

this amendment in the committee, but I was told not to do it there, to wait until we go to the floor. Now I am on the floor and I am being told do not do it here. So I am sort of stuck in a way. I do not want to tie up a bill. I think defense production is important, but to have to wait 5 more years to come back with this idea is something I do not want to do, either. So I am using this time to encourage people who may have a better idea on how we can resolve this to make some suggestions so we can avoid holding up this legislation.

I do not need to remind my colleagues, I would just say at the end of all of this, that since 2001 we have lost 2.7 million manufacturing jobs in the United States. In Connecticut, we have lost more than 14 out of every 100 manufacturing jobs in the past 3 years. I have 5,400 small manufacturers in my State of over 240,000 people. A lot of them are what we call mom and pop, with 5, 6, 8, 10 people. Some of them are second and third generation.

I see my colleague from New Hampshire, as well as my colleague from Ohio. They have similar situations with small firms in their own States. Many of them provide critical technologies to our major defense contractors. If I thought the offset agreements had some great relevancy today, I would be the first to say we have to live with this; it is an unfortunate reality. But taking an idea we used at the end of World War II to help our allies get on their feet and to still perpetuate it in the year 2003 I think is wrong.

We better say something about it soon and try to do something about it before we just continue the way we are going and seeing a further loss of jobs and a loss of a manufacturing base in critical technologies which I think we will regret deeply in the years to come.

When this bill comes up, if it does come up, I would like to offer the amendment or have someone work out something so we might address this issue in some way that would not delay the enactment of the Defense Production Act but would give me some sense of hope that we could resolve this kind of problem.

I yield the floor.

#### BIRTHDAY WISHES TO GEORGE GOLSON

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to express my congratulations and best wishes to George Golson on the occasion of his 90th birthday. A devoted husband, a father of four children, an industrious businessman, an accomplished jurist, and a veteran of World War II, George Golson has led a distinguished life.

Born on October 24, 1913, George received his undergraduate education at the University of Columbia, NY, and his legal education at St. John's University. After practicing law for several years in New York, he served his

country proudly for 4 years during World War II in the Judge Adjutant General office in Liverpool, England.

Upon his return from military service, George Golson built a new home in Columbia, SC, and launched a new career in business. He returned to legal practice in 1958 as a member of the South Carolina Bar, and in 1973 was admitted to serve as Attorney of Law in the Supreme Court of the United States.

In 1980, George Golson established an office in Las Vegas to provide consulting services on legal matters in the field of real estate planning. He became a respected and beloved member of the southern Nevada community, and his work contributed to the dramatic growth and development of the State.

Throughout his long and productive life, George has made the most of his free time. He has challenged himself both intellectually and athletically by writing short stories, composing ballads, music, and lyrics, fishing, and playing racquetball.

Please join me in wishing George Golson the happiest of birthdays.

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I was unable to participate in last evening's vote on the nomination of Carlos Bea to be a U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit due to my participation in a memorial service for Rhode Island National Guardsmen killed while serving in Iraq.

#### LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred in Houston, TX. On May 25, 2003, a Houston high school student was attacked by a teacher's aide in class because he is gay. The teacher's aide, also an assistant coach at the school, allegedly taunted the student with comments about his sexual orientation over the course of the school year. The incident was in full view of the class and was later corroborated by seven or eight other students.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ERNEST F. HOLLINGS

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that Mr. Mark

Shields, whose syndicated column appears in more than 100 newspapers, including *The Washington Post* and the *St. Petersburg Times*, paid tribute in a recent column to our dear friend and colleague, the Honorable ERNEST F. HOLLINGS.

That column was most insightful, as it examined the character of Senator FRITZ HOLLINGS, who, unfortunately, has announced that he will not be seeking reelection to the U.S. Senate after nearly four decades of service in this Chamber.

I hope that throughout the history of our Nation there will always be a FRITZ HOLLINGS. As Mr. Shields noted in his column, FRITZ HOLLINGS "was a leader of uncommon courage and uncommon candor." Indeed, FRITZ HOLLINGS' leadership, courage, and candor will be sorely missed.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Shields' column, as it appeared on September 5, 2003, in *The State*, one of the newspapers in Senator HOLLINGS' home State of South Carolina, be printed in the RECORD.

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

A CANDIDATE WITH THAT RAREST OF ATTRIBUTES: CANDOR  
(By Mark Shields)

On Oct. 6, 1983, in a televised debate among Democratic presidential candidates, one candidate said the following about the 1,800 U.S. Marines whom the Reagan administration had then sent to warring Lebanon: "If they were sent there to fight, they were too few. If they were sent there to die, they are too many."

Less than three years later in Beirut, just before dawn on Oct. 23, a terrorist driving a truck loaded with thousands of pounds of explosives plowed into the Marine barracks and killed 241 Americans.

That same presidential candidate went on Nov. 4, 1983, to Dartmouth College, a prestigious Ivy League school with an advantaged student body, and shocked the undergraduates: "I want to draft everyone in this room for the good of the country."

He was not advocating the "old Vietnam-style draft, where if you had enough money, you were either in college or in Canada." His campus audience gasped at the man's discomforting bluntness: "Conscience tells us that we need a cross-section of America in our armed forces. Defense is everybody's business . . . everybody's responsibility. A professional army is un-American. It is anathema to a democratic republic—a glaring civil wrong."

You like candor in your political leaders? This Democrat truly brimmed with the stuff.

That July, to a Washington gathering of the National Council of Senior Citizens—a group with political clout in its membership and Social Security and Medicare benefits on its agenda—he refused to coddle.

Instead, in the face of runaway federal budget deficits, he reminded the seniors, not of the obligations owed to them, but of the seniors' own obligation "to your children and grandchildren." He, alone, would say, "If I'm elected, I will freeze your cost-of-living adjustments for a year."

To a Capitol Hill meeting of defense contractors, pleased and prosperous with President Reagan's doubling of the Pentagon budget, the candidate, himself a combat veteran of World War II, had been frank: "If I'm

elected president, I will freeze the defense budget at 3 percent real growth and do away with the MX (missile) and the B-1."

Exempted from his proposed spending freeze? Food stamps and assistance to the disabled.

We in the press corps are forever lamenting the lack of candor in our political debates and the lack of courage in our presidential candidates, who are unwilling to ask us to sacrifice even the slightest personal comfort for the national well-being.

But when we do encounter the brand of straightforwardness that this 1984 Democratic candidate practiced, we do not applaud or praise it. Doubts are predictably recorded about "the discipline," the "presidential temperament," even the rashness of the fellow.

That's mostly the press treatment Sen. Ernest "Fritz" Hollings, D-S.C., received when he ran for president and publicly said all of the above and again, earlier this month, when he announced that he would retire after 38 years in the Senate.

True, Hollings gave us a lot to work with. While President Bush was furiously trying to publicly distance himself from the disgraced chief of Enron, Hollings quipped, "I did not have political relations with that man, Ken Lay."

That was a take-off on a discredited disclaimer by President Clinton—of whose then-improving poll ratings, Hollings had quipped, "If they reach 60 percent, then he can start dating again."

When his own presidential campaign failed, Hollings reported that "Thomas Wolfe was wrong—'You can go home again.' I know. That's what the people of New Hampshire told me to do."

But let it be recorded that in 1963, when the states of Alabama and Mississippi, governed respectively by George Wallace and Ross Barnett, were battlefields of bloodshed and bayonets in the struggle for civil rights, a young South Carolina governor delivered a much different message to his state and its Legislature: "(T)his General Assembly must make clear South Carolina's choice, a government of laws rather than a government of men. . . . We of today must realize the lesson of 100 years ago, and move on for the good of South Carolina and our United States. This should be done with dignity. It must be done with law and order."

Fritz Hollings was no plaster saint. His tongue was sometimes too sharp. His temper was sometimes too short. But his departure will leave a lonesome place against the sky. He was a leader of uncommon courage and uncommon candor.

#### HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I have risen on numerous occasions in the past 6 months to pay tribute to the men and women who are fighting in Iraq and elsewhere in the war on international terror. Today I rise once again to pay tribute and to honor a young man who was recently killed in action in Iraq—Master Sergeant Kevin Morehead, a native of Little Rock, AR, and a soldier in the U.S. Army 5th Special Forces Group. MSG Morehead was killed September 12 in the early morning raid in Ar Ramadi, an Iraqi city about 70 miles west of Baghdad.

Keven Morehead graduated from Central High School in Little Rock in 1987. After attending the University of Arkansas, Kevin opted for a military career, enlisting in the U.S. Army in 1989.

In 1994, he joined the elite Special Forces. His service over his 14-year career in the Army was exemplary, earning him a number of commendations, including the Bronze Star, the Silver Star, and the Purple Heart. In the last 2 years, he served with distinction in the Middle Eastern theater, first in Afghanistan, where he served as an adviser to the Northern Alliance in the fight against the Taliban extremists. In Afghanistan from October 2001 to February 2002, MSG Morehead called in airstrikes on Taliban positions, and his actions reportedly saved the lives of hundreds of men. MSG Morehead was sent to Iraq in January of this year, where he served with further distinction. Although his unit had already returned from service in Iraq, MSG Morehead had stayed behind to help with orientation for his unit's replacements.

Keven was buried on September 21 in Bald Knob, AR, in a grave on a hilltop next to that of his grandfather. Our condolences and our prayers go out to Kevin's wife Theresa; to his stepdaughters, Kirsten Inman and Kaylyn Council, to his sister, Kristen Wright; to his grandmother, Zelda Guthrie; and to his parents, James and Jeanette Morehead, of Benton, AR.

One attendee at his funeral was quoted in our State's newspaper, the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, as saying that Master Sergeant Kevin Morehead "did not die in vain. Hopefully, by his actions the world will be a better place for all mankind." The mission continues in Iraq, and we remain confident that, as coalition troops move to secure and stabilize the country, Iraq will emerge as a democracy in the Middle East, and that Kevin Morehead's courage and sacrifice will prove to have been given in a worthy cause.

#### RAPE KITS AND DNA EVIDENCE BACKLOG ELIMINATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Advancing Justice Through DNA Technology Act of 2003. This bill contains several important provisions. I am especially pleased with title I of the bill—the Rape Kits and DNA Evidence Backlog Elimination Act, which mirrors the bill of the same name that I introduced earlier this year. The purpose of this title and our original bill is to extend more Federal funding to States and localities to fight crime with DNA technology, expand our national database of DNA profiles from criminals, and train sexual assault examiners.

While the overall violent crime rate has decreased in recent years, the occurrence of rape has only increased. Tragically, somewhere in America, a woman is sexually assaulted every 2 minutes. In other words, by the time I conclude my remarks, at least five women will have been assaulted. It has been estimated, as well, that 1 in 6 women and 1 in 33 men in the United States have been the victim of a com-

pleted or attempted rape. These statistics are truly staggering, especially considering that rape is a chronically underreported crime. Experts contend that rape could be much more prevalent than even these statistics reflect.

The majority of sexual assault victims who report their crimes do so in a hospital emergency room, where they frequently wait hours for treatment—in many cases, to see doctors or nurses who have not received specialized training in dealing with assault victims and who lack the proper forensic tools for evidence collection. As you can imagine, the collection of forensic evidence can be a very invasive process for a rape victim. But in many cases, this is where the investigation stops. In cities across the country, hundreds of thousands of rape kits are sitting untested in police department evidence rooms. While these kits contain vital DNA evidence that could lead to the arrest of rapists, many rape kits have gone untested for more than a decade due to a lack of funding.

In my own home State of Ohio, officials estimated in May 2002 that at least 3,000 kits with rape evidence—and maybe even more—remained unanalyzed, despite recent strides in science that allow DNA evidence from rapes and other violent crimes to be compared against DNA profiles in the Combined DNA Index System, CODIS, our national DNA database. Laboratory researchers at the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation report that they have a high success rate in matching unknown DNA collected from crime scenes to either the DNA of offenders on file or to other crime scenes. That would mean that if all 3,000 unexamined Ohio rape kits contained extractable DNA, several kits very likely could yield evidence leading to the identity of rapists.

We now have both the technology to analyze DNA evidence and a growing database of DNA profiles with which to compare this evidence. This system works, and it catches criminals. Let me share an example of how evidence from rape kits has led to the arrest of a rapist in Ohio. Last year, a Hamilton, Ohio man was convicted and sentenced to 25 years in prison for an April 1998 attack on a woman in a grocery store parking lot. Although a DNA sample from this rape was sent to the State crime lab 3 days after the attack, it took until November 2001—nearly 3½ years later—for scientists to analyze the sample and add it to the State's DNA database. Once this sample was added, a positive match was made and this rapist was prosecuted and put behind bars. Unfortunately, this victim had to wait 3 years for justice, while her rapist remained on the street. While this is an excellent example of how DNA has been used successfully to catch rapists, it also shows the critical need to promptly analyze the kits we have on hand. The longer this evidence sits around unanalyzed, the longer sex offenders will remain free—and free to potentially harm more victims.