

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. NELSON of Florida):

S. 2730. A bill to modify certain water resources projects for the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Georgia, Florida and Alabama; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, the locals call it "God's country." The Apalachicola River, beginning at the confluence of the Chattahoochee and Flint River, near the borders of Alabama, Florida, and Georgia, was and remains an important waterway in the southeast. The river's purpose as a waterway, however, has changed since its colonial fame.

The Apalachicola is the largest river east of the Mississippi. In its heyday, the Apalachicola was an important tributary that served as the largest port on the Gulf of Mexico, harboring ships carrying cotton to Europe and New England.

In the 21st century, while no longer an essential route of transport, the Apalachicola River is an important environmental and commercial asset. The history of the Apalachicola River is an Army Corps of Engineers project began in 1945 with the Rivers and Harbors Act, which authorized dredging of navigation channels. Over the past 57 years, millions of taxpayer dollars have been swept down the river in an effort to dredge and maintain the 9 foot deep channel.

The Corps has had difficulty maintaining the channel, and combines dredging with water releases in order to raise water levels and provide navigation windows. This system is hopelessly flawed. Dredging is unmanageable and navigation windows are unreliable, making the process a fiscal waste.

Add to this fact over the last few years, commercial barge traffic has slowed from an intermittent stream to a virtually non-existent trickle. River traffic dropped dramatically in the late 1990's, with fewer than 200 barges a year using the river system. By 2001, only 30 barges used the entire tri-river system with the cost of dredging the channel exceeding \$30,000 per barge. The past November, the only company that used barges to carry cargo on the upper reaches of the river ceased operations.

Furthermore, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the average cost per ton-mile from 1995-98 at 14.1 cents, almost 24 times more than the cost of the Upper Mississippi River at .597 cents. In light of these circumstances, continuing to dredge Florida's largest river is not just wasteful, it is foolish.

Ending the dredging is not just about how wasteful this project is, it is also about the environmental destruction that is being inflicted on the Apalachicola River and Bay. There are now beaches of sand where there were once

river banks. There are now walls of sand, some towering like buildings four stories high, where the river waters used to meander. To date, dredged sand has resulted in the destruction of approximately one-quarter of the banks of the Apalachicola. The large amounts of sand have choked sloughs and cut off the water supply to surrounding habitat, ultimately threatening the local economy.

Navigation windows remain a threat to endanger species like the Gulf Sturgeon, the Fat Three-Ridge and the Purple Bank Climber. The April 2000 navigation window resulted in an almost complete failure of sportfish spawn along the entire Apalachicola River and reservoirs upstream. Sportfish populations have been in rapid decline along the river since 1990. This time frame corresponds with the Corps' continued reliance on water releases to provide adequate water for navigation.

The constant and gross interruptions of nature have degraded the environment of the Apalachicola River and quality of life of those who depend upon it. Because of this, the Apalachicola recently earned the designation by American Rivers as one of our nation's Most Endangered Rivers. The Apalachicola has also been included in the 2000 Troubled Waters Report and the 2001 and 2002 Green Scissors Reports.

Manipulation of the Apalachicola poses a serious risk to the local economy. Important businesses, such as farmers who produce Tupelo honey and the fishermen who harvest oysters and shrimp in Apalachicola Bay, are dependent on the river's overall health. Commercial fishing operations along the Gulf Coast also rely on the Bay for their livelihood.

The negative impacts of dredging and the low commercial use of the Apalachicola River led former Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Joe Westphal, to describe the project as not "economically justified or environmentally defensible."

Dredging the Apalachicola exacts too high a price from both taxpayers and the environment. Clearly it is time to rethink this expensive and ecologically devastating practice. The bill I offer today, the Restore the Apalachicola River Ecosystem, RARE, Act, provides for the actions necessary to reform the Apalachicola River project.

First, my bill puts a stop to navigational dredging.

Secondly, it instructs the Corps to develop a comprehensive restoration plan to be submitted to Congress that corrects the past harms done to the Apalachicola.

This legislation is widely supported in the State of Florida. Governor Jeb Bush and his Cabinet recently passed a resolution that calls the end of navigational dredging on the Apalachicola. My bill is supported by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, the Northwest Florida Water Management District, Tax-

payers for Common Sense, American Rivers, Audubon Society, Florida Wildlife Federation, the Apalachicola Bay and River Keepers, Help Save the Apalachicola River, the Nature Conservancy, the Apalachee Ecological Conservancy, the Chipola River Economic and Environmental Council, the League of Conservation Voters Education Fund, Florida PIRG, the Florida Fishermen Federation, and 1000 Friends of Florida.

The only way to restore the Apalachicola River to its former greatness is to cease navigational dredging. This designation of the Apalachicola as one of the nation's most endangered rivers should be a wake-up call to Congress and the Army Corps of Engineers to permanently end the dredging of the Apalachicola and allow the river to return to its natural state free of man's manipulation.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, which is both fiscally sound and environmentally responsible.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I rise to day in support of the Graham-Nelson bill to de-authorize the dredging of the Apalachicola River.

The time has come to end the dredging of the Apalachicola river in north Florida. The detriments far outweigh the benefits of this expensive Army Corps of Engineers river project. The barge traffic is negligible; and the environmental and economic impact to the area surrounding this river are harmful.

Since 1998, fewer than 140 barges have used the Florida portion of the Apalachicola River. And of the barge traffic that does navigate this waterway, most is confined to a 6 mile long stretch of the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint ACF River System for the transport of sand and gravel, the principal commodity shipped on the system.

The dredging to keep this small amount of barge traffic going has resulted in sand mountains that have destroyed one-quarter of the banks of the Apalachicola River and choked sloughs cutting off water supply to surrounding habitat. In addition, the releases of large quantities of water to allow barge traffic to navigate the river disrupts the spawning behavior of three endangered species: the Gulf Sturgeon, the Fat Three-Ridge and the Purple Bank Climber.

Another concern is the effect of pulses of this fresh water on the balance of salt and fresh water in Apalachicola Bay. The Apalachicola Bay is the largest oyster harvesting area in the Gulf of Mexico and one of the principal nurseries for Gulf Shrimp and blue crabs. Commercial fishing operations along the Gulf coast rely heavily on the Bay for their continued prosperity. The fresh water influxes threaten this important industry. For these reasons, this project must end.

I urge my colleagues support for this important piece of legislation.

By Mr. CORZINE (for himself and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 2731. A bill to establish the Crossroads of the American Revolution National Heritage Area in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, today along with Senator TORRICELLI I am introducing legislation, the Crossroads of the American Revolution National Heritage Area Act of 2002, to establish the Crossroads of the American Revolution National Heritage Area in the State of New Jersey. I am proud to be joining my New Jersey colleagues, Representatives RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN and RUSH HOLT, who have introduced this legislation in the House of Representatives with the support of the entire New Jersey delegation.

This legislation recognizes the critical role that New Jersey played during the American Revolution. In fact, New Jersey was the site of nearly 300 military engagements that helped determine the course of our history as a nation. Many of these locations, like the site where George Washington made his historic crossing of the Delaware River, are well known and preserved. Others, such as the Monmouth Battlefield State Park in Manalapan and Freehold, and New Bridge Landing in River Edge, are less well known and are threatened by development or in critical need of funding for rehabilitation.

To help preserve New Jersey's Revolutionary War sites, this legislation would establish a Crossroads of the American Revolution National Heritage, linking about 250 sites in 15 counties. This designation would authorize \$10 million to assist preservation, recreational and educational efforts by the State, county and local governments as well as private cultural and tourism groups. The program would be managed by the non-profit Crossroads of the American Revolution Association.

A National Heritage Area would bring many benefits to New Jersey. First, it would help our communities and state preserve our history and educate our citizens. It would also encourage the protection of open space within the area, which is so critical to our quality of life. Finally, National Heritage Areas create significant economic opportunities, providing local communities with incentives and resources to work together to increase tourism in the region by highlighting historic sites and cultural events.

Simply put, we are the Nation that we are today because of the critical events that occurred in New Jersey during the American Revolution and the many who died fighting there. By enacting the Crossroads of the American Revolution National Heritage Area Act of 2002, we will pay tribute to the patriots who fought and died in New Jersey so that we might become a Nation free from tyranny.

I am proud to introduce this legislation to ensure that we properly honor New Jersey's pivotal role in our Nation's history as the true crossroads of the American Revolution.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 2732. A bill to allow a custodial parent a bad debt deduction for unpaid child support payments, and to require a parent who is chronically delinquent in child support to include the amount of the unpaid obligation in gross income; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the bill I am introducing today is long overdue. The Child Support Enforcement Act will bring much-needed relief to the millions of families who are not receiving the child support they are legally due.

The importance of this bill is clear. Each year, nearly 60 percent of parents owed child support receive less than the amount they are due. And more than 30 percent receive no payment at all. California is no exception: preliminary findings from the 2000 Census Report found that of the more than 2.3 million Californians who were owed child support, only 39 percent received those payments.

Clearly, millions of individuals, women and children, are in crisis when it comes to child support. It is time to treat delinquent child support the same way bad debt is treated in the tax law.

The Child Support Enforcement Act would allow custodial parents to deduct the amount of child support they are owed from their adjusted gross income on their income taxes. This is true for all taxpayers, regardless of whether they itemize. So while we are not providing the full amount they are due, this bill will provide much-needed relief.

This bill will also penalize the non-custodial parent who is not paying his or her legally obligated child support. It will force the deadbeat parent to add the owed amount to his adjusted gross income, creating a tax penalty.

This is not creating new tax law. It is extending current tax law on bad debts to delinquent child support payments. It's that simple.

The relief provided in this bill is extremely important for single parents. Child support payments can literally mean the difference between paying rent or being homeless; the difference between putting food on the table or being forced to let children go hungry; the difference between making ends meet or going on welfare.

I am pleased to be joined in this effort by Senator SNOWE. And Representative COX is introducing the House version of the bill today as well. As you can see, this is not a partisan issue, this is a family issue. It will help families and children nationwide. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill.

By Mr. BINGAMAN:

S. 2733. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand retirement savings for moderate and lower income workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the "Retirement Security for All Americans Act," legislation that will help all of our Nation's workers save for their retirement. Although there are several ways to measure pension and retirement plan coverage, there is one constant statistic, less than half of the workers in our country are covered by an employer sponsored pension plan. In spite of numerous incentives provided by Congress over the years, our Nation's coverage rate has remained virtually unchanged for the past three decades. New Mexico, my home State is the worst, with a coverage rate of 30 percent. In real terms, this means that 70 percent of New Mexicans working in the private sector will have to fund their retirement on the other 2 legs of the proverbial 3 legged stool, personal savings and Social Security. In truth, it seems unlikely that private sector workers who do not have a pension or retirement plan will have any significant savings, leaving them to get by on a one legged stool, not an easy trick.

Not surprisingly, the coverage rate is substantially reduced for lower income workers and minorities. For example, the 1999 U.S. Census Current Population Survey illustrates that only 27 percent of Hispanics in the private sector have an employer sponsored pension or retirement plan while it is 47 percent for whites and 44 percent for all workers. The Census data further illustrates that minorities are more likely to work at jobs that do not offer their workers a retirement plan. For instance, only 40 percent of Hispanics work at jobs that offer retirement plans while 62 percent of whites and 58 percent of all workers have this employee benefit. If, on the other hand, an employer does offer its employees a retirement plan, the Census data indicates that all workers, regardless of race or ethnicity tend to participate at the same rate. While it is not conclusive, this data indicates that if workers are offered a plan, they tend to take advantage of this benefit and save for their retirement.

We cannot continue to have a national retirement policy that results in the majority of Americans not having adequate savings for what is supposed to be their golden years. This is unacceptable. The legislation that I am introducing today addresses this need by encouraging employers to not only offer plans, but to provide contributions to their lower paid workers. While each of these provisions standing alone would improve coverage and our national savings rate, combined, there is a strong synergic effect among the provisions, making passage of all three imperative.

The first provision expands and makes permanent the current Savers'

Credit that was signed into law last year. Under this new provision, employees earning up to \$15,000, \$30,000 for married couples, will receive \$0.50 for every dollar that they save in their 401(k) or IRA. The credit rate gradually phases down for those with incomes between \$15,000 and \$27,500, \$30,000 and \$55,000 for married couples. Currently, the Savers' Credit drops from 50 percent to 20 percent once a worker makes \$15,001. We get rid of this cliff by phasing the credit out so as to not have disincentives to save more.

For those taxpayers without income tax liability, we will provide a tax credit of 50 cents on the dollar for their contributions through a new series of indexed government bonds. These bonds are not transferable and not redeemable until the worker retires to avoid abuses and to guarantee the funds are saved for retirement. By giving new savers bonds, it will encourage them to save more and help them realize the benefits of long term savings plans.

The second provision of the bill requires all employers with more than 10 employees, who do not currently offer their employees a qualified retirement plan, to provide their workers with the option of a payroll deduction IRA. Presently, all employers remit payments to financial institutions for a variety of reasons, including the deposit of payroll taxes, it is something that they already have to do. This provision would simply ask them to set up accounts at a financial institution so that workers can to send part of their own paychecks directly to an IRA set up at a financial institution of the employer's choice.

To offset any administrative cost, a tax credit of \$200 for the first year and \$50 for subsequent years is provided to the employer, though in most cases there will be no additional expense. Employers are also allowed to remit the employee's contributions to their IRAs on the same schedule as they currently remit payroll tax deposits to the same financial institutions or the IRS.

The benefits to the employee are clear. A payroll deduction IRA will allow workers to save small amounts out of each paycheck instead of making periodic or annual contributions to an IRA. As little as \$10 a week saved could result in an employee saving over \$750 dollars a year when combined with the Savers Credit. Saving is a learned response, the first step is to get people to save the first dollar and experience the benefits of compounding interest.

The final section incorporates the Senate passed provision that was dropped in the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 conference that provides small businesses with a tax credit for their contributions to the retirement accounts of their non-highly compensated employees. This provision, which has been pushed by Chairman Baucus and others for many years, will greatly increase the amount that employers contribute to workers' retirement plans.

Essentially it allows employers to receive a 50 percent tax credit on contributions up to 3 percent of an employee's annual compensation, but only to the non-highly compensated. To keep the costs of the proposal down, it is only available for a limited time, 3 years, to new plans. This should encourage many employers to not only offer a plan for the first time, but create a noteworthy incentive to contribute to these employees' accounts.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to bridge this enormous gap in pension coverage in our country. We must be realistic about how much we can accomplish in one shot. Coverage hasn't improved in 30 years. We must therefore continue to advance proposals that will make gradual but meaningful improvements. We cannot allow ourselves to operate under the fiction that the system is currently working for all Americans. At a time when Social Security solvency is at issue, we must find ways to reduce the reliance of all our seniors on these benefits for their retirement needs. It was never the intent of Social Security to be a retiree's sole source of retirement income. This legislation will begin the slow process of increasing our national pension coverage. Because these benefits will not accrue over night, we must act now while the spotlight is still on retirement policy. I hope all my colleagues will join me in passing this important legislation.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. HOLLINGS, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 2734. A bill to provide emergency assistance to non-farm small business concerns that have suffered economic harm from the devastating effects of drought; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce emergency legislation to help small non-farm businesses across this Nation that are in dire straits because of drought conditions in their State. They need assistance, particularly access to working capital to pay the bills and meet payroll, but they can't get it because they are falling through the cracks of Federal disaster loan programs.

Why? Well, this is hard to believe, but it is because a drought is not considered a disaster under the Small Business Administration's disaster loan program, and under the Department of Agriculture's disaster program, which does consider a drought a disaster, only agriculture-related businesses are eligible for disaster assistance.

This assistance is critical to the survival of thousands of small businesses that make their living in tourism and recreation industries, as well as other industries dependent on water. Droughts are a cruel phenomenon of nature. They are out of the control of a small business owner, and it isn't fair

that they aren't eligible for Federal disaster assistance but the victims of floods, fires, and hurricanes are.

With a very small change, we can make all the difference to affected small businesses. Specifically, I propose amending the Small Business Act in order to make a drought a disaster.

More than 30 States are struggling with drought right now, according to the National Drought Mitigation at the University of Nebraska, and far more than agricultural, forestry and livestock businesses are hurt. If you talk to the governors of your States, I am sure they will tell you how bad the situation is. In northern Massachusetts, we have been in a drought since last fall. In South Carolina, the conditions are so bad that small businesses dependent upon lake and river tourism have seen revenues drop anywhere from 17 to 80 percent. The victims range from fish and tackle shops to rafting businesses, from restaurants to motels, from marinas to gas stations. For those who are listening and discount the serious impact of drought on small businesses, ask the rafting businesses that went bankrupt in Texas in 1996. The rivers were so low that these established businesses lost everything.

I thank my colleagues who are cosponsors, Senators HOLLINGS, LANDRIEU, BAUCUS, BINGAMAN, DASCHLE, and JOHNSON. I invite my other colleagues with droughts in their States to cosponsor this bill and call on the Administration to work with our Committee in passing this emergency legislation before we go home for the break in August. These small businesses cannot wait.

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

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

S. 2734

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

SECTION 1. LOANS TO SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS DAMAGED BY DROUGHT.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Drought Relief Act".

(b) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) as of July 2002, more than 36 States (including Massachusetts, South Carolina, and Louisiana) have suffered from continuing drought conditions;

(2) droughts have a negative effect on State and regional economies;

(3) many small businesses in the United States sell, distribute, market, or otherwise engage in commerce related to water and water sources, such as lakes and streams;

(4) many small businesses in the United States suffer economic injury from drought conditions, leading to revenue losses, job layoffs, and bankruptcies;

(5) these small businesses need access to low-interest loans for business-related purposes, including paying their bills and making payroll until business returns to normal;

(6) absent a legislative change, only agriculture-related businesses are eligible for Federal disaster loan assistance as a result of drought conditions; and

(7) it is necessary to amend the Small Business Act to allow non-farm small businesses that have suffered economic injury

from drought to receive financial assistance through Small Business Administration Economic Injury Disaster Loans.

(c) EXPANSION OF DISASTER DEFINITION.—Section 3(k) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(k)) is amended by inserting “drought,” after “windstorms,”.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS/MEETINGS

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Wednesday, July 17, 2002, at 10:00 a.m. in Room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct an OVERSIGHT HEARING on the Protection of Native American Sacred Places.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at 224-2251.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Thursday, July 18, 2002, at 10:00 a.m. in Room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a HEARING on a bill to approve the settlement of water rights claims of the Zuni Indian Tribe in Apache County, Arizona, and for other purposes.

The Committee will meet again on Thursday, July 18, 2002, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a HEARING on S. 2065, a bill to Ratify an Agreement to Regulate Air Quality on the Southern Ute Indian Reservation.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at 224-2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be allowed to conduct a hearing during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 16, 2002. The purpose of this hearing will be to discuss the proposed ban on packer ownership and also the enforcement of the Packers and Stockyards Act. At 10:00 a.m. in SD-562

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 16, 2002, at 10:00 a.m. to conduct an oversight hearing on “The Semi-annual Report on Monetary Policy of the Federal Reserve.”

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on

Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Tuesday, July 16, 2002, at 2:30 pm on the nomination of Jonathan Adelstein to be a member of the FCC.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to hold a hearing during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 16th, 2002, at 2:30 p.m. in SD-366.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on the Administration's plans to request additional funds for wildland firefighting and forest restoration as well as ongoing implementation of the National Fire Plan.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet jointly with the Committee on the Judiciary on Tuesday, July 16, 2002, at 10:00 a.m. to conduct a hearing to receive testimony on New Source Review policy, regulations and enforcement activities.

The hearing will be held in SD-106.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 16, 2002 at 10 a.m., to hear testimony on Homeland Security and International Trade.

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet for a hearing on The Proposed Department of Homeland Security: Issues before the Help Committee during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 16, 2002 at 10 a.m. in SD-430.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY/COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet to conduct a joint hearing on “Clearing the Air: New Source Review Policy, Regulations and Enforcement Activities” on Tuesday, July 16, 2002 in Dirksen Room 106 at 10 a.m.

TENTATIVE WITNESS LIST

PANEL I

The Honorable Thomas L. Sansonetti, Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable Jeffrey Holmstead, Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

PANEL II

The Honorable William H. Sorrell, Attorney General, State of Vermont, Montpelier, VT.

The Honorable Eliot Spitzer, Attorney General, State of New York, New York, NY.

The Honorable Bill Pryor, Attorney General, State of Alabama, Montgomery, AL.

PANEL III

Mr. Eric Schaeffer, Director, Environmental Integrity Project, Rockefeller Family Fund, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Bob Slaughter, President National Petrochemical & Refiners Association, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Hilton Kelley, Port Arthur, TX.

Mr. Steve Harper, Director, Environment, Health, Safety, and Energy Policy, Intel, Corp., Washington, D.C.

Mr. John Walke, Clean Air Director, Natural Resources Defense Council, Washington, D.C.

Mr. E. Donald Elliott, Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP, Washington, D.C.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 16, 2002 at 10:00 a.m. and 2:30 p.m. to hold a closed hearing on the Joint Inquiry into the events of September 11, 2001.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE OVERSIGHT AND THE COURTS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on “FBI Computers: 1992 Hardware—2002 Problems” on Tuesday, July 16, 2002, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

WITNESS

Ms. Sherry Higgins, Project Management Executive, Office of the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, DC.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Britt Gordon McKein, who is an intern, be granted the privilege of the floor during debate today.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to grant floor privileges to my fellows, Stacy Sacks, David Dorsey, and Brian Hickey, for the duration of the floor debate on the bill.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator BAUCUS, I ask unanimous consent Alaine Perry, a detailee in his Finance Committee office, and Brian