of S. 2428, a bill to amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act.

S. 2433

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2433, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1590 East Joyce Boulevard in Fayetteville, Arkansas, as the ''Clarence B. Craft Post Office Building.''

S. 2444

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2444, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve the administration and enforcement of the immigration laws, to enhance the security of the United States, and to establish the Office of Children's Services within the Department of Justice, and for other purposes.

S. 2452

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. 2452, a bill to establish the Department of National Homeland Security and the National Office for Combating Terrorism.

S. 2454

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2454, a bill to eliminate the deadlines for spectrum auctions of spectrum previously allocated to television broadcasting.

S. RES. 244

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 244, a resolution eliminating secret Senate holds.

S. RES. 247

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 247, a resolution expressing solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism.

S. CON. RES. 105

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 105, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Nation should take additional steps to ensure the prevention of teen pregnancy by engaging in measures to educate teenagers as to why they should stop and think about the negative consequences before engaging in premature sexual activity.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

S. 2462. A bill to amend section 16131 of title 10, United States Code, to increase rates of educational assistance under the program of educational assistance for members of the Selected Reserve to make such rates commensurate with scheduled increases in rates for basic educational assistance under section 3015 of title 38, United States Code, the Montgomery GI Bill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I am pleased to be introducing the Selected Reserve Educational Assistance Act of 2002. This legislation will provide our National Guard and Reserve personnel with expanded educational opportunities at a reasonable cost. Endorsed by the 52-member Partnership for Veterans Education, the bill provides assistance and equity that is logical, fair, and worthy of a Nation that values both higher education and those who defend the freedoms that we all enjoy. Under the total force concept of our military services, a large number of Selected Reserve personnel are now on active duty to support the war on terrorism at home and abroad.

The original G.I. bill, known as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, was enacted in 1944. That bill provided a $500 annual education stipend as well as a $50 subsistence allowance. As a result of this initiative, 7.8 million World War II veterans were able to take advantage of post-service education and training opportunities, including more than 2.2 million veterans who went on to college. My own father was among those veterans who volunteered for the war, fought bravely, and then returned to college with assistance from the G.I. bill.

Since that time, various incarnations of the G.I. bill have continued to assist millions of veterans in taking advantage of educational opportunities they put on hold in order to serve their country. New laws were enacted to provide educational assistance to those who served in Korea and Vietnam, as well as to those who served during the period in-between. Since the adoption of the total force concept and the change to an all-volunteer service, additional adjustments to these programs were made, leading up to the enactment of the Montgomery G.I. bill in 1985. It is a two-part program, one for active duty personnel and veterans and another for members of the Selected Reserve.

The value of the educational benefit assistance provided by the Montgomery G.I. bill, however, has eroded over time due to inflation and the escalating cost of higher education, making it harder for service members and veterans to achieve their educational goals. Last year, military recruiters indicated to me that the program's benefits no longer were as strong an incentive to join the military; nor did they serve as a retention toll valuable enough to persuade men and women to stay in the military, either on active duty or in the Selected Reserve. Perhaps most important, the program has been losing its value as an instrument to help our National Guard and Reserve personnel to maximize their productivity and contributions to their families and the coummunities of which they are a part by furthering their education and training.

In fact, in constant dollars, with one exception, the current G.I. bill up until January of this year provided the lowest level of assistance ever to those who served in the defense of our country. The basic benefit program of the Vietnam Era G.I. bill provided $493 per month in 1981 to a veteran with a spouse and two children. Twenty years later, a veteran in identical circumstances received only $43 more, a mere 8 percent increase over a time period when inflation had nearly doubled, and a dollar bought only half of what it once purchased.

During the first session of the 107th Congress, we were successful in addressing some of these problems. Public Law 107–103 greatly improved educational assistance benefits available under the part of the Montgomery GI bill for service members and veterans, Chapter 30. This part of the G.I. bill now provides nine monthly $800 stipends per year for four years. The total benefit is $28,800. On October 1, 2002, the monthly amount will increase to $900, producing a new total benefit of $32,400 for the four academic years, a considerable improvement that Senator JOHNSON and I worked hard to accomplish.

Now is the time to bring educational assistance program for members of the Selected Reserve, Chapter 1606, in line with Chapter 30. Current full-time assistance for the Selected Reserve is $272 per month for a total benefit of $9,792, only 34 percent of the monthly amount currently received under the Chapter 30 program. The bill that we are introducing today would raise the monthly amount of assistance for our Selected Reserve to $428, for a new total benefit of $15,408 and be comparable to the increases that have and will occur in the Chapter 30 program. The increase would be effective October 1, 2002.

The legislation that we are proposing would fulfill the promise made to our Nation's service members, help with recruiting and retention of men and women in our military, strengthen the State and national economies, and partially reflect the current costs of higher education. Now is the time to enact these modest improvements to the benefit program of the Montgomery G.I. bill for members of our National Guard and Reserve forces.

I urge all Members of the Senate to join me in support of the Selected Reserve Educational Assistance Act of 2002.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter in support of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 6, 2002.

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

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS, I write today on behalf of the nearly 80,000 members of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. I understand that you intend to introduce the Selected Reserve Educational Assistance Act of 2002, legislation that would not only increase educational payments to members of the Selected Reserve, but would also tie proportional increases in the Reserve GI Bill (Chapter 1606) to increases in the active duty (Chapter 30) provisions of the bill.

ROA believes that these changes are both appropriate and timely in as much as they recognize the increased contributions and responsibilities of the Reserve components within the Total Force. Since Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, Reserve component support of contingency operations has increased twelve hundred percent, to the point that it now averages nearly 13,000,000 mandays per year. That figure does not include the nearly 85,000 Reservists currently on active duty in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. Moreover, there is no indication that this tempo of operations is likely to decrease anytime soon.

Your bill is a landmark in the realm of Reserve education benefits in as much as it contains provisions for automatic increases in payments that keep pace with inflation and with Active component usage. This is a great improvement to a very significant recruiting and retention program, and will doubtless, make it all the more popular and valuable to the military and to the nation as a whole in the years to come.

Again, let me thank you for support of the Reserve components of our Armed Forces and their people. If we here at ROA can be of any assistance on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

JAYSON L. SPEIGEL,
Executive Director.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 2463. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to restrict bundling of Department of Defense contract requirements that unreasonably disadvantages small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I am pleased to be introducing the Small Business Contracts Opportunity Act of 2002. This legislation would help expand opportunities for small businesses to bid on government contracts, thus allowing them to sell more products and services to Federal agencies. The bill would prohibit the consolidation of contract requirements in excess of $5 million absent a written determination that the benefits of consolidation substantially exceed the benefits of alternative contracting approaches that would involve a lesser degree of consolidation.

The Small Business Reauthorization Act of 1997, P.L. 105–135, requires Federal agencies to conduct market research to assess the potential impact of ''bundled contracts,'' and to proceed with such contracts only if the benefits of bundling substantially exceed the benefits of proceeding with separate contracts. Unfortunately, the reality is that the Department of Defense, and other Federal agencies, have narrowly interpreted these provisions of the Small Business Reauthorization Act. The result is that too many Federal contracts are so large that they are out of reach for small businesses. Yet, small businesses could perform the work if the contract requirements were divided into separate contracts rather than consolidated.

For the past several years, the evidence that contract bundling is hurting small businesses has been growing. For example, on November 16, ''Eagle Eye'' publishing released its second study on bundling since 1997, which found that the Defense Department is the biggest culprit of bundling, accounting for 82 percent of all bundled dollars. The study report goes on to say, that large businesses are the main beneficiaries of bundling, and highlights that large firms win 74 percent of all bundled dollars and 67 percent of all prime contract dollars. With the average bundling contract worth $8 million, it is no wonder small businesses receive only 9 percent of all bundled contract dollars. Eagle Eye found that the average bundled contract was 11 times larger than the average unbundled contract.

Also, according to the Eagle Eye study, major DoD bureaus remain the largest proponents of bundling. Army's 1999 bundled total was up to 22 percent since 1992 to $15.8 billion, while Navy increased only by 2 percent, but still managed to bundle $22 billion worth of contracts. Air Force bundled $18.8 billion, but offered some good news because its total is down 24 percent since 1992.

The legislation that I am proposing would require the Department of Defense to prove the cost benefit of consolidating a contract in excess of $5 million. Now is the time to enact this modest provision to ensure that our small businesses have the opportunities that they deserve to provide goods and services for the Department of Defense.

I urge all Members of the Senate to join me in support of the Contract Consolidation Act of 2002.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 2465. A bill to extend and strengthen procedures to maintain fiscal accountability and responsibility; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Governmental Affairs, jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, with instructions that if one Committee reports, the other Committee have thirty days to report or be discharged.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I rise today to join with my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator GREGG, to introduce a common-sense budget process bill, the Budget Enforcement Act of 2002.

In the 1990s, we took fiscally responsible actions that led to balancing the budget in 1999 and 2000 without using Social Security. But last year, the government returned to the bad habit of using the Social Security surplus to fund other government activities. We need to put an end to that practice.

The Government will not have these Social Security surpluses to use forever. In the next decade, the Baby Boom generation will begin to retire in large numbers. Starting in 2016, Social Security will start redeeming the bonds that it holds, and the non-Social Security government will have to start paying for those bonds from non-Social Security surpluses. The bottom line is that starting in 2016, the government will have to show restraint in the non-Social Security budget so that we can pay the Social Security benefits that Americans have earned.

That's why we cannot continue to enact either tax cuts or spending measures that push the government further into deficit. Before we enter into new obligations, we need to make sure that we have the resources to meet our Nation's commitment to our seniors under Social Security.

We need to return to the priority of protecting the Social Security Trust Funds. We should, as President Bush said in a March 2001 radio address, ''keep the promise of Social Security and keep the government from raiding the Social Security surplus.''

And to get the Government out of the business of using Social Security surpluses to fund other government spending, we need to strengthen our budget process. That is what the bill that Senator GREGG and I are proposing would do.

The history of budget process changes teaches that realistic budget enforcement mechanisms work. The Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, enacted with bipartisan support, with a Democratic Congress and a Republican President, deserves much credit for helping to keep the Government on that path to reduce and eventually eliminate the deficit.

A central feature of the 1990 act was the creation of caps on appropriated spending. In recent years, Congress has blown through those caps, when those caps were at unrealistic levels, and when the Government was running surpluses. But in most years of their history, appropriations caps helped to constrain the politically understandable appetite to spend without limit.

Congress has repeatedly endorsed the idea of spending caps. Congress renewed and extended the caps in the budget process laws of 1993 and 1997. And 6 of the last 8 budget resolutions have set enforceable spending caps. If budget numbers are to have any meaning, if they are not to be just wishes and prayers, then we need to have enforcement.

Our bill would reinstate and extend the caps on discretionary spending, and would do so at a realistic baseline. It would simply set those levels at those in the budget resolution reported by the Budget Committee on March 22.

And our bill maintains, without change, the separate subcaps created in the Violent Crime Act of 1994 and the Transportation Equity Act of 1998.

Like the 1990 budget law that it extends, our bill would apply budget enforcement to entitlements and taxes. It would extend the pay-as-you-go enforcement mechanism. All parts of the budget would thus be treated fairly.

Our bill would also improve the points of order that enforce the caps and pay-as-you-go enforcement. It would allow Senators to raise a point of order against specific provisions that cause the caps or pay-as-you-go discipline to be violated. This part of the bill will work very much like the important Byrd Rule that governs the reconciliation process, which is of course named after the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia.

Under our bill, if a piece of legislation violates the caps or pay-as-you-go discipline, any Senator could raise a point of order and force a vote on any individual provision that contributes to the budget violation. If the point of order is not waived, then the provision would be stricken from the legislation.

The bill would also shut back-door ways around the caps and pay-as-you-go enforcement, by requiring 60 votes to change the caps, alter the balances of the pay-as-you-go scorecard, or direct scorekeeping.

Our bill would limit the exceptions to the point of order against emergency designations in the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution, so that all emergencies would be treated alike. Our bill would thus treat emergencies as they were treated in the text of that budget resolution when the Senate passed it on April 7, 2000, rather than in the watered-down form it had when it came back from conference with the House of Representatives.

And finally, our bill would extend for 5 years the requirement for 60 votes to waive existing points of order that enforce the Congressional Budget Act. The 60-vote requirement that gives these points of order teeth expires on September 30 this year under current law.

This is sensible budget process reform, in keeping with the best, most effective budget process enforcement that we have enacted in the past. It would make a significant contribution toward ending the practice of using the Social Security surplus to fund other government activities. And that is something that we simply must do, for our seniors, and for those in coming generations who will otherwise be stuck with the bill. I urge my colleagues to join us to cosponsor our legislation.

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

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

GREGG-FEINGOLD BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2002

Appropriations Caps—The bill would reinstate and extend for 5 years the caps on discretionary spending, keyed to the levels in the budget resolution reported by the Budget Committee. Points of order and the threat of across-the-board cuts would continue to provide enforcement.

Pay-as-You-Go for Entitlements and Taxes—The bill would reinstate and extend the pay-as-you-go discipline that controls entitlement spending and tax law changes. Points of order and the threat of across-the-board cuts would continue to provide enforcement.

Point of Order Against Specific Provisions that Violate the Caps or Pay-as-You Go—If legislation violated the caps or pay-as-you-go enforcement, the bill would allow any Senator to raise a point of order against (and thus force a vote on) any individual provision that contributed to the budget violation. If the Senate did not waive the point of order, then the provision would be stricken from the legislation. This point of order would work just like the Byrd Rule against extraneous matter in reconciliation legislation.

Guarding Against Budget Evasions—The bill would shut back-door ways around the caps and pay-as-you-go enforcement, by requiring 60 votes to change the discretionary caps, alter the balances of the pay-as-you-go scorecard, or direct scorekeeping.

Limit Emergency Exceptions—The bill would limit the exceptions to the point of order against emergency designations in the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution, so that all emergencies would be treated alike.

Extending Existing Points of Order—The bill would extend for 5 years the requirement for 60 votes to waive existing points of order that enforce the Congressional Budget Act. The 60-vote requirement that gives these points of order teeth expires on September 30 this year under current law.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mrs. CARNAHAN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2466. A bill to modify the contract consolidation requirements in the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I am pleased today to be introducing legislation, the Small Business Federal Contractor Safeguard Act, designed to protect the interests of small businesses in the Federal marketplace.

As the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I have focused a considerable amount of energy promoting the interests of small businesses in the Federal marketplace. The legislation being introducing today marks a critical step forward in this process.

It is no secret that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship places a great deal of importance on moving legislation forward in a bipartisan manner, the members of my Committee understand we represent the interests of all of our Nation's small businesses, the most important and dynamic segment of our economy. And nowhere is the bipartisan consensus stronger than in the area of Federal procurement and ensuring that our Nation's small businesses receive their fair share of procurement opportunities. I am pleased to once again be introducing bipartisan legislation with the Committee's ranking member, Senator KIT BOND. Regardless of who has chaired the Committee during our tenure together, we have both worked hard to improve small business Federal procurement opportunities.

I am also pleased to be joined by Senator JEAN CARNAHAN, a member of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Senate Armed Services Committee and Senator SUSAN COLLINS, also a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. While small business participation in procurement activities is important throughout the Federal Government, nowhere is it more important than at the Department of Defense, which is responsible for over 63 percent of the goods and services purchased by the Federal government. The support of Senator CARNAHAN and Senator COLLINS will help ensure the success of this legislation.

The legislation we are introducing today has one ultimate purpose, to prevent Federal agencies from circumventing small business protections with regard to the practice known as contract bundling. Few issues have so strongly galvanized the small businesses contracting community as the practice of contract bundling, which occurs when procurement contracts are combined to form large contracts, often spread over large geographic areas, resulting in minimal or no small business participation.

Many supporters of the practice of contract bundling point to its cost savings. They claim it saves the taxpayer money to lump contracts together. Unfortunately, there is little evidence supporting this claim, and too many contracts are bundled without the required economic research designed to determine if a bundled contract will actually result in a cost savings.

The Small Business Administration's, SBA, Office of Advocacy, an independent body within the SBA, estimated that for every increase of 100 bundled contracts, there was a decrease of over 106 individual contracts issued to small firms. Additionally, for every $100 awarded on a bundled contract, there was a decrease of $33 to small business. The Office of Advocacy arrived at these conclusions using a conservative definition of what constitutes a bundled contract. Therefore, the negative impact on small businesses from contract bundling is likely more severe.

While seemingly an efficient and cost effective means for Federal agencies to conduct business, bundled contracts, are anti-competitive. When a Federal agency bundles contracts, it limits small businesses' ability to bid for the new bundled contract, thus limiting competition. Small businesses are consistently touted as more innovative, providing better and cheaper services then their larger counterparts. But when forced to bid for mega-contracts, at times across large geographic areas, few, if any, small businesses can be expected to compete. By driving small

business from the Federal marketplace, contract bundling will actually drive up the costs of goods and services purchased by the Federal Government because competition will be limited and our economy will be deprived of possible innovations brought about by small businesses.

Although there is current law in place intended to require Federal agencies to conduct market research before bundling a contract, loopholes in the current definition of a bundled contract allow them to often skirt these safeguards.

Our legislation changes the name ''bundled contract'' to consolidated contract, strengthens the definition of a consolidated contract, and closes the loopholes in the existing definition to prevent Federal agencies from circumventing statutory safeguards intended to ensure that separate contracts are consolidated for economic reasons, not administrative expediency.

The new definition relies on a simple premise: if you combine contracts, be it new contracts, existing contracts or a combination thereof, you are consolidating them and would need to take the necessary steps to ensure it is justified economically before proceeding.

Our legislation also alters the current Small Business Act requirements regarding procurement strategies when a contract is consolidated to include a threshold level for triggering the economic research requirements.

Previously, any consolidated contract would trigger the economic research requirements, something considered onerous by many Federal agencies and often cited as the reason for circumventing the law. The new procurement strategies section of the Small Business Act would require a statement of benefits and a justification for any consolidated contract over $2 million and a more extensive analysis, corresponding to current requirements for any consolidated contract, for consolidations over $5 million.

In order to move forward with a consolidated contract over $2 million, the agency must put forth the benefits anticipated from the contract, identify alternatives that would involve a lesser degree of consolidation and include a specific determination that the consolidation is necessary and justified. The determination that a consolidation is necessary and justified may be determined simply through administrative and personnel savings, but their must be actual savings.

In order to move forward with a consolidated contract over $5 million, an agency must, in addition to the above: conduct current market research to demonstrate that the consolidation will result in costs savings, quality improvements, reduction in acquisition times, or better terms and conditions; include an assessment as to the specific impediments to small business participation resulting from the consolidation; and specify actions designed to maximize small business participation as subcontractors and suppliers for the consolidated contract. The determination that a consolidation is necessary and justified may not be determined through administrative and personnel savings alone unless those savings will be substantial for these larger contracts.

By establishing this dual threshold system, we have placed the emphasis for the economic research on contracts more likely to preclude small business participation, while not ceding smaller contracts to the whims of a Federal agency. This change, coupled with a clear definition of a consolidated contract should be enough to garner compliance. However, if Federal agencies continue to consolidate contracts when there is no justification, fail to conduct the required economic research, or fail to provide procurement opportunities to small businesses, I would see little choice but to support legislative changes requiring punitive measures for these Federal agencies. This is a step I have been reluctant to take in the past. However, I am optimistic that such a step will not be necessary and that the fair and reasonable system established under this legislation will be effective.

I would once again like to thank my fellow sponsors, Senators BOND, CARNAHAN, and COLLINS for their support on this issue. I hope all of my colleagues will join us in supporting this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2466

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Business Federal Contractor Safeguard Act''.

SEC. 2. CONTRACT CONSOLIDATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3(o) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(o)) is amended to read as follows:

''(o) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act the following definitions shall apply:

''(1) CONSOLIDATED CONTRACT; CONSOLIDATION.—The term 'consolidated contract' or 'consolidation' means a multiple award contract or a contract for goods or services with a Federal agency that—

''(A) combines discrete procurement requirements from not less than 2 existing contracts;

''(B) adds new, discrete procurement requirements to an existing contract; or

''(C) includes 2 or more discrete procurement requirements.

''(2) MULTIPLE AWARD CONTRACT.—The term 'multiple award contract' means—

''(A) a contract that is entered into by the Administrator of General Services under the multiple award schedule program referred to in section 2302(2)(C) of title 10, United States Code;

''(B) a multiple award task order contract or delivery order contract that is entered into under the authority of sections 2304a through 2304d of title 10, United States Code, or sections 303H through 303K of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253h through 253k); and

''(C) any other indefinite delivery or indefinite quantity contract that is entered into by the head of a Federal agency with 2 or more sources pursuant to the same solicitation.''.

(b) PROCUREMENT STRATEGIES.—Section 15(e) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) PROCUREMENT STRATEGIES; CONTRACT CONSOLIDATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To the maximum extent practicable, procurement strategies used by the various agencies having contracting authority shall facilitate the maximum participation of small business concerns as—

''(A) prime contractors;

''(B) subcontractors; and

''(C) suppliers.

''(2) PROCUREMENT STRATEGY REQUIREMENTS WHEN THE VALUE OF A CONSOLIDATED CONTRACT IS GREATER THAN $2,000,000.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An agency official may not execute a procurement strategy that includes a consolidated contract valued at more than $2,000,000 unless the proposed procurement strategy—

''(i) specifically identifies the benefits anticipated from consolidation;

''(ii) identifies any alternative contracting approaches that would involve a lesser degree of contract consolidation; and

''(iii) includes a specific determination that the proposed consolidation is necessary and the anticipated benefits of such consolidation justify its use.

''(B) NECESSARY AND JUSTIFIED.—The head of an agency may determine that a procurement strategy under subparagraph (A)(iii) is necessary and justified if the monetary benefits of the procurement strategy, including administrative and personnel costs, substantially exceed the monetary benefits of each of the possible alternative contracting approaches identified under subparagraph (A)(ii).

''(C) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS WHEN THE VALUE OF A CONSOLIDATED CONTRACT IS GREATER THAN $5,000,000.—In addition to meeting the requirements under paragraph (A), a procurement strategy that includes a consolidated contract valued at more than $5,000,000—

''(i) shall be supported by current market research that demonstrates that the consolidated contract will result in—

''(I) cost savings;

''(II) quality improvements;

''(III) reduction in acquisition cycle times; or

''(IV) better terms and conditions;

''(ii) shall include an assessment of the specific impediments to participation by small business concerns as prime contractors that result from contract consolidation;

''(iii) shall specify actions designed to maximize small business participation as subcontractors, including suppliers, at various tiers under the consolidated contract; and

''(iv) shall not be justified under paragraph (A)(iii) by savings in administrative or personnel costs, unless the total amount of the cost savings is expected to be substantial in relation to the total cost of the procurement.

''(3) CONTRACT TEAMING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the head of an agency solicits offers for a consolidated contract, a small business concern may submit an offer that provides for the use of a particular team of subcontractors for the performance of the contract (referred to in this paragraph as 'teaming').

''(B) EVALUATION OF OFFER.—The head of the agency shall evaluate an offer submitted

by a small business concern under subparagraph (A) in the same manner as other offers, with due consideration to the capabilities of all of the proposed subcontractors.

''(C) NO EFFECT ON STATUS AS A SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—If a small business concern engages in teaming under subparagraph (A), its status as a small business concern shall not be affected for any other purpose.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO THE SMALL BUSINESS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1997.—Section 414 of the Small Business Reauthorization Act of 1997 (41 U.S.C. 405 note) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT.—The Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 2(j)—

(i) by striking the subsection heading and inserting the following:

''(j) CONTRACT CONSOLIDATION.—''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''bundling of contract requirements'' and inserting ''contract consolidation'';

(B) in section 8(d)(4)(G), by striking ''a bundled contract'' and inserting ''a consolidated contract'';

(C) in section 15(a)—

(i) by striking ''bundling of contract requirements'' and inserting ''contract consolidation''; and

(ii) by striking ''the bundled contract'' and inserting ''the consolidated contract''; and

(D) in section 15(k)(5)—

(i) by striking ''significant bundling of contract requirements'' and inserting ''consolidated contracts valued at more than $2,000,000''; and

(ii) by striking ''bundled contract'' and inserting ''consolidated contract''.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, today I join the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY, in introducing this important legislation on an issue of vital concern to small businesses. This bill, a truly bipartisan effort, represents one of the best opportunities in a long time to remove the current logjam on controlling contract bundling.

We often say around here that, in some cases, all that is necessary to help small business is for government policy to stop visiting harm upon them. Contract bundling is one of those harmful policies. It eliminates small businesses from competing for contracts to sell the government some of the $200 billion in goods and services it buys every year.

The Small Business Act says that small firms shall have the maximum practicable opportunity to compete for Federal contracts. This is good for small business, good for the purchasing agencies, and good for the taxpayer who pays the bills.

Small business benefits from having access to a stable revenue stream while they get up-and-running. The Small Business Act recognizes how government contracting can contribute to business development and economic renewal. For example, my HUBZone program provides contracting incentives for small firms to locate in blighted neighborhoods, helping them win Federal contracts and stabilize their revenues while they develop a nongovernmental customer base.

Federal agencies also benefit from small firms in Federal procurement. Many of the most innovative solutions to our problems, such as new technologies in defense readiness, come from small firms. Large business can be just as bureaucratic as the worst Federal agencies.

Complex chains of command, the need to consult with the corporate headquarters, and repetitive sign-offs on a new idea that have to be cleared with Accounting, Marketing, and Human Resources can stifle innovation and creativity. The absence of all these structures can make small business able to ''turn on a dime,'' deliver new innovative products at lower cost, and clobber their big competitors. Agencies trying to carry out their governmental functions can take advantage of these innovations and deliver better quality services to our constituents.

Finally, the taxpayer wins when small business competes for contracts. The more competition, the lower the prices and the higher the quality.

But contract bundling gets in the way of all those benefits. To simplify the contracting process, agencies will take a bunch of small contracts and roll them into one massive contract. The result is a contract that a small business could not perform, due to its complexity or its obligation to do work in widely disparate geographic locations. A small business owner says, ''I could not perform the contract, even if I won it. So I won't even bid.'' When that happens, we all lose.

During my tenure as Chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, we took a stab at trying to control bundling. At that time, no statutory definition of bundling existed. It was like the Supreme Court trying to deal with pornography, we know it when we see it. In the Small Business Reauthorization Act of 1997, I pushed for a specific definition of bundling and created an administrative process to review instances of bundling. Agencies were supposed to make a determination whether a proposed bundle was ''necessary and justified.''

Since that time, we have seen agencies poke holes in that definition. For example, they say that a proposed contract represents a new requirement. Since it is new, it was never issued previously as separate smaller contracts, so it isn't bundling, they say. Now they don't have to do the ''necessary and justified'' determination.

Or, they will point to another phrase in the current definition of bundling. Currently, a bundle involves consolidating contracts in a way that makes small business participation unlikely. If they structure a tiny piece of the contract so that a small business somewhere, someday might be able to win that piece, the rest of the massive contract isn't technically bundling. Therefore, the agency doesn't have to do the determination.

This bill will close those kinds of loopholes. It builds upon some very positive language introduced in last year's Defense Authorization bill when the Senator from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, proposed a draft during markup in the Senate Armed Services Committee. The Senator from Michigan noticed that it doesn't make sense for Federal agencies to avoid the ''necessary and justified'' determination. The goal of that process is to ask, does a proposed bundle make sense? Is it good value to the taxpayer and to the agency? Does it help or harm the vendor base that would be available to the agency in the future?

My colleague from Michigan decided it was time to make Defense agencies complete these bundling studies, to make sure we weren't doing harm to our defense readiness through these acquisition policies. I think we need to do the studies to make sure the Small Business Act is not cast aside and ignored. Suddenly, after a long impasse on this issue, the Senators from Michigan and Massachusetts and I found we had common ground on this issue.

Unfortunately, we were unable to get these positive provisions included in last year's Defense bill. That's why we are trying again. The Bush Administration sought to have a single governmentwide policy apply to all Federal agencies, not just the Defense establishment. This is a sound approach, but it would have required making changes to the governmentwide bundling policy in the Small Business Act. We were ready to agree to such a change, but our counterparts in the other body objected, citing jurisdictional claims about using an Armed Services bill to make changes in Small Business Committee jurisdiction.

The bill we offer today should overcome these problems. It would make a uniform governmentwide policy, through the Small Business Act. It is a stand-alone bill. It builds upon an approach suggested by the Armed Services Committee as a reasonable one.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his work on this issue and I am pleased to have been at the table with him in crafting this proposal. I look forward to its enactment.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 2467. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to modify the computation of eligibility for certain Federal Pell Grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 2468. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1986 to provide for strategic sectoral skills gap assessments, strategic skills gap action plans, and strategic training capacity enhancement seed grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 2469. A bill to amend section 171(b)(1)(D) the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for training service and delivery innovation grants; to

the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I come to the floor today to address a topic that I believe is key to the future competitiveness of our Nation, and that is the training of our workforce.

These have been tough times for the economy of my State, and certainly the economy of the Nation at large. The most recent employment data available from the Bureau of Labor Statistics have offered little comfort in Washington, which along with the other Pacific Northwest States of Oregon and Alaska, continue to have among the highest unemployment rates in the Nation.

This body moved quickly to provide immediate relief to the workers most impacted by the devastating economic impacts of the September 11th incidents, and I am proud that this Senate under the leadership of our Majority Leader was able to deliver some temporary assistance to workers who have exhausted unemployment benefits.

Nonetheless, our efforts should not stop with an unemployment insurance extension. We must continue pursuing long-term strategies for a sustained recovery. The fundamental strength of our economy lies in the working men and women of this Nation whose innovation and hard work propelled the massive economic expansion of the past decade.

The edge that will keep our workers ahead in this changing global economy is their skills. Our economy is global, linked by international markets and communications networks. The sustained success of U.S. companies depends on adaptability and innovation to survive, which means that workers themselves need to remain flexible and continually update job skills.

Even in this time of relatively high unemployment, businesses throughout the country are having hard times finding skilled workers. Last year, for example, 46 percent of American businesses had trouble finding qualified workers. Next year, 29 percent of American businesses expect that they will continue to have trouble hiring qualified workers, even in this slugish economy.

At the same time, over 3 million workers are laid off each year, but well under 500,000 receive any sort of training in response to meet the skills demands of those hiring businesses.

But meeting those skills demands, and bridging the skills gaps that persist between will not widely occur without a strong financial commitment to ensuring access to skills training programs, and ongoing efforts to maximize the effectiveness of those funds that we already invest.

The decision we make today to invest in our workers will pay off many times over in the form of a stronger economy, healthier communities, and improved quality of life.

But the persistent truth is that we are delivering a trickle of funding while faced with a tidal wave of need.

During the Easter recess, I traveled across my State, from Olympia to Kelso, Vancouver to Bellingham, the Tri-cites to Mt. Vernon, and received a great deal of feedback from Washingtonians who are seeking training, are providing it, or are serving as employers who need to hire skilled workers. And I heard similar concerns repeated in each of these areas: first, as our economy continues to change, the demand for new skills has grown; second, that the State has experienced an enormous increase in demand for skills training by individual workers, a trend that appears to be widespread throughout the Nation; but third, that far too many of those workers seeking to access training cannot get the training they need due to limited availability of slots at training institutions and the limited availability of tuition assistance.

Last month my office released an informal study of this apparent shortfall in the capacity of training systems in my state to meet emerging demand, and the results of that study were staggering to me. Tens of thousands of workers who want to upgrade their skills have only a limited ability to do so because of budgetary limitations that prevent institutions from adequately adding capacity to deliver training, and because only limited numbers of training vouchers are available through the federal job training system.

I might add that our governor has truly been a leader in expanding access to training. In response to the recent wave of layoffs in our State, he managed to add more than 1,300 additional adult worker-training slots to the state's community and technical college system. Even in the face of our state's terrible revenue crunch, Governor Locke has made that commitment, and he deserves tremendous credit for it.

But it is clear that states need additional help from the Federal Government. Workforce investment must be a national priority.

As my colleagues know, the programs authorized by the Workforce Investment Act are only in their second year of implementation. Although we still have several job-training programs offered through the Federal Government, the WIA system is clearly the centerpiece. It is the only Federal system designed to meet a broad range of worker needs, and it emerged from years of bipartisan work by Congress to consolidate at least 17 Federal programs into one system for delivering employment and training services.

Continuing our financial commitment to WIA programs at this critical stage in their development is essential to effective implementation of these system-wide reforms.

Senators KENNEDY, DEWINE, WELLSTONE, and our other colleagues took an enouous step in passing WIA in 1998. And despite bumps in the road, the system is already showing great promise. Nonetheless, as we move toward reauthorization of WIA and TANF, there are a number of issues that many of us will want to address in seeking to take the system to the next level.

We must, first and foremost, put an even higher priority on training. In developing human capital that maximizes the power of our economic engine, we must not get caught in the short-sighted quicksand of a work-first mentality. We will do ourselves a grave disservice if we simply force more people without the skills to obtain and hold a job in this dynamic economy, to work faster, in whatever job is available, often low paying jobs, rather than getting them the tools that they need to truly be self-sufficient.

Second, we must further enhance the seamlessness of our training systems. As GAO has documented in recent months, we still have partners in the WIA system that do not fully participate, and we still have numerous Federal training programs operating independently of one another, often duplicating effort and resources. We need to keep our eye on ball in this case, that the goal is to provide the highest possible service at the lowest unit cost on behalf of the customers of the system, its employment and training recipients, and we need to maximize the return on our Federal investment.

Third, in meeting these objectives, we need to maintain the flexibility of the systems while encouraging the types of activities and use of funds that will help us match skilled workers with available jobs. We need to take a serious look at whether the systems effectively balance the need for accountability with the flexibility for local boards in the use of federal dollars that is will allow them to most effectively target resources at the problems that most plague their communities.

Finally, in the short term, we must tailor all of our Federal training systems and programs to ensure the greatest possible access for workers who want to obtain training. That means that it is incumbent on us to keep the door open as wide as possible for adult students to access programs like Pell. And we must try to utilize the most current and powerful technologies to enhance the delivery of training.

Today, I am introducing three bills that are designed to build upon the existing workforce structure to expand access to training and improve its effectiveness.

The first piece of legislation would change the Pell Grant program to make certain that student financial aid is available to recently laid off workers.

A standard practice in the determination of Pell Grant eligibility for student aid is to base grant awards upon the applicant's income during the previous year. The use of tax forms for this purpose, in many cases, is the appropriate and easiest administrative method of obtaining a clear and official

statement of need. But as a result, many recently laid-off workers are often not eligible for critical financial assistance at a time when the worker's family is experiencing a dramatic decrease in income.

The legislation would explicitly provide the authority for educational institutions, after taking sufficient precautions to prevent fraud, to consider current-year income levels for applicants seeking training through Pell-eligible programs. It does this in a very narrow way, by ensuring that institutions in states with high unemployment rates consider current year financial circumstances rather than previous year, income.

The second bill also addresses issues of access and delivery of training. While many distance-learning technologies have been developed in recent years, those technologies have not necessarily reached many of those most in need of training. Many workers in need of training may not be aware of opportunities available online to engage in distance-learning training coursework and may not have sufficient access to technologies that provide the means to access such distance-learning technologies.

It may not be enough to create a distance-learning curriculum and passively provide it through an educational institution website. Rather, comprehensive solutions need to be developed that integrate curriculum innovations, technological access, and the promotion and linkage of workers in need of training with such opportunities. Additionally, sources of funding to obtain online coursework may not be available to many workers seeking to engage in such training.

The third bill that I am introducing is designed to help WIA Boards access more, high-quality information to better understand regional labor market dynamics and improve system performance with goal of identifying emerging sectors and targeting employment and training resources appropriately.

While workforce areas may be conducting research now on the employment landscape in those areas and states, those assessments and statistical labor market data collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics is not be sufficient to provide a level of detail for identifying actual job opportunities in regional labor markets and matching available workers to those business demands. As a result, local systems may not have the information needed to most efficiently target the use of available resources and training providers may not always build curricula and programs that most effectively address local workforce needs.

This legislation is designed to make resources available to maximize employment and training resources toward meeting emerging area skills needs. I want to make clear that this is not intended to simply reinvent the wheel for areas that are already developing sectoral approaches within existing workforce development systems. But it should in fact, allow those areas to take the next step by providing funds to enhance the capacity of systems to meet area employer needs.

This is a first step on a long journey as we work to improve Federal job training systems, and it is in no way independent of the need for additional resources to grow those systems.

Each of these bills is an important component of that broader strategy and I look forward to working with my colleagues as we begin to look at the reauthorization of TANF, of WIA, and of the Higher Education Act this year and next.

By Mrs. CARNAHAN:

S. 2470. A bill to encourage and facilitate the security of nuclear materials and facilities worldwide, to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mrs. CARNAHAN. Madam President, the disintegration of the Soviet Union more than a decade ago resulted in economic and political chaos.

The Soviet Union possessed more than 10,000 nuclear weapons, and dozens of nuclear weapons production facilities sprawled across 11 time zones. As a result of the economic collapse, funding fell short for security at nuclear weapons storage and production facilities. This left dangerous amounts of deadly weapons and materials vulnerable to theft.

Since 1991, there have been countless documented cases of individuals stealing plutonium and uranium from the former Soviet Union. So far, we believe no ''nuclear smuggler'' has taken enough material to make a nuclear device. The real problem is the uncertainty of the unknown.

Since the end of the Cold War, we have done a great deal to curb the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction. The United States has taken the lead in the international community to help Russia secure its nuclear weapons and material. The Department of Defense's Cooperative Threat Reduction Program and the sister programs at the Department of Energy are truly ''defense by other means.'' The Defense Department's program is more commonly known as the Nunn-Lugar program, in recognition of its creators, my colleague from Indiana, Dick Lugar, and former Senator Sam Nunn of Georgia. Because of these two men, we face less of a threat from the Soviet Union's nuclear legacy than we would have otherwise.

The Department of Defense has focused on destroying nuclear weapons and improving security over weapons in transit and storage. The Department of Energy has focused its own threat reduction efforts on locking up uranium and plutonium that could be used in a nuclear weapon and helping develop peaceful, commercial job opportunities for weapons scientists. The investments made in these programs to secure Soviet nuclear weapons and materials have truly been in our national interest.

However, as far-reaching as these programs have been, they were not designed to address some of the terrorist threats we now face. In particular, there are three gaps in our nuclear threat reduction policies that need to be dealt with.

First, these programs do not apply to countries outside of the former Soviet Union. Second, these programs do not address the threat of radiological materials. Third, these programs do not deal with preventing terrorist sabotage of nuclear power plants.

Expanding our threat reduction programs globally is an important priority. So far, most of our efforts have focused on the dangerous situation in the former Soviet Union. This makes sense, since most of the under-secured nuclear weapons useable material is located in that part of the world.

However, we need to pay more attention to the smaller amounts of weapons material in other parts of the world that are not under tight enough lock and key. This means building up security at every type of nuclear facility worldwide, including nuclear power plants, processing facilities, storage sites and other related buildings.

We also need to start focusing on radiological materials.

And by radiological materials, I am referring to highly radioactive substances other than weapons-useable uranium or plutonium. A ''dirty bomb'' combines radioactive material that could be found at nuclear power plants, medical facilities or other industrial sites with explosives. This weapon would not be as immediately destructive as a nuclear bomb. But it would cause significant physical, environmental, economic, and psychological damage to our citizens, and to our national security.

Indeed, intelligence reports indicate that Osama bin Ladin has been actively pursuing the materials to develop a ''dirty bomb.'' In fact, he called the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction a ''religious duty.'' In addition, there have been reports of meetings between Pakistani nuclear weapons scientists and al-Qaeda operatives and between Iraqi officials and al-Qaeda representatives. We will never know what went on at these meetings. But we must take every step possible to thwart their evil plans.

Finally, we will contribute to our national security by improving nuclear power plant security outside the United States. The Department of Energy has been working for years to improve the safety of Soviet-designed nuclear power plants in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. This is to prevent the possible repeat of the Chernobyl disaster.

However, to date, protecting these plants from terrorist sabotage has never been addressed. Before the tragedies of September 11, we never thought such an attack was realistic. Now that our reality has changed, we are providing greater security to protect our

power plants here at home. These efforts will serve as good models to upgrade the security at nuclear plants in Russia and elsewhere.

Today I am introducing a bill that would help bolster our national security by improving the security of all nuclear and radiological material worldwide. My bill addresses each of the three gaps in our current efforts that I have just identified.

First, it calls on the Department of Energy in cooperation with the Departments of State and Defense to develop a program that would encourage all countries to adhere to the highest security standards for their nuclear material wherever it is used or stored;

Second, it requires the Department of Energy to establish a systematic approach for securing radiological materials other than uranium and plutonium outside the United States; and

Third, it directs the Department of Energy, in consultation with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the International Atomic Energy Agency, to develop plans for preventing terrorist attacks on nuclear power plants outside the United States.

This bill is a cost-effective and short-term way to counter current threats to our national security and it promotes world cooperation in securing nuclear materials. Already, this bill has gained the endorsement of several world leaders in the field of nuclear non-proliferation, including: Dr William Potter, Director of the Monterey Institute's Center for Nonproliferation Studies; Dr. Graham Allison, former Assistant Secretary of Defense; and Rose Gottemoeller, former Deputy UnderSecretary at the Department of Energy.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that letters of support from each of these individuals and organizations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTER FOR NONPROLIFERATION STUDIES,
Monterey, CA, April 29, 2002.

Senator JEAN CARNAHAN,
Hart Senate Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CARNAHAN: As the director of the Monterey Institute's Center for Nonproliferation Studies, I have long been involved in research and training activities designed to combat the spread of weapons of mass destruction. I have focused especially on proliferation risks associated with the former Soviet Union and have sought to enhance the safety and security of fissile material and nuclear facilities in that region. As you are well aware, this task has acquired even greater urgency in the aftermath of September 11, as has the need to consolidate and secure the smaller amounts of fissile material that are inadequately safeguarded in other parts of the world.

Although the highest priority should be given to consolidating, securing, and reducing the global stocks of fissile material—the stuff of nuclear weapons—it also is important for more attention and resources to be devoted to countering nuclear threats posed by the sabotage of nuclear power plants, research reactors, and spent fuel storage sites, and the risks associated with so-called ''dirty bombs'' or radiological dispersal devices, which could be made by matching conventional explosives with radioactive source material. These dangers, while global in nature, are especially acute in Russia due to the amount of nuclear material present, the absence of adequate safeguards, and the vulnerability of many nuclear facilities to sabotage and/or terrorist attack. Although experts at Russian nuclear facilities have highlighted these vulnerabilities for a long time, their remediation has not typically been a high priority for U.S. nonproliferation assistance.

In light of these serious nuclear dangers, I strongly support your efforts to develop new legislation to counter nuclear terrorism and to improve the security of fissile and radiological material and nuclear facilities both in Russia and worldwide. In this regard, there are many useful lessons to be learned from the decade of U.S.-Russian collaboration in cooperative threat reduction, a topic many of my staff and I have analyzed carefully. Please feel free to contact me if you would like more detailed information on our prior work or if I can be of any assistance to you as you pursue your exceptionally timely and important legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. POTTER,
Director, CNS and CRES and Institute Professor.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge MA, April 30, 2002.

Senator JEAN CARNAHAN,
Hart Senate Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CARNAHAN: I am writing to support your draft legislation focused on addressing the threat of nuclear terrorism. As a member of the Baker-Cutler panel and a longtime Russia watcher, I have seen with my own eyes security systems for potential bomb material that would make it an easy task for terrorists to steal. As a former Senator, now Ambassador Howard Baker has testified to his colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, ''I don't mean to be unduly philosophical or psychological about it, but it really boggles my mind that there could be 40,000 nuclear weapons, or maybe 80,000 in the former Soviet Union, poorly controlled and poorly stored, and that the world isn't in a near-state of hysteria about the danger.'' And the problem is not limited to Russia: around the world, there are dozens of facilities with enough highly enriched uranium or a bomb—some of them civilian research facilities with a single night watchman and a chain link fence providing the only security.

In the aftermath of September 11, with Osama bin Laden declaring that acquiring weapons of mass destruction is a ''religious duty,'' allowing such conditions to continue would pose an unacceptable threat to the security of the United States and the world. If a nuclear weapon were to fall in the hands of those who organized the September 11 attacks, there would be no threats and no negotiations. Tens of thousands of innocent victims would die in a flash; if the bomb were in lower Manhattan, it would destroy everything up to Grammercy Park.

That terrible vision must guide our efforts now, and our sense or urgency. We must be asking ourselves: ''on the day after a U.S. city is destroyed in a nuclear blast, what would we wish we had done to prevent it?'' And then we must take those actions now, a quickly as we practically can.

What is needed is a fast-paced, focused effort to eliminate stockpiles of potential bomb material wherever they are no longer needed, while instilling rapid security upgrades wherever these materials will remain. The goal should be to attain a stringent, global standard for security for all stockpiles of nuclear weapons and materials—for if these cannot be stolen, then terrorists cannot get the means for a nuclear attack. At the same time, we must be doing more to guard against potential Chernobyls caused by terrorist attacks on nuclear facilities or terrorist acquisition and use of radiological material for a ''dirty bomb.''

Thus the objectives outlined in your legislation are precisely what is needed. Should this legislation become law, the security of the United States would be measurably improved, and our children and grandchildren will thank you. I commend you for your leadership in this crucial endeavor. Let me know if I can be of any assistance in pushing it through.

Sincerely,

GRAHAM T. ALLISON,
Douglas Dillon Professor of International Affairs, Former Assistant Secretary of Defense.

CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE,
Washington, DC, April 12, 2002.

Senator JEAN CARNAHAN,
Hart Senate Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CARNAHAN: Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Rose Gottemoeller, and I am a Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment. I have previously served in senior positions both in and out of the U.S. government, most recently (until October 2000) as Deputy Undersecretary of Energy for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, and Assistant Secretary of Energy for Nonproliferation and National Security. From 1994 to 1997, I was Deputy Director of the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, after serving in 1993 and 1994 as the White House National Security Council Director responsible for denuclearization of Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus. Prior to that time, I was at the RAND Corporation as a senior researcher on issues related to Soviet defense and arms control policy.

Based on my long experience working on nuclear security issues, I strongly believe that more needs to be done, both in the former Soviet Union and throughout the rest of the world, to ensure a safe and secure future for all Americans. For the better part of the last ten years, the United States has borne the brunt of helping Russia and its neighbors improve security of its civilian and military facilities that house weapons-useable fissile material. As you know, the United States has contributed millions of dollars to secure the Soviet nuclear legacy, but not out of altruism: it is clearly in our national interest to do so.

While I strongly believe that the support of the U.S. must continue, I now also emphasize that the only way to develop a comprehensive effort to address poorly secured nuclear materials in other parts of the world is for our friends and allies to shoulder some of the burden. The security of nuclear material is in every country's best interest, and every country should be an active participant.

Thus far, most cooperative efforts to improve the physical protection of nuclear materials have taken place in the former Soviet Union. This is logical, given that most weapons-usable fissile material is located in that region of the world, and much of it has been adequately protected since the break-up of the USSR.

However, particularly since September 11th, I believe that we all need to pay more attention to the smaller caches of fissile material that exist in other parts of the world. Many of them are not protected to a level commensurate with international standards.

It is important to note that while terrorists might have aspirations of developing advanced weapons of mass destruction, it is more likely that a terrorist organization would be able to develop a Radiological Dispersal Device (RDD). This weapon of mass disruption could be created with conventional explosives and some spent fuel or other radiological source material. To the best of my knowledge, there are no nonproliferation efforts for radiological materials. This needs to change. One approach would be to improve the physical protection of such materials, although this task would be so enormous and expensive on a worldwide basis that I believe careful priorities need to be set for such projects. It would also be important to consider emergency response and public information efforts, so that local governments and citizens will have the tools at hand to respond to such an attack.

The security of nuclear power plants has also come under scrutiny lately. The DOE has been working for years to improve the safety of Soviet-designed nuclear power plants, with significant successes. However, to date, protecting these plants from terrorist sabotage has been less of a priority, and thus has not received attention or funding. This, too, must change.

The DOE could very easily and usefully take the lessons it has learned from its experience during the last decade of cooperation with Russia and apply them to these new and evolving threats to our national security.

Therefore, I strongly support your endeavors, and am thankful for your vision in developing new legislation to address these issues. In the absence of a determined program of action, we have every reason to anticipate acts of nuclear terrorism against American targets before this decade is out.

Please feel free to contact me if I can provide you any further information or clarification. Again, thank you for your commitment to this important issue.

Sincerely yours,

ROSE E. GOTTEMOELLER,
Senior Associate.

RUSSIAN AMERICAN NUCLEAR SECURITY ADVISORY COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2002.

Hon. JEAN CARNAHAN,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CARNAHAN: On behalf of the Russian-American Nuclear Security Advisory Council (RANSAC), I want to thank you for sponsoring legislation in support of expanded and improved international efforts to control nuclear and radiological materials. Few objectives are more central to ensuring international security than keeping these and other weapon of mass destruction materials out of hostile hands.

Since its inception, RANSAC and its members have been very active in promoting efforts to improve nuclear controls in Russia and the former Soviet Union. But we also believe that it is essential to engage the rest of the international community in this effort.

Since last September there has been some forward progress in programs working to reduce the global nuclear materials threat, but the pace of these efforts remains drastically out of synch with the magnitude of the risks. And, the international community must devote more time, attention, and resources—both in the former Soviet Union and the rest of the world—to diminish these obvious nuclear dangers. I applaud and support the goals of your legislation as a practical step toward accelerating and expanding these efforts.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Sincerely,

KENNETH N. LUONGO,
Executive Director.

NUCLEAR THREAT REDUCTION CAMPAIGN

STATEMENT FROM THE NUCLEAR THREAT REDUCTION CAMPAIGN, ON THE INTRODUCTION OF THE GLOBAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ACT OF 2002

Since 1993, the International Atomic Energy Agency has documented almost 400 cases of trafficking in nuclear and other radioactive materials. Of those, 18 involved small volumes of weapons-grade plutonium or highly enriched uranium, and most of those cases originated in the former Soviet Union. Recent revelations from American intelligence officials indicate that Osama Bin Laden and his al Qaeda network have been trying to acquire radiological material to build a co-called ''dirty'' bomb for use against American targets.

At present, there are no cooperative programs to secure radiological materials in Russia or elsewhere. The Nuclear Threat Reduction Campaign (NTRC) applauds Senator Jean Carnahan (D–MO) for taking important measures to address this serious threat by introducing the Global Nuclear Security Act, 2002. In the wake of the tragic events of September 11th, Senator Carnahan's bill will begin the difficult, but necessary, process of securing radiological materials from potential terrorist theft, tighten international nuclear safety standards, and develop plans for mitigating the threat of terrorist attacks on nuclear power plants outside of the United States.

This bill supports the President's pledge that, ''Our highest priority is to keep terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction.'' The Global Nuclear Security Act, 2002 is an immediate and cost-effective mechanism to counter current threats to our national security.

(The NTRC has put forth a five-part agenda encouraging Congress and the Bush Administration to: work toward a comprehensive inventory of nuclear weapons and weapons-grade materials; pass the Debt-Reduction-for-Non-Proliferation Act; sign a legally-binding agreement to reduce stockpiles of strategic weapons held by the United States and Russia; strengthen joint U.S.-Russia threat reduction and non-proliferation programs; and expand existing programs to mitigate the threat of bioterrorism. The NTRC is a project of the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation and The Justice Project.)

Mrs. CARNAHAN. In January of this year, I traveled, with eight of my colleagues, to meet with the leaders of Pakistan, Turkey, Afghanistan, and several countries of the former Soviet Union.

We were impressed with their level of commitment to the war against terrorism, and to making the world safe from weapons of mass destruction. We are all in this struggle against terrorism together. The only way to lock up all nuclear and radiological material is for friends and allies to work together and share the burden. We will spend several billions of dollars this year to improve our homeland security, and rightly so. But we also must recognize that we are only as safe as the weakest link in the chain-link fence guarding some nuclear material in far away country.

I fully support President Bush's call to action, when he said late last year, with Russian President Putin by his side, that ''Our highest priority is to keep terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction.''

I hope my colleagues will join me as well in supporting this effort.

STATEMENTS ON SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 261—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT PUBLIC SERVANTS SHOULD BE COMMENDED FOR THEIR DEDICATION AND CONTINUED SERVICE TO THE NATION DURING PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. VOINOVICH, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. THOMPSON) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 261

Whereas Public Service Recognition Week provides an opportunity to honor and celebrate the commitment of individuals who meet the needs of the Nation through work at all levels of government;

Whereas over 20,000,000 men and women work in government service in every city, county, and State across America and in hundreds of cities abroad;

Whereas the United States of America is a great and prosperous Nation, and public service employees have contributed significantly to that greatness and prosperity;

Whereas Americans benefit daily from the knowledge and skills of these highly trained individuals;

Whereas public servants—

(1) help the Nation recover from natural disasters and terrorist attacks;

(2) fight crime and fire;

(3) deliver the mail;

(4) teach and work in the schools;

(5) deliver Social Security and Medicare benefits;

(6) fight disease and promote better health;

(7) protect the environment and national parks;

(8) improve transportation and the quality of water and food;

(9) build and maintain roads and bridges;

(10) provide vital strategic and support functions to our military;

(11) keep the Nation's economy stable;

(12) defend our freedom; and

(13) advance United States interests around the world;

Whereas public servants at the Federal, State, and local level are the first line of defense in maintaining homeland security;

Whereas for every essential service disrupted by the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, public servants responded quickly and effectively, many giving their lives for their country;

Whereas public servants demonstrated once again on September 11, 2001, that civil servants at every level of government are decent, hard-working men and women, committed to doing a good job regardless of the circumstances;

Whereas America's Federal employees have risen to the occasion and demonstrated professionalism, dedication, and courage during the attacks of September 11, 2001, and in their aftermath;

Whereas after September 11, 2001, thousands of Federal employees were deployed in