

nominations for positions to a co-equal branch of government, he should not be able to tip the scales of justice by packing the courts with ideologues who are selected to implement his political agenda. Recently, Walter Dellinger noted that the President's "slate of nominees, considered as a whole, . . . [is] a list tilted to the right and from which any other views have been carefully culled." I agree that we need to broaden the slate. This could be best accomplished with the creation of new judicial selection commissions who could make recommendations to home State Senators and to the President.

I urge the White House and Chairman HATCH to work with us to assemble the type of bipartisan panel that Senator HATCH helped assemble in 1997 and 1998 to fill the remaining vacancies on the Court of Federal Claims in a way that respects the tradition of compromise and accommodation that has marked appointments to this court. I also look forward to working with Senate Republicans to preserve our constitutional role in advising the President on judicial nominations to all courts through the use of bipartisan selection commissions.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Marian Blank Horn, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FRIST. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) would each vote "aye."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 38 Ex.]
YEAS—89

Akaka	Boxer	Chafee
Alexander	Breaux	Chambliss
Allard	Brownback	Clinton
Allen	Bunning	Cochran
Baucus	Burns	Coleman
Bayh	Byrd	Collins
Bennett	Campbell	Conrad
Biden	Cantwell	Cornyn
Bingaman	Carper	Craig

Crapo	Inhofe	Reed
Daschle	Inouye	Reid
Dayton	Jeffords	Roberts
DeWine	Johnson	Rockefeller
Dole	Kennedy	Santorum
Dorgan	Kerry	Sarbanes
Edwards	Kohl	Schumer
Ensign	Kyl	Sessions
Enzi	Lautenberg	Shelby
Feingold	Leahy	Smith
Feinstein	Levin	Snowe
Fitzgerald	Lincoln	Specter
Frist	Lott	Stabenow
Graham (SC)	Lugar	Stevens
Grassley	McCain	Sununu
Gregg	Mikulski	Talent
Hagel	Murray	Thomas
Harkin	Nelson (FL)	Voinovich
Hatch	Nelson (NE)	Warner
Hollings	Nickles	Wyden
Hutchison	Pryor	

NOT VOTING—11

Bond	Durbin	McConnell
Corzine	Graham (FL)	Miller
Dodd	Landrieu	Murkowski
Domenici	Lieberman	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALENT). Under the previous order, the President shall be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

NOMINATION OF MIGUEL A. ESTRADA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have heard some of the remarks made on the floor today. I thought I would clarify them, clarify the reality of what really happened. I have had a little bit of criticism by my colleagues from the other side of the floor because we actually had the committee vote last week when it should have voted. So I took the liberty of writing a detailed letter to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, the distinguished minority leader, who is a dear friend. I know he has been concerned that maybe there was some breach of the rules. So I would like to read this letter into the RECORD so that everybody will understand that there was no breach of the rules last Thursday. Anybody who says there was really doesn't understand the rules, does not understand the obligations of the chairman.

I am writing in response to your comments on the Senate floor concerning the Judiciary Committee's executive business meeting this past Thursday. I know you are a person of the highest principles who would never intentionally misrepresent the actions of a Committee Chairman, particularly when the action involves an interpretation of that committee's particular rules. I think you may have been provided with some incorrect information, and I would like you to know the truth.

As you know, the Judiciary Committee met at 9:30 a.m. last Thursday to consider several nominations and some legislation. Although the Democrats were cooperative about voting out a few widely-supported District Court nominations and some other nominations, they made it clear that they would attempt to filibuster at least two of the three nominees for the Circuit Courts of Appeal, Deborah Cook John Roberts and Jay Bybee.

It is important to note that the nominations of Mr. Roberts and Justice Cook had been filibustered in Committee during our last meeting two weeks ago, and had been on the agenda but held over the week before that. I could have forced a vote two weeks ago, but I declined to do so out of deference to my Democratic colleagues, who had assured me that we would vote on the nominations at the next meeting, meaning last Thursday.

From 9:30 a.m. to approximately 12:30 p.m. yesterday, Committee Members engaged in a thorough debate on the three Circuit Court nominations. I allowed every member to talk as long as they wanted. Everyone was allowed to say his or her piece [even though we could have limited debate].

When the speeches ran out at 12:30 or so, I announced it was time for a vote. Senator Kennedy objected. I overruled the objection, and then all of the Democratic Members walked out of the hearing room in order to deny the Committee a quorum. A few minutes later, Senator, Specter returned to the Committee room, making a total of nine Republicans present, and then a couple of the Democrats returned and demanded to continue the filibuster even though every democrat who wanted to speak had already done so. As support for their filibuster, they relied upon Rule 4 of the Judiciary Committee rules. That rule allows any Member to move to have an item on the Agenda voted upon. In this case, the nomination on the Agenda was brought to a vote.

As background, you know well that Senate Committee Chairmen have a number of inherent powers that are not expressly stated in Committee rules. For example, the Judiciary Committee Chairman has the power to call and set the agendas for hearings and mark-ups even though those powers are not explicitly granted by Committee Rules. The Chairman also has the inherent power to bring a matter to a vote. The Chairman also has the power to interpret the rules of the Committee, as Senator Leahy has done in the past. The Parliamentarians assured me of this on Wednesday.

Rule 4 of the Judiciary Committee Rules is not the authority by which the Chairman calls for a vote. On the contrary, the clear text of Rule 4 gives a majority of the Committee (which must include Members of both parties) a mechanism to force a vote, presumably when the Chairman does not want or call one. In other words, it ensures that the majority will is not thwarted by an obstreperous Chairman who refuses to allow a vote on an item on the Agenda.

Rule 4 works like this: When a Member wants to end debate and bring a matter to a vote, he or she is entitled to make a motion to hold a vote and the Chairman must entertain it. If anyone objects, then the Committee must vote on the motion (the motion is not debatable). The motion carried only if a majority of the Committee, including at least one Member of the minority party, votes in favor. If the motion carries, the Committee proceeds to a vote on the underlying matter.

The Democrats who raised Rule 4 at the mark-up [last Thursday] turned Rule 4 on its head. They tried to use it to deny a vote, not to force one. Their argument ignores the purpose of Rule 4, the inherent power of the Chairman to call for a vote, the fact that the debate had already ended, and the common sense idea that legislative bodies must have the power to make decisions—even difficult ones. I do not believe that Committee filibusters should be allowed, and I think it is a good and healthy thing for the Committee to have a rule that forces a vote.

I understand your misperception given the fact that you may not—and indeed have no

reason to—be fully familiar with the Judiciary Committee's rules, as you do not serve on the Committee. But knowing you as a fair man, I thought my explanation would help clear any misconceptions.

It is unfortunate that I was forced to exercise the Chairman's inherent power to force the Committee to act [last Thursday]. I had given every fair consideration to my Democratic colleagues for debating the nominations. The nominees before the Committee were very well qualified, enjoy home-state support (bipartisan, in the case of Bybee), and were ultimately approved by substantial bipartisan majorities of the Committee.

I know it makes for popular speechmaking to accuse politicians of abusing process and procedure. And as a former Majority Leader of the body, you appreciate the difficult decisions one must make in order to do the business of the people and exercise our constitutional obligations, particularly in the face of obstruction by a few. But you and I have worked well together over the years, and I know that you would never make those accusations about me unless you had somehow received inaccurate information.

Unfortunately, that is what seems to have occurred in this case. I appreciate you and your consideration of this letter.

Sincerely,

ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman.

Mr. HATCH. That letter makes it very clear that not only were the rules not abused, there was an abuse by the other side in trying to not live up to the rule we have in the committee that any item on the agenda can be put over for a week, and that in the next week there is a vote on that item, unless the chairman and the ranking member agree. In this case, we not only put over Roberts and Cook for a week, we put them over for 2 weeks, because my colleagues asked for it. I agreed to do that in deference to them.

Then, when it came time to vote for them, I walked into the committee room and I was told by the ranking member that they weren't going to vote on Roberts and Cook that day. I said: Oh, no, we are going to vote on them because that is what we agreed to. We are going to vote on them because that is what the rules agree to. So I waited for all Senators to make their comments.

We took 3 hours to hear rather long statements. I think we were very patient with those statements because at least one of them hardly talked about the nominees but talked about a whole raft of other issues involving the committee, which is a right of a Senator. Other Senators gave long statements on the nominees themselves, which was their right to do. But when the statements wound down and there were no further statements to be given, I said: We are going to vote. And that is when people got mad and demanded that we not vote.

At that point, I had to make a decision as committee chairman—which is a legitimate decision—that we are going to vote, that filibusters are not proper in committee, and that we had people on both sides who were willing to vote for these nominees. We had people from the minority and from the

majority. All three of them passed out with substantial votes. So there is hardly room here to criticize what was done. Any committee chairman worth his or her salt has to ultimately bring the matters before the committee to a vote. That is what I did. In the case of judicial nominations, I don't believe there should be filibusters under any circumstances against Presidential judicial nominees. I think they should be voted up or down—not only in committee but on the floor of the Senate as well.

These are important positions. We should not treat them as though they are just regular legislative items that can be kicked around at will. These are important positions that literally must be given their chance for a vote. Not only were the rules followed, but we were very gracious and considerate in allowing my colleagues on the other side to make whatever statements they wanted to. I cannot say we have to do that every time. If people are going to come in and make hour-long statements in the future, and do it solely for the purpose of obstruction, then I think there comes a time when a chairman has to exercise his or her prerogative and call for a vote.

If the Democrats don't like the nominees, they should vote them down. I hope the only negative votes will be those that were well considered, decent, honorable, by those who literally had good reason behind a negative vote. But even if they didn't have these good reasons, then they have a right to vote them down. Others have a right to vote them up. If a nominee passes, then the nominee should pass out of committee and come to the floor. Hopefully, we will have a debate for a reasonable length of time and we will vote on nominees, as we should, on the floor of the Senate.

Let no one be deceived; the rules were followed. I chatted with the Parliamentarians beforehand to make sure I was on a good track here and that I was following the best standards of the Senate, even though I certainly had to put my foot down as the chairman. I acted in accordance thereto.

With that, I understand the Senator from New York would like to make a statement.

I yield the floor.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 414

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and begin the consideration of Calendar No. 21, S. 414, a bill to provide an economic stimulus package.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it seems very interesting to me that this request would be made when our friends on the other side, last year, did not even pass a budget, for the first time

since the Budget Act was enacted, and did not pass the appropriations bills, by and large.

Mr. REID. Regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. HATCH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my good friend from Utah. I do not agree with them, but he is always someone who is ready to express his heartfelt convictions about any matter. I believe, having now traveled and talked with and heard from so many of my constituents, that it is time for us to face the real issues that are on the minds of the American people.

Obviously, we know Americans today are quite concerned and worried about the continuing defiance of the United Nations by Saddam Hussein and the amassing of 200,000 of our men and women in uniform in the gulf in the event the President must order military action to fulfill the requirements not only of Resolution 1441 but of all the resolutions that Saddam Hussein has defied for over a decade.

I know many of the people I represent are deeply concerned that in the last week we have not been able to get any information from the administration about their projected costs of the military action should it occur in Iraq, and the follow-on costs that would be required for the pacification and rebuilding of Iraq, the efforts to try to create a set of conditions that could provide a better opportunity for a brighter future for the people of Iraq.

Many of my constituents have said: Senator, how much is it going to cost? How long is it going to take? How many of our people will be put at risk? We do not know the answers. I think that is something on which we should be focused.

Certainly, I hear quite a bit of concern about how well prepared we are to defend ourselves at home. Have we put the amount of resources strategically deployed on defense that we have done on offense? As many of my colleagues know, I have been coming to the Chamber now for, I guess, 16 months expressing my deep concerns that the answer to those questions is no; that we have not done for defense what we have done for offense.

I am proud of the extraordinary capacity that our military has, by far the most ready, the most powerful in the history of the world. That is a great comfort and point of pride for every American.

I was up at one of those facilities just today, the Watervliet Arsenal in Albany. It dates back to the War of 1812. It has been producing guns and tubes, mortars and tank equipment for decades. I am very proud it is in a State I represent that has such a tradition of patriotism where the Revolutionary War was largely fought and won.

I am very grateful we have this level of commitment to our military, but I

do not hear the same from our mayors, our police chiefs, and our fire chiefs, and I do not think we can honestly say we have done everything we need to do to provide for hometown security, to make sure we get the people on the streets we require.

I met today with three mayors from cities I represent: Mayor Jerry Jennings from Albany, Tony Masiello from Buffalo, and Matt Driscoll from Syracuse. They came to talk about their unmet needs. When the alert goes up and the phone calls start coming in and they are expected to respond, they are not given the tools and resources that high level of responsibility demands.

I know we are in difficult economic times, but I do not think that can stand in the way of the Federal Government fulfilling its responsibility to the mayors, police chiefs, fire chiefs, emergency responders, hospital administrators, and others who make up our front line defense at home. In fact, I think it is imperative that we give the same attention to hometown security that we have been giving to national security because the two are absolutely inextricably linked.

There is no front over there. We do not put people on boats, on troop ships, and send them off somewhere far away. We do not wave goodbye to them at airports as they travel halfway around the world to defend freedom and America's vital interests. When we see a police officer standing on the street, when we go by a firehouse, those are the frontline soldiers. Those are the people who have to respond to whatever happens.

It has been troubling to me that this administration repeatedly has talked about the need for security but time and again has not been willing to give support with the dollars that are desperately required.

I have spoken with people throughout my State. I want to take a moment to share the comments and concerns of just one of the cities and counties I represent. It happens to be the county in which I live, West Chester County in another community, the city of New Rochelle, with a very dedicated group of leaders, Mayor Idoni and others who are totally committed to building New Rochelle and protecting New Rochelle. They have gone to briefings and training sessions to find out what they need to do.

Unfortunately, when I asked if their city had incurred any additional costs due to the recent code orange, this was their response:

Unfortunately the city of New Rochelle is nowhere able to prepare for or respond to homeland security alert level orange than we are for alert green. Incurring personnel expenses, i.e., overtime, is not fiscally possible. Additionally, all that we would have accomplished would have been to put more people on the street with limited training and virtually no equipment.

These words come from our frontline defenders. These are our generals, our colonels, and our captains. They are the people who are going to direct

whatever response we need in the event of some kind of terrorist attack.

Seventeen months have passed since that horrible day in September, and all the while the Federal Government has been asking our mayors to do more with less. According to the U.S. Conference of Mayors, cities have invested \$2.6 billion of their own resources to protect our Nation.

In November 2001, after visiting with the people in New York City, who know more about what is needed than literally anybody in our country, and going to Buffalo to meet with the mayor, police, fire officials there, I immediately called for \$3.5 billion of direct funding for our first responders. I proposed the homeland security block grant in 2000 and 2002, and it was the first piece of legislation I filed again this year in 2003.

Last week, the administration finally conceded what many of us, along with mayors, police commissioners, fire chiefs, emergency response teams, and others have been saying for the last 2 years: We need more resources at the local level to secure our homeland.

In January, I released a report that showed how 70 percent of our local cities and counties had not received any Federal homeland security funding. I can go through chapter and verse talking about what each community has had to do.

I recall a comment by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget who said in response to my criticism and others: There is not enough money in the galaxy to protect everyone and everybody.

That may be objectively true, but I think we have to do more to try, and I sure think we have to recognize places of increased vulnerability, targets of opportunity.

As we take great comfort in the capture of Khalid Sheik Mohammed in Pakistan, we cannot help but notice amongst the documents apparently recovered and the information that was used as a basis for this apprehension were concerns about additional attacks, I must say once again, focused primarily on New York City and Washington.

I do not think for a minute these are the only targets in the United States. I do believe they are still the two most prominent areas of concern for us and, therefore, need more attention than most places do.

Who would have guessed we would have found a terrorist cell in Lackawanna, NY, a few miles outside of downtown Buffalo? Who would have guessed that people accused of helping to finance terrorism would be arrested in Syracuse, NY? So we need a national plan for local response, and that is why on Friday I called for the establishment of a domestic defense fund within the Office of Domestic Preparedness in the Department of Homeland Security.

Whether it is in New York City, where between February 7 through the 20 the NYPD estimates it spent \$1.1

million for personnel costs, or in Los Angeles where an additional \$650,000 had to be used to put on personnel to search cars at the airport, or Wilmington, DE, which spent \$25,000 a day for police overtime, we know these costs are building up. In this time of an ocean of red ink for our State and local budgets, there are no resources that can be dipped into to make up for these losses our cities and counties are experiencing.

This domestic defense fund would provide direct funding for our local communities, for personnel costs, equipment, and other first responder needs. It would also include the covering of other emergency preparedness costs, whether it is high overtime costs as a result of code orange or extra security if there is a high profile trial like Zacarias Moussaoui, or to help local law enforcement cover the costs they incur if they arrest a sleeper cell such as they did in Lackawanna. We need to be ready to provide these additional funds.

When the Presidents Day blizzard occurred up and down the east coast, cities and States knew that FEMA's disaster recovery fund was in place to help defray these costs. LIHEAP, the Low Income Heating Energy Assistance Program, is set up in the same spirit. When it gets colder and our citizens are at risk of exposure to dangerous temperatures, the Federal Government provides for home heating costs. Right now we have a national alert system and a local response system, but as the threat level approaches orange, our local governments have to dig deep to find the funds to respond. Therefore, we need to do better.

Just as we have done for our men and women in uniform, we have to be willing to provide the funds our men and women on the front lines at home need and deserve.

I understand the administration plans to come forward with a wartime supplemental appropriations bill. In the Senate, my colleagues and I will be pushing also for an emergency supplemental to address our unmet domestic security needs. That should include direct funding for local communities, and it should include the domestic defense fund.

I do not see any way to avoid the necessity of providing the funds that are needed for our homeland-hometown security, and I hope this body, and our colleagues across the Capitol, as well as the administration, will cross party lines and in a bipartisan manner make sure we do everything possible to prepare. We can always hope for the best, but we have to prepare for the worst, and that means we have to pay attention to what we are being told by local first responders. They are the experts. They know what they need. We have to stand ready to assist them, and I hope as we move forward over the next month we will do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have enjoyed my colleague's remarks, and although we have our differences on some of them, I appreciate her diligence and effort. I have a lot of respect for her.

I will say that continually asking to go off the Estrada matter for other matters really concerns me, because I think it is a failure to recognize that this is one of the most important nominees and one of the most important positions in the country. There is one way to get off of this nomination, and that is to vote up or down, instead of filibustering. Do what has always been done in the past in these matters and bring this issue to a vote. Then we can go to these important economic matters and other matters as well.

I have been concerned, because I remember when the minority leader and the minority whip came on the floor last week and basically said: Why are we not on economic issues?

I did get very upset because I thought that is nice for them to say that, but they were not even willing to do a budget last year because it takes a lot of guts to do a budget. We always did. Last year was the first time in the history of the Budget Act that the majority party refused to do a budget. We know why. Because they made a lot of cheap shots against us when we had to make those tough decisions on the budget. Then all of a sudden they found they were in a position where shots could be taken against them, cheap or otherwise, and they were not able to get together on their side because they had so many factions on their side that did not agree.

So it is easy to criticize, but you better have a better standing to criticize than what I think they have.

Also, the reason we had to have this omnibus appropriations bill after the first of the year is because our colleagues on the other side could not pass the appropriations bills. We did it in a matter of weeks after we came into power this year. I think that is something the Republicans deserve a great deal of credit for. Our colleagues on the other side deserve some criticism for it.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. In the last Congress Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement 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 January 5, 2002 in Tacoma, WA. Three gay men were attacked and another woman shot in a nightclub parking lot. When the three men walked to the nightclub parking lot, they were confronted by two or three other men in a truck who asked "Are you gay? Are you gay?" The men in the truck said that it was a "straight parking lot" and demanded that the gay men leave. The men in the truck then approached the victims and began beating them. A woman and her husband came to the aid of the victims, and the assailants shot the woman once in the chest. The bullet traveled through her chest and lodged in her cheek. She was treated at a local hospital and was later released.

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.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL PEACE CORPS DAY

• Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to one of our most essential and enduring national endeavors: the Peace Corps.

Last Friday, February 28, was National Peace Corps day. While the Senate was not in session on Friday, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the Peace Corps—an institution that is certainly deserving of our praise and support.

As my colleagues are aware, it is always with tremendous fondness and pride that I speak of the Peace Corps. It gives me occasion to recall my own years as a volunteer in the Dominican Republic. Indeed, I have often spoken of how these 2 years changed my life. Living and working outside of the United States and seeing the way other nations operated for the first time, I grew to appreciate our Nation more and more, and developed a strong sense of what it means to be an American. I was proud to share my experience as an American citizen with the people I was there to help. Those 2 years were invaluable to me, and truly brought home to me the value of public service.

It was 42 years ago when President Kennedy laid out his vision for the future of American volunteer service. Speaking of a corps of committed and idealistic young volunteers who would travel all over the world "promoting world peace and friendship," he saw public service as an ideal to transcend political rhetoric. Peace Corps volunteers were not to reflect particular Republican or Democratic ideology. Rath-

er, their service would be a manifestation of the core American values we all share.

Since 1961, more than 168,000 Americans have responded to President Kennedy's call, and the Peace Corps now sends more than 7,000 volunteers to 76 different countries every year. This means that there are 7,000 important American liaisons scattered around the world helping people and promoting American values. In fact, the need for such ambassadors—people who truly show the world the best of America—has never been greater. Especially in these difficult and tumultuous times, I believe that an increased Peace Corps presence in regions with significant anti-American sentiment could help to foster greater mutual understanding and tolerance between Americans and the communities they serve.

After all, these volunteers are really the heart and soul of the Peace Corps. They are the ones on the front lines, working hard, making one-on-one connections with the citizens of the countries in which they work. For 42 years, they have brought a wealth of practical experience to communities in Africa, Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, Eastern Europe, and the Pacific. And, I believe it is important to recognize that the enduring success of the Peace Corps is rooted in each volunteer's commitment to leave behind skills that allow people to take charge of their own futures.

The Peace Corps is a truly remarkable institution in America, a symbol of the very best of our ideals of service, sacrifice, and self-reliance. I believe that we must provide sufficient resources for the Peace Corps so that it can increase the number of volunteers in the field and continue its noble mission. National Peace Corps Day honors its volunteers, past and present, and reaffirms our country's commitment to helping our friends and neighbors throughout the world. Mr. President, in recognition of National Peace Corps day and in light of the special service this institution performs for our nation and the global community, I reaffirm my strong support of and commitment to this invaluable institution. I hope my colleagues and fellow Americans will do the same.

I thank the President. •

IN MEMORY OF BARBARA COY

• Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, my office encountered a loss this past weekend. My first military fellow, Lt. Col. Tim Coy, U.S. Air Force, lost his wife after a battle with cancer. Barbara Louise Coy, age 43, passed away in Woodbridge, VA, on Saturday, March 1, 2003. She was born on July 30, 1959, at Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, CA, she graduated from Hampton High School, Hampton, VA. She accompanied Tim on his many military assignments to Nevada, Wyoming, California, Colorado, and Virginia. She leaves behind her husband of