

President Clinton's term, and they were blocked. Now with President Bush in office, I put the same 20 in to show bipartisanship. They are back in there and should be passed. President Bush can nominate the people for these positions. I cannot believe either side would hold us up.

I hope we will have a consent agreement for a limited amount of debate at some point and then go to a vote.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEAHY. Yes.

Mr. REID. Under the previous unanimous consent agreement that has been granted, the Senator from Louisiana has 10 minutes before we get to debate on this bill. It has been 21 years since this bill has been reauthorized, so I do not think anyone can criticize the Senator from Vermont and/or Senator HATCH for taking a little time talking about this bill. But it appears this is such important legislation that we will probably have a rollcall vote on it, I would think.

Mr. LEAHY. I hope so.

Mr. REID. I ask my friend from Vermont, does he have an idea how long he and/or Senator HATCH will take debating this conference report?

Mr. LEAHY. I cannot speak for Senator HATCH, Mr. President, but I will be happy to vote later this afternoon at 4:30 or so.

Mr. REID. It is quarter to 3 now. So within the next couple hours, it is likely we could have a vote.

Mr. LEAHY. I hope.

Mr. REID. Has the Senator asked for the yeas and nays on this yet?

Mr. LEAHY. No, but I will. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I yield the floor and thank my good friend from Louisiana for her usual courtesy and cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Utah for their very hard work over a long period of time on this major piece of legislation. The vote was overwhelming in the House, and it is due to the bipartisan work that has gone into crafting the reauthorization of the Justice Department. I look forward to voting for that legislation later today.

I have been contacted by many of my sheriffs and law enforcement officials and, of course, I have been particularly interested in some specific aspects of the bill particularly dealing with violence against women and violence against children and child abuse and the good work that the Department of Justice is doing to help our local counties and communities fight these terrible incidents that occur in our country.

My heart is heavy and very sad to say that just this last weekend we lost

another child to child abuse in a horrific way. A little 7-year-old was stabbed to death in front of about 10 people by a deranged and very sick individual who had threatened the life of this child's mother. The 7-year-old was trying to protect his mother and was killed on the streets of New Orleans.

The Senator from Vermont knows well the great needs of the country regarding these issues. I thank him for working so hard on them.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, due to her good work on the bill, of which she is a prime sponsor, reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act is in this bill. It tracks the Leahy-Hatch-Kennedy-Landrieu bill.

We also have authorized funding for the Centers for Domestic Preparedness. I note that because it has been the persuasive persistence of my friend from Louisiana that has improved this bill so much, and I commend her.

WEST NILE VIRUS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. While this underlying bill is important, I wish to take a moment this afternoon to urge my colleagues to take up another bill that does not have the same breadth and depth as the one that was just described. The people of Louisiana, and I might add, the people of Illinois—Senator DURBIN has been working hard on this particular issue—and many other States have been severely affected by the West Nile virus. In fact, over 17 people have died in Louisiana and over 2,400 people have been affected and infected by this very frightening disease.

If we can manage today—and I have had discussions with the leadership—we are going to hopefully pass this bill by unanimous consent, which will give grants to our counties and parishes in Louisiana to help their local officials do more effective pest eradication, whether that is through traditional spraying or larvacide techniques that are used to kill mosquitos at their various stages before they can attack human beings and carry this deadly disease.

The effects are quite frightening. People in my State are having a very tough week. We had a terrible storm that was not a hurricane but nonetheless it was a very large and intense tropical storm. So the headlines at home have been filled with storm warnings, storm preparations, and consequences of the storm management.

Now, in the gulf, we find ourselves facing yet another potential hurricane that is moving toward the shores of Louisiana. So this summer has been a very anxious time between the storms and the West Nile virus at home where a lot of the parishes in Louisiana were affected. Seventeen deaths are quite extraordinary. I think it is the largest outbreak in many years. We are really struggling with providing some help to the local communities and parishes

that, in fact, do have mosquito abatement control districts and, under normal circumstances, can take care of those needs on a local level. But when something such as this breaks out, it is important for us to step up to the plate and help.

This bill will give local governments an opportunity to submit for grants to take care of their businesses and to upgrade their eradication programs. There are other parts of the Federal Government that can be helpful in educating people about how to stay safe from this virus, such as what to do, what symptoms it shows.

This bill that I hope we can take up today will provide hard dollars, not for bureaucracies, not for a new Federal agency but to get grants to Georgia, the State of the Presiding Officer, and my State, for those local jurisdictions to get their spraying up to par and to do it in an environmentally safe way.

Hopefully, the worst is behind us, but we do need to prepare in the event we have another outbreak. Getting this grant program established will help us next year if this happens again.

I urge my colleagues to consider H.R. 4793—I am not asking that it be called up at this time—which I hope we can pass by unanimous consent later on today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it is important for us to understand where we are on the homeland security bill. This is, obviously, a very important bill for the President. The President has outlined extensively his plan of organizing this agency.

The one thing he has asked is that he be given an agency that is workable. The distinguished majority leader has pointed out there have been a number of cloture votes and we have not gotten cloture, so by that he suggests that somehow this side of the aisle is the problem.

I believe it was June of this year that the majority leader promised he would not fill up the tree. For those who may be listening at home, that is a means of adding a number of amendments so that the other side cannot offer any amendments for a vote. Well, they filled up the tree to keep the President from getting an up-or-down vote on his proposal. As a result, we have opposed cloture because it would have prevented us from getting to the President's proposal.

If we get to the President's proposal—and I hope we will—the majority leader may have the votes to defeat it. But I think, since we are dealing with this subject in wartime, where we need to reorganize Government to make it flexible, to make it responsive, to make it effective in defending the homeland, we ought to give the Commander in Chief at least a vote on his proposal.

I believe my colleagues who have been working on the bipartisan bill that reflects the President's proposals have taken some 25 different amendments to accommodate the interests of Congress and various bodies. The distinguished junior Senator from Georgia and the senior Senator from Texas have worked with the Senator from Tennessee on this measure. They have gotten to the point where they have made compromises. It comes down to the point where the President believes, and most of us on this side agree, that he could not manage the Department effectively if his hands were tied. Whether my colleagues want to vote on it or not, I think it makes sense, out of common courtesy, if nothing else, to give the Commander in Chief an up-or-down vote on his proposal.

As has been pointed out, the Senate bill does not include the managerial flexibilities the President needs to run the Department. His representative, Dr. Falkenrath, stated we think the bill, as reported by the Governmental Affairs Committee, would create an extremely rigid bureaucracy. There would be a huge gap between the responsibilities of the Secretary to integrate the units as to what it says in article 102 and actually do that in practice.

What it means is we set up a new Homeland Security Department that is supposed to be fast and responsive, assimilate the information that comes in from all the varying intelligence sources, and then develop an appropriate response. Unfortunately, too many elements of the Governmental Affairs bill tie the President's hands and keep him or his Secretary of the Department from taking a responsive action to make sure the Department is responsive and effective in searching out and trying to stop direct threats to the health, safety, and, frankly, the lives of people in America.

It was surprising to me that the bill even moved backward from where this President, the previous President, the previous President, and so forth down the line, had the ability, in national security interests, to make some of the changes in terms of promoting and rewarding exceptional employees, assigning them to the right duties and getting rid of employees who do not want to or are not able to do the service expected of them.

When we are talking about national security, it has been the long accepted practice that commanders have to be able to command their troops. They are still protected by some 65 to 68 different provisions assuring there is no discrimination and a whole other range of protections, but to give the managers the flexibility to manage the Department of Homeland Security is simply consistent with what previous Presidents have exercised for decades. The Presidents can use the power of Commander in Chief to make sure the military works. If somebody slacks off in the Army, does not show up for a job

as a sentry, they do not get 30 days of pay and a year and a half of appeals. They have real problems right now, and that is because they are dealing with national security.

I believe it is time we move on with homeland security. I was delighted to know that the majority leader is committed to moving this bill prior to our adjournment. I want to go home as much as anybody else, but the very simple way to do that would be to give us an up-or-down vote on the Gramm-Miller, or Miller-Gramm, substitute, as amended, which reflects the President's views to accommodate the interests of the reasonable requests made by Members of Congress and others who wanted to see changes in it.

We can pass this bill. All we ask for is an up-or-down vote. If we have an up-or-down vote, those who favor the system that has been reported out of the Governmental Affairs Committee may win or we may win, but we certainly ought not hold up the bill simply to prevent a vote on what the President said is a critically important issue for national security.

I believe the time has come to stop filling up the trees, trying to invoke cloture to prevent a vote, trying to lock in an amendment that would undercut the President's power before he has an opportunity to have a vote on his proposal. That does not make any sense.

This body ought to show not only concern for the Commander in Chief's request but ought to respect the needs of the American people who must be assured we are doing everything in our power to move forward on homeland security with the Department that is effectively constituted and set up to carry out the responsibilities.

USE OF FORCE AGAINST IRAQ

We also have another important issue before the Senate. Before we get out of here, I hope very shortly, we will be moving toward a resolution authorizing the use of force against the threat posed by Saddam Hussein. Let's be clear about the intent. The resolution, that I trust the House will adopt and we will adopt, should send a clear message to the world community and the Iraqi regime that the demands of the United Nations Security Council must be followed. Saddam Hussein must be disarmed.

Previous administrations, both President Clinton and Vice President Gore, have outlined the dangers that Saddam Hussein has posed. President Clinton made a very forceful statement in 1998 and then on May 23 of 2000. The Vice President, Al Gore, said we must get rid of Saddam Hussein.

Regrettably, the situation has gotten worse. Without inspectors, there has been no check on the development of weapons of mass destruction. We know from defectors and other intelligence sources he is moving forward on these issues. We know the Iraqi regime possesses biological and chemical weapons. It is rebuilding the facilities to

make more. According to the report we received from British Prime Minister Tony Blair, he could launch a chemical or biological attack in as little as 45 minutes after the order is given. The regime has longstanding and continuous ties to terrorist groups. We know there are terrorists operating inside of Iraq. Members of al-Qaida and the Iraq Government have been in contact for many years. This regime is seeking a nuclear weapon and the delivery capability to go with it.

Unfortunately, he has readily available other weapons of mass destruction such as biological and chemical weapons. The Iraqi dictator has answered a decade of resolutions from the United Nations with a decade of defiance. In the southern and northern fly zones over Iraq, coalition aircraft continue to be fired upon and coalition pilots continue to put their lives on the line just to enforce these resolutions.

Unfortunately, some elected officials went to Iraq this past weekend and said: We trust Saddam Hussein; we do not trust our President. They should have watched what we have seen on television, the firing on the coalition aircraft by Iraqi forces. In the last 2 weeks alone, coalition aircraft have been fired on 67 times. Saddam Hussein claims to be willing to accept inspections. He wants to work with us. However, 67 times he has tried to kill our pilots who are flying to enforce the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council.

As President Bush stated this past weekend, the Iraqi regime is led by a dangerous and brutal man. We know he is actively seeking the destructive technologies to match his hatred. We know he must be stopped. The dangers we face will only worsen from month to month and year to year. To ignore these threats is to encourage them. When they fully materialize, it may be too late to protect ourselves and our allies. By then, the Iraqi dictator will have had the means to materialize and dominate the region and each passing day could be the one in which the Iraqi regime gives anthrax or VX nerve gas or a nuclear weapon to a terrorist group.

The mantle of leadership requires this body to act. We have seen the United Nations speak loudly and carry a soft stick too long. I am pleased to be able to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I believe we made reasonable accommodations in the resolution the President has recommended. I hope we can have hearings on that resolution. We see the final words, get it passed by the House, and pass it out of this body by a very significant majority vote of both parties. That is the clearest message we can send to the United Nations, to our allies, to those on the fence, and to the malefactors of great evil who lurk in our world today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). The Senator from Georgia.

BUS SAFETY

Mr. CLELAND. Madam President, I rise today to address two timely issues.

It is with a heavy heart over the loss of two passengers on a Greyhound bus last night in California and the injury of several others that I turn the attention of the Senate to bus security. This tragedy occurred when a passenger attacked the driver of the bus. After a heroic struggle upon being stabbed in the neck, the driver lost control of the bus. That is when the bus careened off Interstate 5. The alleged attacker was subsequently arrested by the police.

While terrorism is not suspected as the cause of the attack, no one knows what would have happened had the attacker gained control of the bus. Also, this attack occurs almost exactly 1 year after the October 3, 2001, Greyhound attack in Tennessee that left 7 dead.

However, we have seen the all-too-often result of buses used to commit terror attacks in the Middle East where suicide bombers have used buses to carry out their deadly work. Historically, between 1920 and 2000, about half of the terrorist acts in the world occurred against buses or bus companies. With intercity buses serving almost 800 million passengers annually in over 4,000 communities, I believe Congress must act to protect our travelers from being subject to the same terror and safety concerns.

Last November, I introduced S. 1739 to authorize a 2-year grant program to improve the safety and security of buses. Funding could be used for safety improvements inside the terminals and on buses—for equipment such as metal detectors, database programs for sharing passenger lists, communication technology, cameras, and more. My legislation passed the Commerce Committee earlier this year without opposition, but unfortunately, it has been stalled waiting for floor action. I urge my colleagues to clear this bill for passage by the full Senate today. We owe it to the families of those who have been touched by this tragedy, and we owe it to the millions of passengers embarking on a trip or tour via bus service.

Also, the House companion legislation, H.R. 3429, has passed the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and is pending on the House floor. It has strong bipartisan support, including its sponsor Committee Chairmen DON YOUNG.

Congress has already expressed its approval for funding of such security measures in the 2002 supplemental appropriations bill by providing \$15 million for bus security. My legislation authorizes the program at more adequate levels and provides much-needed congressional commitment for implementation of the program. Intercity bus passengers—our fellow citizens—should feel secure and safe, and Congress should not stand in the way.

Additionally, I would like to ask my colleagues to examine the issue of ac-

cess to technology, which is also important to protecting the security of our people. Over 7 months ago the Commerce committee held a hearing on the so-called digital divide at our colleges and universities that serve the largest concentrations of the Nation's minority students. We heard compelling testimony that a significant technology gap exists for a majority of these students at a time when the world economy is becoming increasingly technology driven. Only one tribal college has funding for a broadband connection, and it is not yet in place. At private historically black colleges and universities, 75 percent of their servers and printers are obsolete or nearly obsolete and in need of replacement. Half of the HBCUs surveyed in a landmark study 2 years ago by the Department of Commerce did not have computers available in the location most accessible to students—their dormitories. Hispanic students are almost 20 percent less likely than non-Hispanic whites to have a home computer and almost 25 percent less likely to use the Internet at home.

Currently there is no Federal program that provides funds to minority-serving colleges and universities for computer hardware and software acquisition. S. 414, the NTIA Digital Technology Program Act, would provide this critically needed resource for America's under-represented and educationally disadvantaged minorities in higher education. It has been lauded as the most significant tool for addressing the infrastructure and instrumentation needs of the Nation's minority-serving institutions since the reauthorization of title III of the Higher Education Act. It is a bipartisan bill sponsored by 18 Senators from both sides of the aisle. The bill was reported unanimously by the Senate Commerce Committee in May and also enjoys bipartisan cosponsorship and support in the House of Representatives.

In the ever-expanding world of the information highway, it should be our mandate to work to ensure that no one in this country is left behind—least of all our leaders of tomorrow.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—
S. 414

Mr. CLELAND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 487, S. 414; that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table without further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I object on behalf of Members on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—
S. 1739

Mr. CLELAND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 544, S. 1739; that the Cleland amendment at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table without further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I object on behalf of Members on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CLELAND. Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND. 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.

HIGH COST OF HEALTH
INSURANCE

Mr. BOND. Madam President, there is another matter that is extremely important for small businesses in this country; that is, the high cost of health insurance.

I have, along with my colleague, Senator HUTCHINSON from Arkansas, introduced a measure to authorize association of health plans so small businesses can come together in trade associations or other multistate bodies with similar interests to purchase their health insurance with a large pool.

If you purchase as an individual or as a very small business, it is like going into the store and buying soda one can at a time. You can't get a very good price. It also costs you a lot more in administrative costs to administer that plan if you are the sole administrator. From the health insurance standpoint, you don't share the risks over a broad group of people so that you can make an actuarially sound determination of how much health insurance costs.

We have seen health insurance costs rising all across the Nation.

Early last month, I hosted my second National Conference for Women and Small Business Owners in St. Louis. And not surprisingly, some 72 percent of them said providing health insurance, which is extremely costly, was one of the most important challenges they face.

We also found another statistic that I found very amazing. We have 39 or 40 million people without health insurance in the country today. That is far too many. But did you know that 60 percent—roughly 24 million of those