

a Federal court order which restricts the number of days fishermen can fish; \$10 million for NOAA for such things as backup capability of satellite services and a supercomputer backup.

The bill changes the Advanced Technology Program which currently imposes a ceiling of \$60.7 million on the amount of new grants that can be awarded by the end of the fiscal year to establishing a floor of \$60.7 million that can be awarded in any new grants by the end of the fiscal year; \$1.725 million for the International Trade Administration. ITA has already received a substantial increase in funding during the last few appropriations cycles.

The appropriators' practice of legislating on items within the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee knows no bounds. This bill would prohibit the use of funds to implement, enforce, or otherwise abide by the memorandum of understanding between the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice that was signed March 5, 2002.

Again, the test whether we are acting responsibly is simple. Just read the title of the bill. This bill is the "Further Recovery From and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States." Any item that is not for this purpose should not be in this bill.

Using the guise of responding to the terrorist acts of September 11 to spend Federal funds on items that obviously have nothing to do with fighting terrorism is war profiteering, pure and simple. Such actions do not help the war effort but only do a disservice to the honorable men and women who are on the front line fighting this war.

Again, I am very pleased that one of our first actions is to remove one of the most egregious aspects of this bill, and that is the basic emasculation of the Aviation Loan and Stabilization Program. Why it was ever in the bill, of course, escapes my understanding. Perhaps it was going to be one of those deals that would be done, as is so often on these appropriations bills, in such a way that no one would notice, which is the general way that porkbarrel spending ends up enacted into law. So I am pleased we are going to act on it and, of course, we need to have a recorded vote on it to ensure that the will of the Senate is clearly expressed as this bill would go to conference with the other body.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, at the outset, let me say I agree with my distinguished colleague from Arizona about striking section 1004. The purpose for my seeking recognition has been to address that subject.

The Congress acted promptly, after September 11, to provide for \$10 billion in loan guarantees because the airlines were hit in a very drastic manner. Obviously, after the attack on the World Trade Towers, the striking of the Pentagon, and the plane which went down

in Somerset County, PA, my home State, air traffic stopped instantly. In fact, for several days you could not fly at all. The FAA grounded all the planes.

With the closing of Reagan National Airport, a major airport in the United States, US Airways, which is hubbed in my State, Pennsylvania, was very heavily impacted. It was very difficult. So Congress acted to provide for \$10 billion in loan guarantees.

When this provision was put in section 1004, which limited the guarantees to \$4 billion and not more than \$429 million from being spent in fiscal year 2002, it sent shudders through the airline industry, including US Airways in Pennsylvania.

US Airways is a great national and international carrier, very important for the United States generally, but of particular importance to Pennsylvania where there are some 17,000 US Airways employees, with hubs in Pittsburgh and in Philadelphia. When US Airways was having problems immediately after September 11, Mr. Stephen Wolf, Chairman of US Airways, called me and others in the Pennsylvania delegation to secure our help, which we provided. US Airways had not planned to make an immediate request for a loan but decided to defer until this summer when they are moving to reorganize the company.

Yesterday, while I was traveling in Pennsylvania, I received a call that US Airways had asked me to introduce the amendment to strike section 1004. I immediately agreed to take the lead. Later in the day, I heard that the amendment would be authored by Senator HOLLINGS, the chairman of the Commerce Committee, and Senator MCCAIN, ranking member, with the Aviation Subcommittee chairs joining to give it the impact of the full Commerce Committee which has authorization and jurisdiction. I am pleased to note this morning that Senator BYRD, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and Senator STEVENS, the ranking member, have undertaken the amendment, which shows how the issue has escalated in a very brief period of time.

For a while it was very onerous and very worrisome. Last week, during the recess, I traveled the State. I was in Pittsburgh, where 11,000 of the 17,000 Pennsylvania employees work. There was great consternation as to what would happen to US Airways. When I was in Erie, there was a similar concern. There was a similar concern in Altoona, a concern in Allentown, a concern in Wilkes-Barre, and a concern in Scranton.

That is good news indeed, and not just to US Airways, but also other carriers, with the expectation that United may be applying for a substantial loan guarantee of \$2 billion, and US Airways at \$1 billion. Had this loan guarantee not been available, it would have been at a particularly bad time to US Airways, which is trying to restructure

the entire airline. There has been a very difficult situation regarding cashflow this year.

I am very pleased to see this amendment has been offered by the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. That has been done with their awareness of the tremendous impact it would have on the Nation when we had legislation to provide \$10 billion in loan guarantees, that it should stand, and there had been reliance by the airline industry on those loan guarantees being available. So this amendment will obviously solve that problem.

We still have to go to conference with the House, which, as I understand it, prohibits loan guarantees until fiscal year 2003, but would not reduce the overall amount of the loan guarantees available.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, in the absence of any other Senator in the Chamber, if no one is seeking recognition to talk about the bill, I ask unanimous consent I may proceed for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

#### UNITED STATES-SYRIA RELATIONS

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I have sought recognition to talk briefly about a United States-Syria dialogue, which was held two weeks ago at the James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy at Rice University in Houston, Texas. I attended the conference, characterized as a dialogue. It was directed at trying to find some way of improving United States-Syria relations. Quite naturally, the conversation focused on terrorism.

I have had the opportunity to visit Syria on many occasions since the mid-1980s and have always believed that Syria was a key to a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East. During the course of those visits, I came to know President Hafez al-Assad. I saw, with almost yearly visits from the late 1980s until I attended President Assad's funeral in June 2000, a subtle but decisive shift in Syrian thinking so that Syria did attend the Madrid Conference in 1991. Syria was engaged in very extensive discussions with Israel at a time when Prime Minister Rabin was in office. Those negotiations were conducted in a somewhat curious way, through President Bill Clinton. Syrians would not talk directly to the Israelis. The Israelis made efforts to talk directly to the Syrians. However, whatever format those negotiations took, they came very close to an agreement, with Israel committing to a return of

the Golan Heights. Security arrangements had not been quite worked out and the precise boundary form had not been laid, but they were very close.

Regrettably, with the assassination of Prime Minister Rabin and with other leadership in Israel, there was a time when the relationship was very difficult. In 1996, the Syrians had some maneuvers on their border near Israel at a time when Prime Minister Netanyahu said that Israel would hold Syria accountable for what was happening with Hezbollah in southern Lebanon. At any rate, the peace talks disintegrated.

When I had a chance to visit the new President, Bashar al-Assad, in March 2002, I suggested to him while the time might be not exactly right now, with the problems with Israel and the Palestinian Authority, those negotiations ought to be resumed at an early date. I reported that conversation to President George W. Bush and made the suggestion that President Bush might be determinative and influential, as President Clinton had been. While no commitment was made, that is something that would be considered by the Bush Administration when the time was right.

Edward Djerejian had been Ambassador to Syria, and when he visited President Bashar al-Assad early this year, he had a discussion with President al-Assad about having this United States-Syrian dialogue, and the James A. Baker III Institute hosted it. Former Ambassador Djerejian is the executive director there. Their plan is to have another Syrian-United States dialogue in the fall. I made the suggestion to the Syrians in attendance, former Secretary of State James Baker, who attended, and also former Ambassador Djerejian, that a good time to schedule another dialogue would be right after the elections this November, perhaps the Thursday following the Tuesday election. That is about the only time Members of Congress are somewhat uncommitted. I received a comment that they might be willing to consider that. So, in addition to the Presiding Officer, any of my colleagues who may be listening on C-SPAN, may reserve the Thursday after the elections to join a congressional delegation to travel to Syria and participate in these important discussions.

Regrettably, Damascus has not been a hot spot on congressional travel. However, I think that visits there could be very useful.

At the conference two weeks ago, the focus was in trying to define terrorism. It seems to me pretty clear that when civilians are targeted, that constitutes terrorism and that is unacceptable. There is a disagreement on that subject, a disagreement which I had with the Iranian Ambassador to the United Nations, who visited Washington. I hosted a small dinner for him several months ago as part of an effort to have a visit by Parliamentarians from the House and Senate with the Iranian

Parliamentarians, a suggestion which goes on again, off again. It is a little difficult right now with President Khatami responding in somewhat of an unfriendly tone to some of what the administration has had to say about Iran being part of the "axis of evil."

At any rate, the Iranian Ambassador to the UN emphasized the point that he thought Hezbollah had a right to undertake military activities against the Israelis because of what he terms "the occupation." It is a discussion which needs a lot of work. I think ultimately there can be a definition of terrorism to include attacks on civilians.

However, the issue of having a dialogue is one which is very important. The three-day session in Houston was closed to the press, but I think it is within the bounds to comment that terrorism was the focus of attention. It is always salutary when people get together and talk. It is my hope that we can have some influence on Syrian activities, having Hamas and Hezbollah and other organizations, which we consider terrorist organizations and on the terrorist list, to have them ultimately ousted.

There has been a recognition by the State Department about Syria's help on al-Qaida. There has been a recognition that Syrian assistance has, in fact, saved American lives. Much, much more needs to be done, but the dialogue at the James Baker Institute is a good start. If we could get a significant congressional delegation to go to Damascus in the fall, I think it would help that very important effort. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 3557

Mr. BOND. Madam President, when the shocking events of September 11 hit us, we all realized that major changes had occurred. The devastation and the death that was visited by the terrorists were truly shocking. But there was collateral damage as well in many areas. We are seeing small businesses that have been put out of business. We have worked hard to try to help them.

But, obviously, one of the most severely affected areas of our economy—really, the lifeline of our Nation's transportation system—the airline industry, was severely hurt by this action. Not only did we shut down flights

for a period of days, which cost the airlines literally billions of dollars, their insurance rates skyrocketed and put them at risk. And when you put the airline industry at risk, you put all of us at risk because ours is a very mobile country that depends upon a healthy, competitive airline industry.

I came to the floor on September 13 to urge my colleagues to take immediate action. Well, people in both Houses shared that view, and we did act. We adopted critical legislation to ensure that our airlines could continue to operate even as their insurance rates skyrocketed. This was a successful approach.

Then we embarked on another approach. We said we would set up a \$10 billion loan guarantee program to provide assistance to airlines that were doing well, that were "taking off," so to speak, but whose cash shortfall was exacerbated by the shutdown and the slow return of airline passengers. That \$10 billion loan guarantee program sounded like a good idea.

We should support this amendment that tries to preserve the full commitment we made to our airlines and to the traveling American public.

Now, we have a problem, specifically with the ATSB—that fine group of Federal servants—that decide what airlines get the money. So far, I think there have been seven applications; and they have only granted one. Even if all the applications were granted, I understand that \$10 billion would be more than enough to cover them.

I have had a real problem because we have a fine, growing airline, a new airline in Kansas City, called Vanguard Airlines. So far, the ATSB has formally denied three loan applications submitted by Vanguard. Actually, they have only approved one. That was for America West. We are very glad that our colleagues who fly on America West and the people served by America West will be helped.

The intent of this program was to help airlines such as America West and, I believe, such as Vanguard. When you look at the facts, Vanguard actually stacks up better than America West when you consider the necessary criteria. The airline was growing rapidly and consistently prior to September 11. The airline is trying to get back on its feet, has recently made new hires, is getting back on a growth track. It is increasing routes and hiring people. They wanted a private loan package that would allow them to purchase more aircraft, more Boeing MD-90s.

When I talked with one of the officials at ATSB, they said: Well, we don't have any collateral. If you don't have collateral, and you are going to use the loan to buy an airplane, guess from where the collateral is going to come? They are even bringing in equity funding that would come in with the loan if it were granted. If we fail to do that, the potential ripple effect will not only be on the airline industry but