of repository siting approval and it becomes law within 90 days from yesterday.

This is an extraordinary process. The 97th Congress, which prescribed this process for us to follow 20 years ago, did not do so lightly. The Members of the 97th Congress only arrived at this procedure after considerable debate. Representative Morris K. Udall, who was the principal architect of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, explained the thinking of our predecessors. "We are all agreed that the States ought to have a veto," Chairman Udall said. "If you are going to put something as important, as a nuclear waste repository, in a State, then the State, through its Governor or legislature, ought to be able to say no thanks." But, he continued, "we are also agreed that once the State has made that veto, that there ought to be mechanism so that, in the national interest, it could be overridden, as we do in war when we need an air base or at other times when we need Federal eminent domain."

The process upon which we are embarking today was designed to serve those two goals. It will afford the State of Nevada a fair hearing on its objections to the repository and will ensure that those objections stand unless the administration can persuade both Houses of Congress to override them. At the same time, it will give the administration an opportunity to present its case and to override the State's objections if it can show its decision was sound and in the national interest.

It is my intention, once the Senate completes action on the energy bill, to schedule hearings before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to consider the President's rec-

ommendation of the Yucca Mountain site and the objections of the State of Nevada to the use of the site for the nuclear waste repository and to report the committee's recommendation to the Senate within the prescribed 60-day period as the 97th Congress envisioned.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 232—CONGRATULATING THE HUSKIES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT FOR WINNING THE 2002 NCAA DIVISION I WOMEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP.

Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. LIEBERMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 232

Whereas the University of Connecticut women's basketball team won its second national championship in 3 years by defeating the University of Oklahoma by the score of 82-70;

Whereas NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Coach of the Year Geno Auriemma's team finished the 2002 season with a perfect 39-0 record, becoming only the fourth NCAA Division I women's basketball team to go undefeated;

Whereas Sue Bird was chosen as the national women's player of the year;

Whereas Swin Cash was named the Final Four Most Outstanding Player;

Whereas Sue Bird, Swin Cash, Diana Taurasi, Asjha Jones, and Tamika Williams were selected as All-Americans;

Whereas the Huskies' 35-point average margin of victory during the regular season was the largest in NCAA Division I women's basketball history;

Whereas the Huskies dominated this year's NCAA Division I women's basketball tournament, averaging 83.3 points and a 27-point margin of victory en route to the championship;

Whereas the high caliber of the Huskies in both athletics and academics has significantly advanced the sport of women's basketball and provided inspiration for future generations of young men and women alike; and

Whereas the Huskies' season of unparalleled accomplishment rallied Connecticut residents of all ages, from New London to New Haven, from Hartford to Hamden, behind a common purpose, and triggered a wave of euphoria across the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commends the Huskies of the University of Connecticut for—

(1) completing the 2001-2002 women's basketball season with a 39-0 record; and

(2) winning the 2002 NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Championship.

SENATE RESOLUTION 233—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND TERRAPINS FOR WINNING THE 2002 NCAA NATIONAL BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. SARBANES (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 233

Whereas the 2002 University of Maryland Terrapins men's basketball team won 32 games, a school record for wins in a season;

Whereas the 2002 Maryland Terrapins were undefeated at home in the last year of play at historic Cole Field House, compiling a home record of 15-0;

Whereas the 2002 Maryland Terrapins continued their dominance over nonconference opponents at home, extending their NCAA record nonconference home winning streak to 84 wins;

Whereas the 2002 Maryland Terrapins won their first, outright Atlantic Coast Conference regular season championship in 22 years;

Whereas the Maryland Terrapins qualified for a 9th consecutive NCAA tournament under Coach Gary Williams, being awarded a number 1 seed in the East Region;

Whereas the Maryland Terrapins handily defeated the Siena College Saints in the first round of the NCAA tournament by a score of 85-70;

Whereas in the second round, the Maryland Terrapins ousted the Wisconsin Badgers by a score of 87-57;

Whereas in the Sweet Sixteen, the Maryland Terrapins overpowered the tough Kentucky Wildcats by a score of 78-68;

Whereas in the final game of the East Regional, the Maryland Terrapins earned a 2d straight bid to the Final Four by defeating the Connecticut Huskies by a score of 90-82;

Whereas in the Final Four, the Maryland Terrapins achieved a 97-88 victory over the potent Kansas Jayhawks;

Whereas in the NCAA championship game, the Maryland Terrapins came away with a 64-52 victory over the storied Indiana Hoosiers;

Whereas on April 1, 2002 the University of Maryland won the NCAA men's basketball championship, the first ever for the University of Maryland;

Whereas the 2002 Maryland Terrapins, by winning the 2002 NCAA men's basketball championship, became only the 5th NCAA Division I athletic program to have won national championships in both basketball and football;

Whereas senior Juan Dixon was named the most outstanding player of the 2002 NCAA tournament, first team all-American, and Atlantic Coast Conference player of the year;

Whereas senior Lonny Baxter was named the most valuable player in regional play for the second year in a row; and

Whereas in game number 2002 of the University of Maryland men's basketball program, the Terrapins achieved the title of 2002 national champion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the mighty University of Maryland Terrapins for winning the 2002 NCAA national men's basketball championship on April 1, 2002;

(2) commends the Maryland Terrapins for their outstanding performance in the 2002 NCAA national tournament, the Atlantic Coast Conference, and the entire 2002 season;

(3) applauds the Maryland Terrapins for their commitment to high standards of character, perseverance, and teamwork;

(4) congratulates the Maryland Terrapins on reaching their goal of an NCAA championship, an achievement that no previous Maryland men's basketball team had been able to accomplish;

(5) recognizes the achievements of the players, coaches, and support staff who were instrumental in helping the University of Maryland Terrapins win the 2002 NCAA championship;

(6) congratulates all of the 65 outstanding teams who participated in the 2002 NCAA Tournament;