

Pressing presidential flesh was good, Cushingham said, but the photo is best. It's proof of his few moments of glory.

"It's something I'm going to keep to show to my children and my grandchildren. I can say, 'Hey, I met the president.'"

## EXHIBIT 2

## BUSH CONTINUES SEAGOING TRADITION

(By Otto Kreisher)

WASHINGTON.—President Bush's stay aboard the Abraham Lincoln off San Diego today will continue an unbroken record of presidential visits to U.S. Navy aircraft carriers that goes back to Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1957.

Nearly half of those carrier visits have occurred in the same Southern California waters that Bush will sail through during his overnight cruise aboard the Lincoln as it nears the end of a war-extended deployment to the Persian Gulf.

The Lincoln will be the first U.S. warship Bush has gone aboard as president, an apt recognition of the major role that carriers have played in the conflicts that he ordered in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Because the Lincoln will be too far off San Diego for a helicopter, Bush will fly to the carrier in a tactical aircraft, a historic first for a president.

After arriving at North Island Naval Air Station aboard Air Force One this morning, Bush will board a twin-jet S-3B Viking from Sea Control Squadron 35. The plane will make a cable-assisted landing on the Lincoln.

Though he served in the Texas Air National Guard, Bush will be merely a passenger strapped in next to the pilot, according to White House spokesman Ari Fleischer. "For the sake of the landing," Fleischer said. "I'm sure he will be doing no piloting."

Closer to land tomorrow, Bush will return by helicopter and leave North Island before the Everett, Wash.-based carrier arrives in San Diego Bay.

The Navy will not discuss where Bush will stay during his night on the nuclear-powered carrier, citing security concerns. But the president could use either the spacious suite provided for the carrier battle group commander, Rear Adm. John M. Kelly, or the large cabin available to the Lincoln's commanding officer, Capt. Kendall Card.

Both provide a comfortable bedroom with adjoining "head"—Navy for bathroom—and large conference or dining room located several levels above the flight deck.

Presidential staff likely will be put into some of the officer staterooms vacated by about half of the air wing's squadrons, which will have flown off to their home stations before Bush arrives.

Eisenhower started the trend of commanders-in-chief touring carriers with his overnight stay on the Saratoga in June 1957. But every U.S. president has spent time on a Navy vessel since John Tyler in 1844, although for several the only nautical exposure was on the presidential yachts.

Other presidents have spent a lot of time on warships, with the two Roosevelts—both one-time assistant Navy secretaries—leading the pack in visits.

Theodore Roosevelt, who had served as acting Navy secretary, visited at least six warships as president, including a primitive submarine in 1905.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, who had been assistant Navy secretary, spent months aboard 12 different warships, including many wartime voyages for overseas conferences with allied leaders.

Although neither Roosevelt ever visited a carrier, both have had flattops named for them.

George H.W. Bush followed FDR's example of using warships for security overseas. He stayed aboard the cruiser Belknap during a 1989 summit with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev in Malta and on the amphibious assault ship Tripoli during a New Year's 1992 visit to troops in Somalia.

The elder Bush, a World War II Navy carrier pilot, also visited the carrier Forrestal during his Malta stay.

John F. Kennedy, a PT boat captain in World War II, became the first president to visit a carrier off San Diego when he toured the Oriskany on June 6, 1963. He then spent that night aboard the Kitty Hawk, watching flight operations.

Lyndon B. Johnson spent a night aboard the nuclear-powered Enterprise off San Diego on Nov. 10-11, 1967.

Richard Nixon used two carriers to broadcast Armed Forces Day message to the troops: The Hornet on May 17, 1969, off the Virginia coast and the Independence on May 19, 1973, docked at Norfolk.

Jimmy Carter's visits aboard the carrier named for Eisenhower in 1978 and the Nimitz in 1980 occurred in the Atlantic. The former nuclear-qualified submariner toured the Eisenhower's nuclear reactor spaces—probably the only president ever to visit that highly restricted area.

Ronald Reagan spend part of Aug. 20, 1981, on the San Diego-based Constellation, off the California coast.

Bill Clinton visited three carriers and spent a night aboard the George Washington on June 5-6, 1994, sailing from England to Normandy for the 50th anniversary of the D-day invasion.

## SMITHSONIAN BROUHAHA

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, turning to another subject, I have been concerned about the newspaper reports and stories about the Smithsonian's exhibit that was moved within the museum by its managers. Many of those newspaper stories and other news stories have indicated that I pressured the Smithsonian Museum to move that exhibit. That is absolutely not true. No member of my office nor I contacted the Smithsonian. I checked with the other two members of the Alaska delegation. None has commented on that exhibit or interfered in any way.

When I looked into it, I concluded the Smithsonian was right. It was not just an exhibit of beautiful pictures of Alaska—and I love beautiful pictures of my State. It was an attempt to use the Smithsonian as a place to carry forward the position of the Wilderness Society on the question of whether or not oil and gas development should take place on the Arctic coast.

That is a public issue. Suppose I had taken all the photos and all the exhibits I have displayed on the floor and took them to the Smithsonian and said I wanted them positioned so the people coming in can understand why we should go forward in drilling ANWR. I believe the Senate would come apart at the seams.

This action that has been taken is contrary to the basic concept of the Smithsonian. It should not be a place for advocacy on a public issue. Clearly, that is what happened. It was an exhibit based on a book with contributors

William Meadows of the Wilderness Society; Debbie Miller, of the Alaska Wilderness Society; Fran Mauer, former refuge manager; and former President Jimmy Carter, of the Alaska Wilderness League.

Let me describe the cover of the book. The book talks about seasons of life and land and a photographic journey through Alaska. That is wonderful. They are great photographs. What is the purpose of the book? The purpose of the book is to make people think the land depicted in this book is endangered. There is a picture of a red sign with caribou, labeled "endangered." "Why is this land connected to us all?"

Of the 19 million acres of the Arctic Wildlife Refuge, all but 1.5 million is protected. The Arctic Wildlife Refuge is already protected. It is not endangered. The other 1.5 million acres is an area set aside by an amendment offered by Senator Tsongas of Massachusetts, a Democrat, and Senator Jackson of Washington, a Democrat. It was passed by the Senate, passed by the House, and the bill was signed by President Jimmy Carter in 1980 after the election.

President Carter has a foreword in this book. It says:

In 1960, President Dwight D. Eisenhower established the original 8.9 million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Range to preserve its unique wildlife, wilderness, and recreational values.

I know that; I helped draft that order. I was at the Interior Department as a solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

President Carter continues:

Twenty years later, I signed the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, monumental legislation safeguarded more than 100 million acres of national parks, refuges, and forest lands in Alaska.

That is true.

This loss specifically created the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, doubled the size of the former range, and restricted development in areas that are clearly incompatible with oil exploration.

Since I left office, there have been repeated proposals to open the Arctic Refuge coastal plain to oil drilling. Those attempts have failed because of tremendous opposition by the American people. . . .

This is a propaganda book. President Carter signed that law that had the Tsongas-Jackson amendment that authorized us to go forward with oil and gas development as long as an environmental impact statement demonstrated there would be no irreparable harm to the Arctic Plain.

President Carter has now developed opposition after signing the law that authorized oil and gas development. And the law would never have passed if it had not permitted it.

The basic thing today is what to do about these people both in the Senate and elsewhere who are trying to persecute the Smithsonian officials who saw what they were trying to do. They were trying to use the Smithsonian to further their cause in opposition to the discussions going on in the Congress on

ANWR. The House had just passed a bill containing the approval to proceed with oil and gas leasing. They knew that. They wanted to put it up in the Smithsonian and have all the visitors to the beautiful Smithsonian look at this exhibit and come to the conclusion that those who propose proceeding with the authority under the 1980 act that President Carter signed, are somehow wrong.

That is advocacy on an issue that is pending before the U.S. Congress, and it is wrong to use the Smithsonian for that purpose. I do not believe we should let it go unnoticed. People are criticizing the management of the Smithsonian for having recognized that. I will defend them. They were right.

As a matter of fact, I would defend them if someone from my point of view went to the Smithsonian and demanded space to use the Smithsonian to advocate my point of view. That is not right. They have every right in the world to produce this book, every right in the world to publish it, to distribute it, to sell it, and to advocate a position against what I believe in. The constitutional right of free speech in this country gives them the absolute right to do what they want to do, but they do not have the right to use federally supported facilities like the Smithsonian and demand the right to use it and castigate those who manage the institution, who caught them in the act and said: You cannot do that.

I applaud the Smithsonian managers and I tell them unquestionably, I want them to notify me if there is any further attempt to bully them. We are going to get to the bottom of this one because it is absolutely wrong to challenge and castigate people who are doing their job correctly. The Smithsonian did the proper thing, and their opponents should admit it and stop this.

Every article I have seen, every radio account that I have seen, anything that has been said about this, indicates I am the one who put pressure on the Smithsonian to move it. It is not true. We did not do that. But I do applaud the people who made the decision that this is wrong.

I think the Congress should insist that the Smithsonian and other Federal facilities not be used for advocacy, pro or con, on legislation pending in the U.S. Congress.

#### AIR CARGO SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I rise to give my comments on an act that we passed yesterday. It is the Air Cargo Security Improvement Act. I think it is worth noting some of the particulars of this legislation which passed the Senate last night because it is another important step toward fully protecting the United States and all Americans from terrorists who intend to use our aviation system to commit future attacks.

While there are a bunch of provisions in this bill, it includes the creation of a security program to protect our air cargo from terrorist attacks. This bill mandates crucial studies on blast-resistant cargo containers. It also provides for TSA, the Transportation Security Administration, passenger screening. That is known as CAPPS II. It also provides how to defend our airliners from shoulder-fired missile attacks. That is a shoulder-mounted, heat-seeking missile, similar to that used in the attack of last December on an Israeli charter jet in the skies over Kenya.

This legislation is clearly in the interest of the United States and in the interest of freedom-loving people around the world. It also addresses a deep concern of mine regarding foreign citizens coming to the United States to receive pilot training on all sizes of aircraft. Does that have a resonance? Does that call to mind something that had disastrous consequences to this country?

Well, indeed, because what we have seen is what can happen when people come to our country with the specific intent to do us great harm. Many of the September 11 hijackers had learned to fly airplanes right here in the United States. They used those airplanes, then, as deadly weapons against the interests of Americans and the people who were in those buildings. They learned to fly in flight schools right here in the United States.

Now, section 113 of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act, which was enacted in the last Congress, requires background checks of all foreign flight school applicants seeking training to operate aircraft that are 12,500 pounds or more. I had attached that particular provision in the Commerce Committee, and that was part of the package that ultimately became law.

Clearly, that was a step in the right direction because, had that been in effect, it would have screened out those who did harm to us by learning to fly airliners in our own flight training schools here. But that provision—with a cutoff of only learning to fly 12,500-pound aircraft or more—doesn't help us from preventing different types of potential attacks against our domestic security.

To rectify that problem, we attached another amendment to the bill that passed last night which addresses the issue of background checks for all foreign flight students who come to flight schools to learn to fly in the United States.

Why? Besides the obvious—the events on September 11—the FBI has issued terrorism warnings indicating that small planes might be used to carry out suicide attacks. Small aircraft can be used by terrorists to attack nuclear facilities, carry explosives, or to deliver biological or chemical agents. We remember what they found on the computer of one of the suspected hijackers: information about learning to fly a crop duster.

For example, if a crop duster is filled with a combination of fertilizers and explosives and were it to be taken into an area of high concentration of people, such as a sports stadium, that could do some serious damage and some serious injury, not even to speak of the possibility of distributing biological or chemical agents from something like a crop duster. It is in the interest of this country to ensure we are not training terrorists to perform those acts.

The bill that passed last night will close an important loophole and answer the critical warnings issued recently by the FBI by extending the background check requirement to all foreign applicants to U.S. flight schools regardless of the size of aircraft they seek to learn to fly.

The flight schools naturally have been concerned: Is this going to be more redtape for them? The fact is, when we passed this provision over a year ago, it was assigned to the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice never implemented the bill, to the great frustration of the owners and the operators of flight schools, so that they could never get the foreign flight students in because the Department of Justice had not implemented the rules to allow those background checks, which is a simple little fingerprint test that can be done in our embassies and consulates abroad before the foreign flight student ever comes to America. Naturally, the flight schools were frustrated.

We are rectifying that situation for the flight schools because this is not going to be in the Department of Justice, where the holdup occurred; it is going to be in the new Department of Homeland Security, specifically designated to the TSA, the Transportation Security Administration, and it is my expectation that the TSA, which provided excellent advice in the fine-tuning of this legislation, will apply an appropriate level of background screening to all foreign nationals who seek flight training in the United States, and then the frustrations of the flight schools will be taken care of. The flight schools will be able to know that the background check has already been done abroad before the flight student from a foreign land arrives.

That procedure is not going to allow anyone to slip through the cracks. We cannot aid anyone who intends to do harm to Americans and to our Nation.

I thank all the Senators who helped me with this legislation. It has been a couple of years in the making to finally get it to this point. The chairman and ranking members, Senators MCCAIN and HOLLINGS, and their staff have worked with us to ensure the inclusion of this provision in the bill. Finally, we are on the way to solving this problem.