

really missed the mark and is not focused on the real challenge: how to ensure that all areas of the country have access to broadband services.

Despite some claims to the contrary, broadband access is not a luxury item, like a Mercedes Benz. It has become a necessity in the information age. For rural States like South Dakota, broadband access is literally going to mean whether or not some of our small communities can survive in the new global economy where one's ability to access information and communication services will determine success or failure. While South Dakota will always be an important agricultural State, we know that we need to have the same access to advanced telecommunications and information services as the rest of the country. If we become a second-class society when it comes to broadband, we are more likely to be left behind. We will have less opportunity to keep our young people in the State and have less opportunity to create jobs and generate business activity.

The good news is that there is really no reason why rural America has to lag behind the advances in telecommunications in other parts of the country. But, in order to ensure that we have the same opportunities as those in urban and suburban areas, we have to overcome the unique challenges of covering great geographic distances and the high costs of deploying networks in the prairie states.

Well, help is on the way and we have begun to make some progress towards establishing policies and programs that will help ensure that rural America is not left behind.

First, the recently enacted farm bill contained provisions that established a new low-interest broadband loan program for rural areas. A generation ago, The Rural Electrification Act established low-interest loan programs to enable small town cooperatives and independent phone companies to emerge and provide telephone service and electrical service in the rural and remote areas of the country. As a result, we now have ubiquitous and affordable telephone service. Now that we are moving into the next generation of telecommunications service, i.e., broadband, we need to build upon that model of success. Thus, the Senate demonstrated leadership in the Farm Bill debate this past year and we managed to pass the most significant broadband legislation to date. We provided \$100 million for low-interest government loans for broadband deployment in rural areas over the next seven years. This is going to be very helpful to South Dakota and other rural areas, and I am very pleased that we managed to secure the passage of this landmark legislation.

However, the job is far from complete. The broadband debate needs to move forward and there are several areas that need to be addressed before any of us can honestly say that we have done enough to ensure that

broadband is going to be deployed throughout the United States.

Some of my colleagues have introduced legislation that addresses the broadband issue from various fronts, and I do see merit in the various approaches.

Senator ROCKEFELLER for example has introduced S. 88, the Broadband Internet Access Act. This important legislation would provide tax credits to companies that deploy broadband service to rural America. I am a cosponsor of S. 88 and worked with Senator BAUCUS and others to include this legislation in the stimulus package passed by the Finance Committee. It is unfortunate this package was not adopted by the Senate; however, I will continue to work with my colleagues to secure passage of S. 88.

Another colleague, Senator BREAUX, has introduced legislation that is intended to address the regulatory inequity between cable and telephone broadband systems. The Breaux-Nickles legislation, in my judgment, also addresses a legitimate issue. The problem with our current circumstance is that the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, has decided that cable broadband services should not be regulated but that telephone broadband services should be regulated. This does not make much sense to me. In fact, this circumstance seems to run counter to the technical neutrality policy that Congress adopted in the 1996 Telecommunications Act. It seems to me that similar services should be treated in similar fashion when it comes to government regulation. It does not make much sense to say that on the one hand, broadband services delivered by a cable company should not be regulated, i.e., are not required to provide access to competitors and do not contribute to universal service, and on the other hand subject broadband service provided by telephone companies to regulations that require open access to competitors and mandatory universal service contributions.

As we debate this issue to determine the appropriate level of regulation, we must be certain that we have parity between competitors. I still have much to learn about all the implications of the Breaux-Nickles legislation, but I do know that it does address an important issue, the disparity of regulation between cable and telephone broadband services.

Yet another colleague, Senator HOLLINGS, has introduced a bill that builds upon the success of the farm bill and would redirect some of the existing telephone excise tax money into a broadband investment fund. The money in that fund would make even more low-interest loans and grants available for broadband deployment in rural areas. His bill would also support needed research into new generation broadband technologies, especially those that can help bridge the digital divide in rural areas. I think his legislation is very thoughtful and I agree

with the notion that we do indeed need to invest more into loans and grants for rural broadband. His bill is, in my judgment, part of the solution.

I realize that there are some strongly held positions on various sides of the broadband debate when it comes to the regulatory questions. The Congress will need to examine these issues and I am confident that the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation will continue to debate the various pieces of legislation that have been introduced. I also know that there are some approaches where we seem to have a consensus, namely the idea that we continue to provide low-interest loans and that we maintain the universal service system that has helped to make phone service affordable. For my part, I intend to engage in these debates from the perspective of how rural America is going to participate in the digital age. Rural South Dakota is my biggest concern and I hope that my colleagues who are working hard on these issues will listen and work with those Senators, like myself, who come from rural states to address our unique concerns.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on these important issues. I thank my colleagues for their leadership in this area.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO VICE ADMIRAL
GEORGE PETER NANOS, JR.,
COMNAVSEA

• Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Vice Admiral George Peter Nanos, Jr., United States Navy. Vice Admiral Nanos will retire on Monday, 1 July 2002, after 35 years of faithful service to our nation.

Hailing from Bedford, New Hampshire, Vice Admiral Nanos is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy. At the Academy, he was awarded the 1967 Harry E. Ward Trident Scholar's Prize. Following graduation, he spent two years at sea as Antisubmarine Warfare and Gunnery Officer on USS *Glennon* (DD 840) before entering Princeton University, where he earned a Ph.D. in physics in 1974.

Returning to sea, Vice Admiral Nanos served as Engineer Officer aboard USS *Forrest Sherman* (DD 931) and as Materiel Officer on the staff of Destroyer Squadron Ten. From 1978 to 1982, he was the manager for Technical Development in the Navy's High Energy Laser Program Office (NAVSEA PMS 405). He then served as the Combat Systems Officer in Norfolk Naval Shipyard while also training to become an Engineering Duty Officer. He returned to sea yet again as Chief Engineer for the aircraft carrier USS *America* (CV 66). While on *America*, he participated in Operation Eldorado Canyon and helped to ensure the successful launch of naval airstrikes against

Libya after that country was linked to a terrorist bombing of a West Berlin discotheque, which killed 1 American and injured 78 people. Following this tour, he was assigned as the Deputy Director, Warfare Systems Engineering in the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command.

In 1988, Vice Admiral Nanos reported to Strategic Systems Programs, serving consecutively as Head of the Navigation Branch, head of the Missile Branch, and Director of the Technical Division. In June 1994, he assumed duties as Director, Strategic Systems Programs, responsible for all aspects of the Navy's Fleet Ballistic Missile Weapon Systems.

In May 1998, Vice Admiral Nanos assumed his rank and duties as Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command, the Navy's largest acquisition organization. Throughout the past four years, he has been responsible for the design, engineering, procurement, integration, construction, in-service support, and maintenance of the Navy's ships, shipboard weapons, and combat systems.

Vice Admiral Nanos' service education includes U.S. Naval Destroyer School at Newport, Rhode Island; Engineering Duty Officer basic and mid-career courses; the Senior Officer Ship Materiel Readiness Course at Idaho Falls, Idaho; and the Program Management Course at the Defense Systems Management College, Fort Belvoir, Virginia. His specialty as an Engineering Duty Officer is ordnance and weapons systems acquisition.

Vice Admiral Nanos successfully led the Command through a brilliant transformation of NAVSEA'S business practices in executing complex acquisition and Fleet maintenance and modernization responsibilities. He expertly managed the resizing, recapitalizing, and realignment of the personnel and technical resources devoted to designing, building, repairing, and modernizing ships and their weapons systems. Displaying bold vision, innovation, and superb leadership, he instituted far-reaching quality initiatives that forged a highly focused, reenergized workforce. These have transformed the Command into a unified corporation that provides world-class technical, acquisition, and life-cycle support leadership to America's Navy. His contributions have had a direct and lasting impact on the overall readiness, effectiveness, and survivability of the United States Armed Forces.

Vice Admiral Nanos' superb leadership, exceptional integrity, engineering expertise, and tireless devotion to duty reflect great credit upon him and are in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service. He has done a superb job in leading the Naval Sea Systems Command to fulfill its mission: Keeping America's Navy #1 in the World.

Although Vice Admiral Nanos has worked diligently to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of naval and marine shipbuilding capabilities

throughout the United States, he has often shown his dedication to and respect for the men and women of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard team. He recently visited the Shipyard to personally congratulate and thank the Shipyard team for their record-setting work on two submarines: A record-setting depot maintenance period on USS *Miami*, followed by a record-setting engineering refueling overhaul on USS *City of Corpus Christi*. Thanks in part to his vision, the Shipyard retains its important military-industrial capabilities and continues to provide critical jobs for the region.

Vice Admiral Nanos' innovation has ensured the success of the Naval Sea Systems Command and the United States Navy's ships well into the 21st Century. He is an individual of uncommon character and his professionalism will be sincerely missed. I am proud, Mr. President, to thank him for his honorable service in the United States Navy, and to wish him fair winds and following seas as he closes his distinguished military career.

I suspect Vice Admiral Nanos will continue his adventures, and will bring much credit to his name, as well as our government and our country. He is a true American hero, and his direct contributions to our military will long be remembered with heartfelt gratitude.●

A TRIBUTE TO ALONZO FRANKLIN HERNDON

● Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, shortly after the turn of the 20th century, Alonzo Franklin Herndon, a former slave, founded the Atlanta Mutual Insurance Association, which would later become the Atlanta Life Insurance Company. Today, Atlanta Life holds assets of over \$200 million, operates in 17 states, and stands as one of the largest African-American owned and operated financial institutions in the Nation.

Born on a farm near Social Circle, GA, in 1858, Herndon's beginnings were anything but auspicious. He spent his early life in field labor and sharecropping. However, he ultimately learned the barbering trade and flourished. By the turn of the century, he owned and operated the world renowned Crystal Palace barbershop on Peachtree Street in downtown Atlanta. By the time he founded the Atlanta Mutual Insurance Association, Alonzo Herndon was one of the wealthiest African-Americans in the Nation.

Alonzo Herndon's vision for his company transcended conventional corporate thinking. Mr. Herndon was not only worried about the bottom line, but about the health and livelihood of African-Americans throughout the Atlanta area. The Atlanta Mutual Insurance Association was formed after Mr. Herndon purchased a small benevolent association for \$140, and acquired and reorganized two other companies in September of 1905. By providing sick and death benefits to African-Ameri-

cans for affordable weekly assessments of 5 to 25 cents, the Atlanta Life Insurance Company defined corporate responsibility to the community.

Today, we honor the Atlanta Life Insurance Company on the occasion of their founder's day birthday celebration. Specifically, we join Atlanta Life in honoring the barber profession, without which Alonzo Herndon would not have been able to create the Atlanta Life Insurance Company. Moreover, we look forward to the 2005 Founder's Celebration commemorating the 100th anniversary of Atlanta Life's founding. In an age where corporate malfeasance is too often in the news, it gives me great pride to celebrate a company that has succeeded financially without compromising its values. I wish the Atlanta Life Insurance Company many more years of success.●

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE RISK OF NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION CREATED BY THE ACCUMULATION OF WEAPONS-USABLE FISSILE MATERIAL IN THE TERRITORY OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION BEYOND JUNE 21, 2002—PM 93

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared with respect to the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation is to continue beyond June 21, 2002, to the *Federal Register* for publication. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on June 14, 2001, (66 FR 32207).

It remains a major national security goal of the United States to ensure that fissile material removed from Russian nuclear weapons pursuant to various arms control and disarmament agreements is dedicated to peaceful uses, subject to transparency measures, and protected from diversion to activities of proliferation concern. The accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United