was the one who did all the judges for us. He is someone who knows what is going on.

We have made presentation after presentation to no avail. Senator DODD has spent weeks of his time on this issue. This is not a tort reform issue. It is an issue to allow insurance companies to sell terrorism insurance to allow construction projects to go forward in Las Vegas and other places in the country.

The insurance companies, as they are good at doing, have jacked up the prices so it is hard to get insurance. This legislation is an effort to allow them to receive some help if, in fact, there is an act of terrorism.

My office spoke with people when they complained about this: We had tremendous pressure from the White House to sign on to this advertisement. What is this all about, pressure to sign on to something that is false, misleading, untrue?

When President George Bush was campaigning, he said he was going to change the tone in Washington. I have been in Washington a long time now. I have never seen the tone this way. During the Reagan years, there were some disagreements, but what a fine person to get along with. He and his people were easy to get along with. Here we cannot get along—it is very tough. The atmosphere is extremely difficult. Change the tone? He has changed the tone, there is no question about that, but it is for the worse. I guess he just did not complete his sentence in all the debates and other statements he made. This is a very venomous environment.

Legislation is the art of compromise. I personally do not think this legislation dealing with terrorism insurance should have anything to do with tort reform, but they have forced the issue. The compromise has some tort reform in it. Legislation is a compromise. The White House has been unwilling to compromise, unwilling to meet. They are now putting pressure on lobbyists to fund full-page ads, pro-Bush ads in the Post and more pressure on congressional Republicans to do anything they can to stop this legislation.

I know, I have had friends on the other side tell me they do not want this legislation; they do not think it is necessary. But why not do it like adults? Stand up and say this is bad legislation, not have this charade.

If anyone is truly interested in the real White House strategy, read the story in the New York Times today about this legislation:

Mr. Bush's push for the measure reflects a no-lose political strategy. If Congress reaches an agreement on the measure, he can rightly claim credit for it. If it fails, he can blame Congressional Democrats, and in particular the Senate majority leader, Tom Daschle, for the failure.

That is what it is all about. I believe people of the State of Nevada deserve more; the people of this country deserve more. I have no problem when there are honest disagreements on leg-

islation, but I have been on the ground, so to speak. I have watched this; I have been right here; I have been making the unanimous consent requests. Over the month, I bet I have offered 25 unanimous consent requests right from here. There were objections to appointment of conferees and getting the bill to the floor. But to have this:

We agree, Mr. President, there's too much at stake. . . .

Congress, why the delay?

The time is now. Pass Terrorism Insurance Legislation.

Six months ago, the President in 30 seconds could have had the legislation on his desk, but this has been a big stall to make the trial lawyers look like the enemy of the American people, and that simply is wrong.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 4 o'clock today, with Senators allowed to speak therein, for a period not to exceed 10 minutes each.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. 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. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask that I might proceed for no more than 5 minutes as though in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR STROM THURMOND

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I pay tribute to a colleague of ours whose career of public service may never be matched again in the history of our country. My friend STROM THURMOND sits on the other side of the aisle of the Senate Chamber, but I consider him a friend with whom I have worked closely, and I will miss him.

I remember when I was first sworn into the Senate in January of 1975. Because of a tied vote in the State of New Hampshire that election year, it was a matter that did not get resolved until we actually went back and did the election over in the middle of the year. I was the most junior Member of a 99-Member Senate. We did not have the Russell Building and the Dirksen Building, and a couple of us very junior Members were in basement offices. Senator Garn of Utah, Senator Laxalt of Nevada, and I were down in the dun-

geons. When we were sworn in, I had a small reception down there. I invited Members of the Senate to come, not thinking that anybody would actually show up. There were far more noteworthy people being sworn in that day, some to begin subsequent terms, others newly elected.

I remember standing there with my mother and father, and one of the very first people to come through that door was STROM THURMOND, walking arm in arm with John Stennis of Mississippi. I remember STROM welcoming me to the Senate and telling my mother and father I seemed like a nice young man, and that I might actually have a career ahead of me.

I note that has been the routine of STROM THURMOND, to welcome new Senators from either party. He has done it with hundreds of Senators. This one remembers it well.

We often worked in the field of antitrust laws. We worked together on the National Cooperative Production amendments of 1993, the very first high-technology bill signed by President Clinton, and to improve the protections against anticompetitive conduct in the Digital Performance Right in Sound Recordings Act.

Senator Thurmond has been a legislator. I must admit, when Senator THURMOND and I have worked together, it has raised some evebrows, and when we have introduced legislation together, some have remarked that either it is brilliant legislation or one of us has not gotten around to reading it. But there are so many issues that we did join together. Of course, there have been occasions when he and I have sat on opposite sides of an issue, but even though there were issues about which we felt deeply, Senator THURMOND always conducted himself with the utmost integrity. He has always told the Senate how he felt. He has done so with the people of South Carolina first and foremost in his mind.

I recall him inviting me down to talk to the STROM THURMOND Institute at Clemson. He wanted to put on a debate on economic matters. He had an impartial moderator from the Heritage Foundation. When I walked in, I saw half the Republican party of South Carolina and the Heritage Foundation. I knew I was to be the sacrificial lamb, and I was loving every minute of it. When they stated how much time would be allotted, he stated he should have twice as much time as I because I spoke twice as fast as he did.

We had a very good meeting. I am sure I did not change his mind, or most of the minds of the audience, on a couple of issues. We walked out of there arm in arm, laughing, having a good time. I remember a couple of days later STROM coming on the floor and slapping me on the back and saying, I want to thank the king of Vermont, as he said, for going down with him.

One of the strangest meetings during that time was when we were in the Senate dining room and I introduced him to Jerry Garcia of the Grateful Dead. It was a meeting of cultures, very different cultures.

I share with Senator THURMOND the distinction of being from a State that has provided the Senate Judiciary Committee with three chairmen over the history of the committee. South Carolina and the State of Vermont have each had three different people who have shared the Senate Judiciary Committee. With that in mind, I have always asked what I call the STROM THURMOND question at judicial hearings. He has always reminded nominees that the people and lawyers who appear before them, whatever their position in the case, whether rich or poor, white or black, man or woman, whatever their religious or political affiliation, deserve respect and fairness. He has reminded everyone of that.

I will miss my friend STROM. He has been named President pro tempore emeritus for a very good reason.

I have learned much from the senior Senator from South Carolina. Let me share one additional aspect of Senator Thurmond's legacy to the Senate as he completes this term and retires from office. In addition to all his longevity records and legislative achievements and buildings named for him, there is something else about him I will always remember.

When we hold hearings for Federal judges—and we have held a number this year—I am always careful to carry on a tradition that Senator Thurmond started. Senator Thurmond always reminded nominees for high office that it is essential to treat others with courtesy and respect. He always reminded nominees that the people and lawyers who appeared before them, whatever their position in the case, whether rich or poor, white or black, man or woman, whatever their religious or political affiliation, they are each and every one deserving of respect and fairness.

Senator Thurmond was right to remind judges—and even Senators—of that simple rule. It is another contribution he has made to all of us that will continue to serve us well. As I said earlier, I will miss STROM THURMOND. He has been named President-Pro-Tempore Emeritus for good reason.

21st CENTURY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE APPROPRIATIONS AU-THORIZATION ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before the Senator from Vermont leaves the floor, on a totally different matter, I direct some questions to the Senator.

It is 2 p.m.. Twenty-four hours ago we were fortunate to get this conference report on H.R. 2215. I assumed this matter would be out of here in a matter of 4 or 5 minutes. I thought maybe Senator LEAHY and Senator HATCH would talk about what a great piece of work was done in conference. It is 24 hours later and this legislation has gone nowhere. In fact, the majority last night learned there would not be

even a vote allowed, and we had to file cloture.

This legislation deals with combating terrorism. It is entitled: 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act. The title says it all. It is true, is it not, this deals with fortifying the national border security by authorizing more than \$4 billion?

Mr. LEAHY. I say to my friend, the deputy majority leader, it does.

We realize, as the Senator from Nevada has pointed out, we have problems with our borders. We have to enhance our ability to monitor the borders and still keep the open borders of this country. But it will be expensive. We put this in.

Incidentally, we put this in with the strong support of the administration.

Mr. REID. Is it true, I ask my friend, we have funding for Centers for Domestic Preparedness throughout the country? Is it true we have legislation to improve implementation of a treaty banning terrorist financing? Does it deal with FBI, allow FBI agents who are in duty stations that are perilous to receive extra money? We have heard reports a better job needs to be done with the communications, and it covers that. It covers penalties for the criminals who use body armor.

I could go on literally for 15 minutes talking about what is in this conference report. There are other Senators who wish to speak. Can the Senator give me any reason why this most important piece of legislation for the people of Nevada, Vermont, and the rest of the country is not passing?

Mr. LEAHY. I know one reason. It passed the other body 400 to 4. It came over here. I was asked if we had any objection to moving it quickly. I said, absolutely not. We checked every single member on the Democratic side of the aisle, and they said they would vote for it, every man and woman. But we had a hold put on it from the Republican side of the aisle. They have held it up. They have delayed it. I cannot understand why.

Money laundering by terrorists is covered. President Bush, shortly after the attack of September 11 last year, took extraordinary steps to try to choke off some of the sources of financing of these terrorist groups. I applauded the President for doing that. I thought it was the right thing.

However, there are some major areas we could not pursue without further legislation, which the administration strongly supports, and which Republicans and Democrats strongly support.

That is part of this bill. I would like to turn the spigot off for terrorists' money. That is in this bill.

The President of the United States would sign this bill immediately once it got onto his desk. Why the Republicans are holding it up, frankly, I don't know. I know they are holding it up, but I don't know why, especially when the President of the United States would sign this. There is much antiterrorism in here, everything from

the authorization of Boys and Girls Clubs to hazardous duty pay for Federal law enforcement officers.

This is sort of like voting to acknowledge the sun rises in the east. I don't know what the controversy is.

Mr. REID. The reason it is being held up is the same reason our 13 appropriations bills are being held up, the same reason the election reform, conference reports, bankruptcy, terrorism, Patients' Bill of Rights, generic drugs, all these most important pieces of legislation are held up. It appears clearly they want to be able to say the Senate. controlled by the Democrats, has been unable to accomplish anything. However, we cannot accomplish anything unless we get help from the 49 on the other side. They are trying to show their strength in not allowing us to do anything.

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator is right. Unfortunately, in holding this up, they are taking from the President of the United States tools needed to fight international terrorism. They are turning their back on the law enforcement people of this country.

We have an authorization for a charter change for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, something they have all supported, we have all supported, Democrats are all for. Republicans are holding that up. There was a charter change in here for the American Legion. All 51 on this side of the aisle have supported it. It is being held up on the Republican side. AMVETS, a charter change for American Veterans. That is being held up by the other side. We support it.

This may be the kind of political posturing people think they have to have in an election year. I think it is a crying shame.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, before I make a few comments about the state of the economy, let me talk about the state of business in the Senate. I concur completely with the Senator from Vermont, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, on which I am proud to serve. I cannot imagine what is holding up this legislation. This legislation is designed to restore law and order in this country. It is designed to fight terrorism. There are elements that are absolutely common sense.

It is the first time, I believe, in over 20 years we are reauthorizing the Department of Justice. We are establishing the Violence Against Women Act, to protect areas of domestic abuse. We are talking about drug abuse education, prevention, and treatment. We have a provision in here to provide resources to the Boys and Girls Clubs of America, which in the city of Chicago and across my State of Illinois are so successful in reaching out to young people.

Time and time again, this bill addresses things the Department of Justice needs. It is quite a commentary on