

Idaho will not be subject to negotiations by environmental groups, States, and the industry. It also does not protect wilderness areas from new road construction. It will not retain large, green trees and snags—something that was in the South Dakota proposal.

I know it is an interesting ploy to say we want to do just exactly what South Dakota did. No one really means that. It is a totally different situation involving not 10 million acres but 8,000 acres.

There have been longstanding negotiations in South Dakota. It has been involved in the court system for a considerable period of time.

I think we have to get off that, and get off the fact that we only want to do what the majority leader wants. We want is to make sure that places such as beautiful Lake Tahoe, which is a lake surrounded by the States of Nevada and California are protected—a lot of people are living there. We are really afraid of a fire taking place there because lots of people now live in that basin.

During one of the trips that I remember taking with the supervisor of the forests in that area, he said: Senator, the thing we are worried about is fire, because of the downdrafts and updrafts that occur every day. If a fire starts in here, we will not be able to control it. We came very close this summer to having a fire burn into that basin. We were very fortunate. Nature was kind to us. It burned the other side toward Carson City. That was extremely important.

But what we want and what we hope to be able to have at a subsequent time is the Craig amendment and the amendment we will offer here. We will debate those two amendments and, of course, recognize that because we have the 60-vote threshold here in the Senate, we have been jumping through all of the hoops dealing with cloture. We would simply have the 60-vote threshold on both. We are in the process of seeing if we can work something out in that regard. That proposal was given to me by the Senator from Idaho earlier today. The staff is working to see if they can come up with the unanimous consent agreement.

What we want—and I will just lay out the broad outlines of that—is to protect Lake Tahoe.

What does that mean? We think 70 percent of the money should be spent protecting urban areas—not 70 percent creating new places to cut down trees where there are no people. Lake Tahoe is a perfect example of that. If we could have the trees thinned and, in effect, urban areas protected there for a quarter to a half mile, then it wouldn't matter what happened; we would be able to protect those properties and those people in that basin. The same applies around the rest of the country. We have to protect these urban areas.

We are not asking that 100 percent of the money be spent on these urban areas, but 70 percent. Now it is turned

around. Now only about 30 percent is spent in urban areas and 70 percent spent outside these urban areas.

As I indicated, the Black Hills settlement agreement creates thousands of acres of new wilderness in the Black Elk Wilderness Area. The Black Hills settlement is an environmentally responsible thinning in two areas in the Black Hills National Forest. The Black Hills settlement has conditions of sales negotiated among various parties, including environmental groups. The Black Hills settlement agreement allows negotiated sales to go forward without further appeal or lawsuits. The Black Hills settlement agreement contains large green trees and snags, and it protects endangered species and habitat.

We can get into more debate in that regard with this amendment offered by Senator CRAIG and the one we will offer at a subsequent time. But I just wanted to outline the two basic proposals and how we can't keep harping on the fact that we want to do what was done in South Dakota. Nobody really means that. It is just an effort to try to create an atmosphere where the rules we play by and have been directed by for so many years dealing with forests be done away with. It wasn't done in the settlement in South Dakota. We don't expect it to be done here.

It is my understanding we have a number of amendments that have been cleared and that have been approved by both Senator BYRD and Senator CONRAD. I suggest the absence of a quorum so we can make sure that is the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I apologize to my friend from New Jersey. I sat right by him for 6 years, and it was always hard for people to see me. I apologize. I thought Senator BURNS was the only Senator on the floor.

Mr. CORZINE. I appreciate that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. CORZINE. Thank you, Mr. President.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 2845

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I appreciate the distinguished Senator from Nevada giving me the opportunity to speak on an issue that I am really quite sad about, in all honesty. This is a human issue that I bring to the floor today that I think is an oversight on the part of the Senate and actually all of us in public life.

I want to speak about families of lawful noncitizens whose loved ones perished in the World Trade Center. They are about to be put into a posi-

tion where, on a legal basis, they are deportable as of September 11, 2002, and this at the same time as they are taking on that incredibly difficult task of dismantling their lives here in the United States and returning to their country of birth.

This legislation would extend by 1 year the relief we provided in the Patriot Act to allow noncitizens whose parent or spouse was murdered in the terrorist attacks of September 11.

Today is September 10, just 1 day shy of the 1-year anniversary of the most significant terrorist attack on the United States in history.

The United States lost some 2,800 lives, as you know, but in the past year we have forgotten, in my view, to take into consideration the 504 nationals from 86 foreign countries who were a part of that. Many of these victims were in the United States as guest workers, contributing their technical expertise in helping the U.S. economy be the strongest in the world, be the engine of the world's economy. When they died, their hopes to provide a better life for themselves and their children in the United States died with them.

Tomorrow is September 11, and deportation proceedings could very well begin, if the INS were to proceed this way, for the grieving families of those temporary workers. While those families watch the media coverage of the anniversary—coverage that will no doubt extol the bravery and the sacrifice of so many of their family members—their presence in the United States will be in jeopardy.

These families were admitted to the United States 100 percent lawfully. They had all of their papers. They were admitted because we invited them here to help drive our economy. They did not sneak across any border or overstay their visas. They are lawfully present in the United States because work visas were provided to their loved ones. They paid taxes and submitted all appropriate paperwork. They were active in our communities in New York and New Jersey and very productive members of our society. Yet on the 1-year anniversary of the death of their loved ones, the INS could begin making arrangements for their removal from this country. Fortunately, the INS said they are going to turn a blind eye. But folks have to live with the risk that this is a possibility.

The challenges faced by these brave families were anticipated by those of us in Congress. In fact, the Patriot Act appropriately allowed them an additional year to remain in the United States. But it is becoming quite clear an additional year for families who have had to suffer so much is not adequate. This legislation is a response to the very real challenges of these families.

For example, many of these families are participating in September 11 support groups, groups that simply would

not exist in the countries to which they may be returning. Many of them are eligible for awards from the Victims Compensation Fund, but, as you know, many of the awards have not been processed, or even begun to be processed in many instances. Much work remains to be done.

Although they have been in mourning for nearly a year, many widows and children are waiting patiently for DNA analysis of the remains of their loved ones. Without closure, the grieving process has been prolonged considerably. Because of this delay, many necessary and unfamiliar financial matters have not been adequately addressed. There are homes that need to be sold and other business affairs to be settled before these folks should be returning home.

Also, there are children to consider, many of them in American schools, who have begun their lives. Many of them are American citizens, the children themselves. In fact, I think some of these children could potentially be separated from their parents as we go forward with this whole process. So it is a real issue at a human level on the ground, where people are trying to work their way through this tragic series of events.

While it is difficult to define the precise number of survivors who would be eligible for relief under my legislation, it is safe to say it is under 200. I think it also reflects some problems in the INS. The books and records are not exactly clear on how many folks there are involved. We have identified, in my office, about 80 of these people with whom we are working to try to provide special attention to them. The thought is, it would be close to 200.

Yet despite the fact that this legislation is sculpted very narrowly to address only the most immediate humanitarian considerations for this population, and despite the fact that the number of people included is a narrow 200 or fewer, each time I have attempted to get this legislation cleared, an objection has been raised. Generally, it has been one individual who has used their ability to quietly veto this legislation.

So at this time, with September 11 just 1 day away, Mr. President, I think it is time to pass this legislation. I think it is important. I think it speaks to the nature and the quality of who we are as a nation.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up and pass S. 2845, legislation to extend for 1 year procedural relief provided under the USA Patriot Act for individuals who were or are victims or survivors of victims of a terrorist attack on the United States on September 11, 2001.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BURNS. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection.

Mr. CORZINE. I appreciate the responsibility of the Senator from Wyoming to carry out the objection.

I continue to have serious concerns that if the facts of this issue were known broadly, they would not be resisted. I personally sought out the assistance of a number of folks who have typically objected to legislation dealing with immigration: Senator BYRD, Senator NICKLES, and particularly Senator HATCH, and they have been very helpful on this—and the Senator from Montana; excuse me. The distinguished Senator from Montana. I apologize. I am tied up in this sense of—

Mr. BURNS. I say to the Senator from New Jersey, I have lived on both sides of the line.

Mr. CORZINE. It is all a beautiful part of the country.

But I must say, of all of the issues that get at human interests, I consider it extraordinarily unusual that we have chosen to put a group of people—a limited group of people—at such risk.

I think this idea of having people be able to secretly hold legislation is a troubling one. I hope we can move on with it. I think this is an important piece of legislation.

I thank the Senator from Montana for his graciousness, and also the Senator from Nevada. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this important issue.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for working on this bill be extended past the hour of 12:30, until Senator BURNS and I can clear these amendments.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4523 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4472

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is laid aside. The clerk will report.

Mr. REID. Yes. I failed to ask that. I appreciate that, Mr. President.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 4523.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding 36 undeveloped oil and gas leases in the Southern California planning area of the outer Continental Shelf)

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. . SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA OFFSHORE OIL LEASES.

(a) Congress finds that—

(1) There are 36 undeveloped oil leases on the land in the Southern California planning

area of the Outer Continental Shelf that have been under review for an exceptionally long period of time, some going back over thirty years, and have yet to be approved for development pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act;

(2) The oil companies that hold these 36 leases have expressed an interest in retiring these leases in exchange for equitable compensation and are engaged in settlement negotiations with the Department of the Interior regarding the retirement of these leases; and

(3) It would be a waste of taxpayer dollars to continue the process for approval or permitting of these 36 leases when both the lessees and the Department of the Interior have said they expect there will be an agreement to retire these leases.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that no funds should be spent to approve any exploration, development, or production plan for, or application for a permit to drill on the 36 undeveloped leases while the lessees are discussing a potential retirement of these leases with the Department of the Interior.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the pending amendment, which I have offered at the request of Senator BOXER, is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment regarding southern California offshore oil leases. The amendment notes that several leases have not been developed and that the leaseholders are negotiating with the Government to retire those leases. During these negotiations, the amendment urges that no funds be spent on development of the leases.

The amendment has been agreed to by Senator BURNS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I would normally object to any amendment that would withdraw any lands from energy development or consideration. However, this one is just a little bit different. This is already tied up in litigation. I think anytime we shield land from energy exploration, we do not do this country a great favor, nor do we help our situation in the Middle East.

So I think should it be in any other form—there are litigation discussions now ongoing that could possibly expose this Government to a massive takings litigation. However, the way it is worded, it is only a sense of the Senate, and I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4523) was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BURNS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 4524 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4472

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator BENNETT, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], for Mr. BENNETT, proposes an amendment numbered 4524.