

Now, it did not matter that we had voted on it previously. It did not matter that the amendment dealt with a proposed—not final but a proposed—Department of Labor regulation. None of that seemed to matter. That amendment was, and is still, a show-stopper to this bipartisan bill. So we are at the second goalpost, as it has been moved.

The demand of the leadership of the other side keeps changing. We were talking about just a single-digit list of amendments and, for the most part, hopefully germane amendments. We are not talking about that anymore. Now, since it looks like an overtime pay vote may be in the picture, there is a goalpost yet further away.

For the first time we are hearing of other amendments—not Finance Committee jurisdiction amendments—such as an increase in the minimum wage, that are new showstoppers.

You can't finish this bill, we are told, even though we are told the substance is great. Nobody seems to disagree on the substance of this. So why can't we get a bill to the President? Even though we don't disagree on the substance, there is still a new goalpost. Heaven help us how all that turns out.

There is a final goalpost way out there; that is, getting to conference. We may move through all the goalposts, but then we may be blocked on whether we get to conference. I hope I am proven wrong in a few minutes as we vote on this measure.

If we can't get cooperation from the other side, we have a couple alternatives: One, to go on with other business; two, to look at reconciliation in late spring. I don't want to go with either of those options because we can finish this bill now. There is always a time when the Senate has goodwill between the two parties represented. That goodwill hopefully will surface just as cream surfaces on milk.

Now it is time to get the job done. I hope we can pass this FSC/ETI legislation. It is bipartisan. That is the only way you get things done in the Senate. Consequently, because it is bipartisan, we ought to get it done. And because it is bipartisan, it deserves better treatment than it has received thus far.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 1:31 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the ACTING President pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU).

PREGNANCY AND TRAUMA CARE ACCESS PROTECTION ACT OF 2004—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the

hour of 2:15 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will proceed to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 2207.

Under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 462, S. 2207, a bill to improve women's access to health care services and the access of all individuals to emergency and trauma care services, by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the delivery of such service.

Bill Frist, Orrin Hatch, Judd Gregg, John Ensign, Lamar Alexander, Peter Fitzgerald, Larry Craig, John Cornyn, Robert Bennett, Mike Enzi, Mitch McConnell, Ted Stevens, Norm Coleman, James Inhofe, Kay Bailey Hutchison, George Voinovich, Charles Grassley.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 2207, the Pregnancy and Trauma Care Access Protection Act of 2004, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote "no."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 66 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alexander	Dole	Miller
Allard	Domenici	Murkowski
Allen	Ensign	Nickles
Bennett	Enzi	Roberts
Bond	Fitzgerald	Santorum
Brownback	Frist	Sessions
Bunning	Grassley	Smith
Burns	Gregg	Snowe
Campbell	Hagel	Specter
Chafee	Hatch	Stevens
Chambliss	Hutchison	Sununu
Cochran	Inhofe	Talent
Coleman	Kyl	Thomas
Collins	Lott	Voinovich
Cornyn	Lugar	Warner
Craig	McCain	
DeWine	McConnell	

NAYS—48

Akaka	Byrd	Daschle
Baucus	Cantwell	Dayton
Bayh	Carper	Dodd
Biden	Clinton	Dorgan
Bingaman	Conrad	Durbin
Boxer	Corzine	Edwards
Breaux	Crapo	Feingold

Feinstein	Kohl	Pryor
Graham (FL)	Landrieu	Reed
Graham (SC)	Lautenberg	Reid
Harkin	Leahy	Rockefeller
Hollings	Levin	Sarbanes
Inouye	Lincoln	Schumer
Jeffords	Mikulski	Shelby
Johnson	Nelson (FL)	Stabenow
Kennedy	Nelson (NE)	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Kerry	Lieberman	Murray
-------	-----------	--------

The motion was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote, the yeas are 49 and the nays are 48. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

JUMPSTART OUR BUSINESS STRENGTH (JOBS) ACT—Resumed

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the pending motion to Calendar No. 381, S. 1637.

Bill Frist, Charles Grassley, Gordon Smith, James Talent, John Ensign, John Cornyn, Wayne Allard, Olympia Snowe, Rick Santorum, Michael B. Enzi, Mike DeWine, Trent Lott, Christopher Bond, Thad Cochran, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Jim Bunning, Mitch McConnell.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the pending motion to Calendar No. 381, S. 1637, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 67 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Cornyn	Inhofe
Allard	Craig	Lott
Allen	Crapo	Lugar
Bennett	DeWine	McConnell
Bond	Dole	Miller
Breaux	Domenici	Murkowski
Brownback	Ensign	Nelson (NE)
Bunning	Enzi	Nickles
Burns	Fitzgerald	Roberts
Campbell	Frist	Santorum
Chafee	Graham (SC)	Sessions
Chambliss	Grassley	Shelby
Cochran	Hagel	Smith
Coleman	Hatch	Snowe
Collins	Hutchison	

Specter	Talent	Voinovich
Stevens	Thomas	Warner
NAYS—47		
Akaka	Durbin	Leahy
Baucus	Edwards	Levin
Bayh	Feingold	Lincoln
Biden	Feinstein	McCain
Bingaman	Graham (FL)	Mikulski
Boxer	Gregg	Nelson (FL)
Byrd	Harkin	Pryor
Cantwell	Hollings	Reed
Carper	Inouye	Reid
Clinton	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Conrad	Johnson	Sarbanes
Corzine	Kennedy	Schumer
Daschle	Kohl	Stabenow
Dayton	Kyl	Sununu
Dodd	Landrieu	Wyden
Dorgan	Lautenberg	

NOT VOTING—3

Kerry	Lieberman	Murray
-------	-----------	--------

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote the yeas are 49, the nays are 48. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina. Madam President, on rollcall vote 67 I voted "nay." It was my intention to vote "yea." Therefore, I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome of the vote.

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

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I wanted to take a couple moments and update my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as to where we plan on going on a very important bill, the jobs in manufacturing bill that is before us.

The bill itself, first and foremost, is a critically important bill. We have used the almost mnemonic JOBS bill, but it really does affect workers, manufacturing, employment and, thus, it is critical. From talking to the Democratic leadership and our leadership and the chairman and ranking member, we all agree we need to do everything possible to complete this legislation in a timely way because it is important to the American people. We have a bill that passed out of the Finance Committee 19 to 2 which, by definition, means it enjoyed broad and bipartisan support.

Now we have had two cloture votes that have failed. Both of those cloture votes are signals to stop, to obstruct the bill. Yet in our conversations, everybody agrees we need to do everything possible—today, tonight, tomorrow, and tomorrow night—to complete this bill. First and foremost, it is an important bill. From a procedural standpoint and from what we do over the next hour or so, we are working hard to complete the list of amendments we will be addressing. We will hopefully be able to lock in that list at some point in time so we will have a pathway for completion of the legislation.

Thirdly, there is a particular amendment, the Harkin amendment on overtime, on which I have been clear. Once we have a plan to address all the potential scores of amendments in a reasonable way—hopefully staying on amendments that directly impact the content of the bill itself, that are germane, although the interpretation of germaneness varies on this floor—the overtime amendment will be considered and the Harkin amendment will be considered and voted upon. But what we ask is for a list of amendments and a glide path to completion of the bill. Let people vote up or down, yes or no, for or against the bill so that we can bring it to resolution.

First, this bill is important to workers. It is important to our economy. Second, we are completing how we can put together a glide path to finish the legislation. Third, there is the overtime vote and a companion vote that will be side-by-side votes that will take place on the overtime issue. We continue to work hard.

I withdraw the pending motion to proceed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is withdrawn.

The Senator from Oregon. Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EVENTS IN IRAQ

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, a year ago come Friday, I remember watching with some emotion as the television recorded the events in Baghdad, and an American soldier crawled up a statue of Saddam Hussein and put a chain around its neck and, with the help of American equipment, pulled down that statue to the cheers of a throng of Iraqi people who had suffered for decades under the tyranny of this vicious man, this mass murderer, this fomenter and financier of world terrorism.

I saw that day people hungry for a chance at freedom, hungry for a chance to have a new beginning as a people and as a nation. I remember shedding some tears watching that scene. I reflected at the time that I was watching a piece of American history not unlike the fall of the Berlin Wall, not unlike the surrender of the empire of Japan on the battleship Missouri to General MacArthur, a moment in which I was seeing the values of American foreign policy displayed before the entire Earth.

As a Member of the Senate and as a student of American foreign policy history, I have always taken great pride in the fact that America does not seek the treasury or the territory of other neighbors and nations. But what we do say to the world is: We hold out and spread the values of our Bill of Rights, of our Constitution, of our Declaration of Independence. We hold out values such as democracy, human rights, freedom and liberty, the freedom of enter-

prise, the spreading of peace and prosperity, of domestic tranquility, of promoting the general welfare and providing for the common defense of our people and our friends. To me, that is what American foreign policy is about. I believe that is what it has always stood for.

So it is with particular sorrow that I reflect upon some of the commentary upon our current action in Iraq. I was a new Member of the Senate. I had been here 2 years when President Clinton came to this body and asked that we issue a resolution that called for regime change in Iraq.

President Clinton, after the expulsion of U.N. weapons inspectors, felt compelled to rain bombs on Baghdad for 4 days and 4 nights in order to hit those targets where we believed weapons were held because they had been declared, but not disclosed. President Clinton wisely warned that, based on the intelligence he and other nations had in common, we would fight them now or fight them later.

President Clinton's warnings took on greater urgency for this Senator and for many of my colleagues in the light of 9/11, when still declared but undisclosed weapons of mass destruction were in the hands of a terrorist nation and a sponsor of terrorism like Saddam Hussein. We felt compelled to pursue the policy we all voted upon, to change the regime in Iraq for the safety of the American people, for the safety of the free world.

As I recall that resolution, it was darn near unanimous, if not so. My pride in that vote is we did it together, Republicans and Democrats. Yet it is disappointing to me, as a Republican who stood with President Clinton on so much foreign policy during the 1990s, when President Bush, after 9/11, asked for support and following through on that resolution and 17 U.N. resolutions, this conflict has become increasingly politicized.

I think it is important in my comments and in those of my colleagues that we not question the patriotism of any of our colleagues who voted otherwise or any of our colleagues who believed this is not the right action. But I do think it appropriate to question the wisdom of those who would undermine this American initiative at a time when we need unity.

The comparison was made by one of my colleagues this is Vietnam again. I think it is important, if we want to make that comparison, we point out how many inconsistencies there are to Vietnam. But I think it is also well to remember Ho Chi Minh said the Vietnam war would not be won by them in the streets of Saigon, but in the streets of San Francisco, Chicago, New York, and Washington. The whole point of his comment at that time was the way you beat America is not to beat them militarily but to beat their will at home. I think that is what is being called into question.

What is our will? What are our purposes? For this Senator, my will is we

must win. My vote has been for this action, both under President Clinton and now under President Bush. It is unfortunate that some now call for policies which amount to retreat and loss. I cannot think of a more devastating result for America's place and purpose in this world than for us to fail at this time.

We must win. We must not have the will of the American people broken to the naysayers of today. We have to continue to stand up for the values of freedom embodied in our founding documents, the values of democracy, the values of human rights, the values of enterprise and freedom. Those are the things we hold out to the people of Iraq.

I was stopped in the hall by a reporter who asked if in fact it was true American military forces fired a missile into a mosque in Baghdad. I did not know the answer until I inquired. Now it is all on the news and, in fact, there was a missile fired in the direction of a mosque. The reason it was is because five American soldiers were shot from that mosque as they tried to advance through the streets to secure the security of that area.

I say for the record murderers and terrorists must not find sanctuary behind the cloak of religion in any place. There should be no sanctuary for people such as these. So if the American forces made the decision to fire where they were being fired upon, I say: Well done and do it again. Let them find no sanctuary anywhere if their purpose is to deny the American forces the ability to provide security, if their purpose is to undo this Nation's effort in establishing democracy for the people of Iraq. They have suffered too long; they have suffered torture, maiming, rape rooms, weapons of mass destruction, at the hands of a brutal dictator. There are a few—I mean a decided minority—in Iraq who will not win from the values we enjoy because they won under the tyranny of Saddam Hussein. They must not be allowed to win now.

I plead with my colleagues, patriots all, be careful in the words we use, be wise in what we say, so we do not give aid and comfort to the enemies of that country, the fomenters of terrorism; that we do what we have set out to do, and that is to remove a regime that was bent on tyranny, fomenting terror, and financing it wherever it could; and that we follow through with the promises made by this Government and the previous one, President Clinton and President Bush, that democracy can have a new beginning—in fact, a first chance—on the streets of Arabia. This is our purpose, and may we win. We will win sooner if we watch our words and we weigh them on the scales of wisdom.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending business is S. 1637, the JOBS Act.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING THE MEN'S AND WOMEN'S UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT BASKETBALL TEAMS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise with a strong note of celebration in my voice on behalf of my small State. The presiding officer lives in the same region of the country I do, so I suspect there is a sense of collective regional pride as well.

I am sorry my colleague Senator LIEBERMAN isn't here. He will be here tomorrow. Today is a religious holiday, so he could not be in the Senate today. I am sorry he is not here on one level; but on another level, every time one of the University of Connecticut teams wins, he does the UCONN cheer on the floor of the Senate, which causes his senior colleague a significant degree of embarrassment. He knows this, and I think he enjoys doing it when I am here. So, the one piece of good news I have is I won't have to listen to that cheer tomorrow because I myself will be away tomorrow.

I want to take a few minutes to recognize and celebrate a remarkable historical achievement that occurred both on Monday and Tuesday nights of this week. I speak of the men's and women's national collegiate basketball championships. Never before in history has a single university captured both of those titles in the same year, so my colleagues and others, I am sure, will understand the sense of pride we all feel in Connecticut for the tremendous historic accomplishments of these two wonderful teams—both the men's and women's teams. UCONN's achievement is stunning all the more because when you consider the previous four times in history a school sent both of its men's and women's teams to the Final Four in the same year, those schools failed to come away with so much as one national championship, let alone two in the same year.

Let me briefly recognize both of these teams. While it is certainly a university-wide celebration over the accomplishments of both, each deserves a moment of special recognition for their achievement.

I will begin with the men's team. Those who follow college basketball will recall on the cover of "Sports Illustrated," the University of Connecticut men's team was predicted to win the national championship.

They were the No. 1 ranked team in the country. Shortly thereafter, in November, they faced, ironically, a Georgia Tech team which handed them a rather significant defeat. Ironic I say because it was Georgia Tech that the University of Connecticut faced on Monday night for the national championship.

All told, the UConn Huskies would lose six games all season. For most teams, that would be reason to celebrate, having won 33 games and losing 6. In the Huskies' case, with each loss, more and more people around the country began to doubt whether the University of Connecticut's team had what it would take to go on to win a national title.

To make matters worse, throughout the season, the Huskies' outstanding center, Emeka Okafor, was troubled with a series of back injuries and spasms and was unable to play at his full measure of capability. He was certainly the heart and soul of the team. He scored points, grabbed rebounds, and blocked shots. He is the leader in the country in that last category.

His accomplishments went far beyond his statistics. His mere presence on the floor was fundamentally enough to alter the game. He is that much of a leader.

Even more impressive than Emeka's athletic credentials are his academic ones. We fail to promote academic success. Emeka Okafor is not only the No. 1 basketball player in the country, but he is also the Big East Scholar-Athlete of the Year and the National Academic All-American of the year.

While he was putting up impressive numbers on the basketball court, Emeka was an all-star in the classroom as well. He earned his degree in finance in 3 years with a GPA in excess of 3.8.

A lesser team might have given up hope after losing a player of Emeka Okafor's ability, but a pivotal series was the Big East Tournament where he had to sit out two games. Ben Gordon, a very talented guard for the University of Connecticut, took over the leadership role, along with Rashad Anderson, Taliek Brown, and others. They went on to win six straight games and capture the national title.

One of the most important games, of course, was the Saturday night game in which by a margin of 1 point, UConn defeated the Blue Devils—a very heated rivalry going back a number of years—facing a remarkable Duke team under the leadership of Mike Krzyzewski. We are all very appreciative of his abilities and the teams he put together, but beating Duke has a special significance in the UConn-Duke rivalry. We are very proud of the men's team. They had a terrific season. They certainly deserve some special recognition. Jim Calhoun, who is a good personal friend of mine—I am very proud of Jim's accomplishments. My only regret is that on Monday he was not selected to be in the Hall of Fame. I think he deserved it.

If it was up to my vote, he would have had it. His accomplishments over the years, both at Northeastern and the University of Connecticut, more than qualify him for a special place in the Basketball Hall of Fame. Being only one of three active coaches at the collegial level to have won two national championships, Jim Calhoun deserves a spot in the Hall of Fame. I am

confident he will get one soon. I am sorry it did not occur on the day he won another championship, on Monday.

My congratulations to Jim for a wonderful season, a great leadership on that team. His assistant coaches, Tom Moore, George Blaney, and Clyde Vaughan—good friends of mine—and the players, Rashad Anderson, Hilton Armstrong, Jason Baisch, Josh Boone, Denham Brown, Taliek Brown, Justin Evanovich, Ben Gordon, Ed Nelson, I mentioned Emeka Okafor, Ryan Swaller, Ryan Thompson, Shamon Tooles, Charlie Villanueva, Marcus White, and Marcus Williams, all made significant accomplishments.

The women's team, of course, was also a great success. This is the third consecutive national championship they have won, really a remarkable record only having been achieved once before, ironically, by the Tennessee team they defeated last evening under the leadership of Pat Summitt.

Over the past decade or so, the UConn women's basketball team has become synonymous with excellence across the country. The numbers they have piled up are rather staggering: 5 national titles, 8 appearances in the Final Four, and a record winning streak of 70 consecutive games. Over the same period of time, women's basketball in America has experienced an enormous surge in popularity, and the University of Connecticut women are a major reason why. They have been an inspiration to young girls all across our Nation who dream of being basketball stars. Their combination of athletic skills, academic excellence, and good sportsmanship have made them role models for young men and young women across the country.

Things did not come easily for this women's team this year. Much like the men's team, the women's team had a tough run in the early days. On January 3, they lost a heartbreaker to Duke by 1 point. It was their first home loss in 4 years. For the second straight year, they were eliminated in the Big East Tournament. This year, when the seedings were announced for the NCAA Tournament, UConn received the No. 2 seed, meaning they were not even favored to make it to the Final Four. But as they have done so many times in the past, this wonderful team of talented young women exceeded all expectations. They were led, once again, by the outstanding All-American senior, Diana Taurasi, the National Player of the Year. She is a remarkable athlete, a remarkable person, not unlike Emeka Okafor. She is a presence on the floor. Anyone who watched the game last evening, a wonderful game between Tennessee and the University of Connecticut, could see this remarkable young woman and the leadership she brought to her team.

The team has gone 22-1 in tournament games under Diana Taurasi's storied career. She is only the fifth player to win two Naismith Player of the Year awards.

She has scored the second most points of any player in the women's NCAA Tournament history. She was also named Outstanding Player of the Year in the Final Four.

It was a great game last evening against Tennessee. It has been a wonderful rivalry. Unlike the University of Connecticut and Duke rivalry, the University of Connecticut and Tennessee rivalry is a great one.

My friend from Tennessee, the majority leader, I point out very graciously, about 8:15 last evening, about 15 minutes prior to the UConn-Tennessee game, called and offered a polite wager. I am somewhat disturbed by it. I appreciate it. He offered to wager that if UConn won the game that he would supply me with as many spareribs as I could eat. For a heart surgeon, who happens to be the majority leader, to offer a Democratic member of the Chamber a pile of spareribs makes me wonder what his ultimate goal may have been in that wager.

I have won the wager. I offered him a high protein, very low caloric Connecticut River shad, of which the Presiding Officer is well aware. The Connecticut River provides a border of his State.

Connecticut River shad is high in protein, low caloric, the kind of proposal one would think a heart surgeon would propose. No, he offered spare-ribs—thick, juicy, fat-loaded spare-ribs—for this senior Senator from Connecticut to consume. I will share those with any good Republicans I can find in my State as part of those winnings.

I conclude by congratulating the women's coach Geno Auriemma, who is a wonderful friend, as well as Jim Calhoun. He has had a wonderful career at the University of Connecticut, and has been a wonderful role model for players, coaches, and others. He is very active in our State, as is Jim Calhoun. It goes beyond their leadership of the basketball programs. He is very active in philanthropic programs throughout our State, and is always willing to appear at various events on behalf of worthy causes.

My congratulations to Geno Auriemma for the terrific job he has done, his assistant coaches, Chris Dailey, a wonderful assistant coach over the years, Tonya Cardoza, and Janelle Elliott. And the players: I mentioned Diana Taurasi, Ashley Valley, Kiana Robinson, Maria Conlon from Derby, CT, Stacey Marron, Morgan Valley, Nicole Wolff, Ashley Battle, Willnett Crockett, Jessica Moore, Barbara Turner, Liz Sherwood, and Ann Strother. Ann played a wonderful game last night, as did Maria Conlon, and also the forwards on that team, Barbara Turner and Willnett Crockett, were terrific as well.

Congratulations to these two great teams. I have taken a longer time. When you have two national champions at the same university in the same year, I hope my colleagues will accept my apologies for taking more

time than would normally be the case. We have to export our sport allegiance. We have no professional teams in my State. As my colleague knows, in Connecticut you can almost tell where somebody lives by asking them whether they are a Red Sox or a Yankee fan, a Rangers or Bruin fan, a Knicks or Celtics fan. Connecticut is equally divided in its sports allegiance.

So all my life I have had to embrace teams outside of my own State. This wonderful collegiate athletic performance by the University of Connecticut has given us a wonderful sense of pride in our State. In the midst of otherwise bad news coming out of other parts of the world, I thought I would offer this tidbit of good news from a small corner of our country called Connecticut, with great pride for these wonderful athletes and their coaches, and fans at the University of Connecticut and throughout our State.

I yield the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORNYN). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I congratulate my colleague on the success of his two teams, both of which were truly outstanding. I particularly commend his women's basketball team because before their showdown with Tennessee, they beat an outstanding team from the University of Minnesota, which reached the semifinals and the final four for the first time in the team's history and was led by two outstanding players, Lindsay Whalen from Minnesota and Janel McCarville from the neighboring State of Wisconsin, but we have adopted her as a Minnesotan now, and the two of them have achieved the distinction of being Kodak all-Americans. They led the team, which gave us enormous pride in Minnesota, until they met an outstanding Connecticut team. And they had an excellent game on Sunday night, which, unfortunately, from our standpoint, went Connecticut's way. But the Senator certainly has two teams of which to be very proud.

I also might note, as the Senator from Connecticut knows because we have had the occasion to be at the White House together, President Bush has very graciously the last years that I have been there invited the winners of the women's and men's basketball championships and the winners of the men's and women's hockey national championships to the White House for a ceremony.

I am pleased to say I will be joining the Senator from Connecticut again this year because the University of Minnesota women's hockey team won the national championship the weekend before and, in fact, the University of Minnesota-Duluth men's hockey team is in the chosen four which begins this Thursday night. So I am very hopeful we will have only Senators from two States attending that ceremony from Connecticut in basketball and Minnesota in hockey. But in either event, thanks to the outstanding performance of the Minnesota women's

hockey team, which I must acknowledge as a Yale graduate defeated Harvard 6 to 2 in the finals, much to my enormous satisfaction, but just had a terrific year, it was rated No. 1 throughout the year and prevailed in the national championship. It shows, as the Senator noted, women's basketball is the same as women's hockey. Under the auspices of title IX and the opportunities now that have been given to women athletes starting as young girls, they have equal opportunity to play these sports. Their talents and skills are every bit as good as men's, and they are phenomenal athletes and delights to watch as they play these games with the highest level of proficiency. It is something that as Americans we should be proud of, the fact that we have made that advance and that girls are no longer relegated to being cheerleaders for men's sports or boys' sports, as they were when I was growing up, but now have shown themselves to be remarkable athletes in their own right far advanced to anything that I could have accomplished as a meager athlete back in my day.

So I will see the Senator at the White House.

Mr. DODD. If my colleague would yield, and I appreciate the comments and give congratulations, the Minnesota women's team is a great team. In fact, a mutual friend of ours, a former member of the other body and I, Rick Nolan, who my colleague knows very well, talked the other night, and after the game he told me that Geno Auriemma, coach of the women's team, was quoted extensively in the Minnesota newspapers and radio stations on commending the Minnesota team. He said it reminded him very much of an earlier UConn women's basketball team when they were starting out. I cannot tell the Senator how impressed I was with Miss Whalen and Miss McCarville. They are great players. I love their tenacity and emotion. Your coaches—you have had three coaches in 3 years—have had some difficult times to go through. I thought the game between Minnesota and Duke was one of the great women's basketball teams of all time. I suspect we are going to hear a lot more from Minnesota not only in hockey but in basketball as well.

I am glad my colleague mentioned title IX. I meant to mention it as well. Back in January, I invited a former colleague of ours, Birch Bayh of Indiana, to come to Connecticut to a women's basketball game. The reason I invited our former colleague and the father of our present colleague, EVAN BAYH, was because in 1972, Birch Bayh was the author of title IX. There were a lot of other Members involved; I do not want to suggest he was the only one, but he was the principal author of title IX. I thought he might like to come and watch what a change he had made in America.

It was not solely because of Birch Bayh, but he certainly deserves to be recognized for authoring that bill. To

give my colleague some idea, about 15 years ago a national championship game for the women's basketball game drew maybe 1,500 people. Last night, there were 19,000 people in New Orleans to watch the game. I suspect millions across the country were tuned in to watch Tennessee and the University of Connecticut play.

So we brought Birch Bayh to Connecticut on that day when the University of Connecticut was playing Notre Dame. We had about 15,000 people on hand that afternoon, and at halftime we had some of the leaders of the women's teams over the years. We had a group of younger women just starting out at center court. Birch Bayh received a standing ovation from 15,000 people in Connecticut because he made a difference in this sport.

As my colleague has said, to see fathers and daughters, fathers and granddaughters, young boys and sisters coming to watch these young, remarkable women athletes, created a change in our country for the better. I look forward to the day when we will gather at the White House—I am confident President Bush will do this again because of his great love of sport—when he invites the men's and women's basketball teams from the University of Connecticut. Let me go on record today inviting, as well, not only the women's hockey team from Minnesota but the men's hockey team from Minnesota.

I thank my colleague for his nice compliments about Connecticut.

Mr. DAYTON. I thank my colleague. I think we are in a position where we can come to an agreement on that. I am not sure many of our colleagues would agree, but the Senator is right. In fact, I read over the weekend that the women's semifinal basketball games outdrew the men's in the national televised audience. That is not to say anything disparaging about the men because they had an outstanding tournament as well. It shows the popularity of the sport among all Americans. Certainly, the skill level to which it is played is something that anybody, even a couch potato like this Senator, can enjoy.

The Senator is right, also, that the President has been extremely gracious in hosting these teams. I think he recognizes how much of a thrill it is for the teams that have dedicated themselves all year to this level of national proficiency to be able to be recognized by the President of the United States; it is a great achievement for all of them. I look forward to the President's invitation. He has been very gracious in the past, and I look forward to joining my friend, the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SAFE ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to cosponsor S. 1709, the Security and Freedom Ensured Act, the SAFE Act, which Senator LARRY CRAIG and I have introduced with several of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

The SAFE Act is a narrowly tailored bill that would revise several provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act. It would safeguard the rights of innocent Americans without impeding law enforcement's ability to fight terrorism. The SAFE Act is supported by a broad coalition of organizations and individuals from across the political spectrum.

I challenge any of my colleagues to find the broad base of political support for virtually any bill that we have found for the SAFE Act.

I voted for the PATRIOT Act. I believed then and I still believe that the act made many reasonable and necessary changes in the law. However, the PATRIOT Act contains several provisions that do not adequately protect innocent Americans from unwarranted Government surveillance. The FBI now has broad authority to obtain a "John Doe" roving wiretap which does not identify the person or place being tapped. The FBI has authority now to conduct sneak-and-peek searches and to seize personal records.

The PATRIOT Act was passed at a critical moment in the history of the United States. It was a moment of tragedy and fear. Now with more than 2 years of hindsight and experience, it is time to revisit this law.

I can recall—and I am sure all who followed this debate can remember—how we felt after September 11. Just a few steps away from this Chamber, I was meeting in a room with Senator DASCHLE and a group of Senators and we saw on television the images which every American has seared in their memory. Then someone suggested a bomb had gone off at the Pentagon. We gathered by the windows and looked down this beautiful Mall toward the Washington Monument and saw black smoke billowing across the Potomac, unaware at that moment another airplane had struck that building, killing many innocent Americans.

It was a time of great concern and great anxiety and great unity. The administration came to us and said to the Congress, Give us the tools to find the people responsible for this terrible American tragedy. Give us what we need to protect Americans and to fight the war on terrorism.

In a rare showing of bipartisan support, Democrats and Republicans came together and addressed some of the most difficult and complicated questions about Government authority and