Lundstrom, 25, Miami-Dade County, FL; Johnny Manning, 29, Minneapolis, MN; Mary Matthews, 39, Baltimore, MD; Bertess Montgomery, 87, Memphis, TN; Ramiro Peredez, 34, Atlanta, GA; Lionel Robinson, 23, Baltimore, MD; Patrick Michael Smith, 21, Washington, DC; Levanna Spearman, 23, Baltimore, MD; Alan Villarreal, 23, Houston, TX; Unidentified Male, Newark, NJ; and Unidentified Male, Newark, NJ.

Five of the people I mentioned were the victims of what has been described as one of the worst mass killings in Baltimore history. Mary McNeil Matthews; her mother, Mary Helen Collien; her daughter, Makisha Jenkins; and two family friends, Trennell Alston and Lavanna Spearman; were killed one year ago today by four men who burst into Mary McNeil Matthews' home and shot all five women.

We cannot sit back and allow such senseless gun violence to continue. The deaths of these people are a reminder to all of us that we need to enact sensible gun legislation now.

ENSURING TRAFFIC SAFETY—H.R. 5164

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, in the weeks since Congress passed H.R. 5164, the Transportation Recall Enhancement, Accountability, and Documentation Act, and it was signed into law by the President, questions have been raised by some of my colleagues about the impact of the bill on small business. I want to make clear my intentions toward small manufacturers in passing this legislation.

Obviously, the bill is not intended to result in burdensome and ineffective regulations on small businesses or any size business for that matter. I would expect the Department of Transportation in establishing the regulations under the bill to go through the normal analysis required under existing law to ensure that regulations are not overly burdensome but are effective in advancing the cause of safety.

Let me be clear, however, the primary purpose of this bill and the Department of Transportation is to ensure the safety of the traveling public. No priority can or should be higher as the agency crafts these new regulations. I hope this responds to any concerns my colleagues may have about the provisions of the bill.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Senator and agree without reservation that the purpose of this legislation is to increase safety on the highways. No one in the small business community supports allowing defective auto parts or automobiles to be allowed on the road. After all, small businesses, their employees, and their owners are some of the drivers of the vehicles that would be identified under this law, and they are the other drivers on the road with these vehicles. They care as much as anyone else about highway safety. Without question, the safety of our roadways is one of our highest priorities.

I would just like to add one clarification. When the Department of Transportation promulgates the regulations required by this act, it is required under the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA) to determine whether the regulations will have ''a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.'' If the regulations rise to that level, the Department is required to conduct an initial regulatory flexibility analysis and a final regulatory flexibility analysis as described in SBREFA so that the impacts on small businesses can be identified and better understood. None of the requirements under SBREFA are intended to, or have been shown to, interfere in any way with an agency's regulatory objectives. In this case they would not impede, in any way, the Department of Transportation's ability to provide the maximum safety improvement on the highways as mandated under the TREAD Act.

This is the current law and is consistent with the provision in the TREAD Act which prohibits the Department of Transportation from issuing unnecessarily burdensome regulations. I just want to make it clear that we will be watching closely to make sure that the Department of Transportation adheres to the mandates of SBREFA.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S OFFICE OF SCIENCE

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to address the importance of the Department of Energy's Office of Science, the nation's leading source for fundamental research in the physical sciences for the areas of physics, chemistry, and materials science, and a significant contributor to the biological sciences. Besides funding the individual researcher, the Office of Science leads our nation in providing specialized large user R&D facilities. A partial list of such facilities would include the Stanford Linear Accelerator, the Center for the Microanalysis of Materials at the University of Illinois, The Los Alamos Neutron Science Center, the High Flux Isotope Reactor at Oak Ridge, the high energy accelerators at the Fermilab and the National Synchrotron Light Source at the Brookhaven National Laboratory. These user facilities are national treasures. One cannot over emphasize their importance. They are used by not only university researchers from all 50 states but by industry in both the biological and physical sciences. In 1999, there were 5500 users on just the large light sources alone to investigate new structures of matter in both the biological and physical sciences. In the last four years, the number of biological researchers using these facilities has risen by a factor of four and now accounts for 40 percent of all users. Each of these 5500 investigations on just the light sources alone generates new intellectual property—a dominant export in the 21st century global economy. In short, these facilities provide the critical basic R&D that industry cannot and will not fund directly, R&D that is crucial to maintaining the tremendous technological engine of growth that fuels our economy today.

I would like to point out that in the 106th Congress there was a large and successful bipartisan campaign in both the House and Senate to support the Office of Science's budget request for Fiscal Year 2001. However, the Office of Science's 2001 budget request only met the level of its 1990 budget as adjusted in year 2000 dollars. In comparison the overall federal R&D budget for the life sciences has increased by 45 percent in the same period. The trends in the neglect of funding for the Office of Science are deeply disturbing and are now beginning to influence the basic indicators of intellectual property generation. If one tracks the submissions by U.S. researchers in some of our most prestigious physics journals you'll find that in 1990 the United States commanded the lead of submissions at about 50 percent worldwide. In 1999 the submission rate has dropped to about 25 percent worldwide. The momentum at a national level in the physical sciences is one of decline. We should be disturbed by this trend—the physical sciences are the foundation of the microchip industry, the telecommunications industry, the transportation industry and the petrochemical industry. We are talking about what fuels our engine of U.S. economic growth—high technology and maintaining a commanding lead in a 21st century global economy.

As the 107th Congress gets ready to start, we must pay more attention to the Office of Science and the role that it plays as a generator of a high tech workforce, intellectual property and economic growth. The Office can play an important role in large multi-user facilities for the development of nanomaterials by developing techniques that can literally position groups of atoms to develop a whole new generation of microchip and structural materials. Leadership in such materials research will help maintain our world dominance in the telecommunications and transportation industries. Yesterday a bipartisan group of this body sent to the President a letter supporting a significant increase in the budget of the Office of Science in fiscal year 2002. This letter follows up on the support that these members expressed earlier this year during the appropriation process and presages a commitment of bipartisan support for the Office of Science in the 107th Congress. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD following my statement.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. BINGAMAN. Regardless of the final outcome of the Presidential election, it is my hope that both sides of the aisle will be able to come together next year on a strategy for the continued technological and economic competitiveness of the United States. I hope that support for the work funded by the Office of Science will be the cornerstone of that strategy.

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, DC.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you for joining us in providing strong support for the Department of Energy's Office of Science in this year's appropriation process. Together we have made great progress in advancing recognition of these critical scientific programs. Yet there remains much more that can be accomplished. Continued growth for these programs on par with that proposed for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Science Foundation (NSF) is vital to continued advances in the fields DOE supports and to the training of future scientists and engineers to continue the tremendous advances that America brings to basic science and to the marketplace.

You are aware that the Department of Energy (DOE) is the leading source of federal support for the physical sciences in the nation. In the life sciences, the DOE initiated the Human Genome Program and co-manages this enormously important and promising effort with the National Institutes of Health. It also plays a leading role in supporting other biological sciences, environmental sciences, physics, chemistry, materials science, computer science, mathematics, and engineering. As a consequence, the DOE is responsible for a significant portion of federal R&D funding for scientists and students at our colleges and universities.

One of the primary responsibilities of DOE's Office of Science is to support large-scale specialized user facilities and large teams of scientists focused on national scientific priorities. This makes the Office of Science unique among, and complementary to, the scientific programs of other federal science agencies, including NIH and NSF. Each year over 15,000 sponsored scientists and students from academe, industry, and government—many funded by agencies other than the DOE—conduct cutting edge experiments at the Department's research facilities. DOE's investments in major facilities, smaller-scale user facilities, and in university-based laboratories not only sets it apart from other federal science agencies, but helps ensure that the nation maintains its world leadership across a broad range of scientific disciplines.

Economic experts maintain that today's unprecedented economic growth would not have been realized but for the substantial research investments by the public and private sectors over the past several decades. To maintain the tremendous advances that America brings to basic scientific research and into the marketplace, we need to continue to provide strong support for basic research across the scientific disciplines. Sound science policy also demands a balance between support of individual investigator driven science—such as that conducted by the NIH and NSF—and the maintenance and operation of major facilities, smaller specialized facilities, university based research facilities, and scientific teams such as those supported by DOE's Office of Science.

The appropriation of $3.19 billion for FY 2001 is only a start at addressing these challenges. Annual increases similar to NIH and NSF are needed and merited by the important and unique work being conducted by the DOE Office of Science. They would also build on the spirit of the Senate's passage of the Federal Research Investment Act (S. 296) which calls for doubling investment in civilian research and development efforts.

Support for increases in funding for the DOE Office of Science is critical if we are to attract and retain the best minds, support the construction and operation of modern scientific facilities, and continue to capitalize on the scientific vision that has been the trademark of the Office of Science for so many years. The budget request for FY 2002 is the logical place to continue this effort. We trust you agree and look forward to strengthening our scientific and technological capabilities in FY 2002 and beyond.

Sincerely,

Jeff Bingaman, Blanche L. Lincoln, Ron Wyden, Carl Levin, John F. Kerry, Frank H. Murkowski, Mike DeWine, Patrick Leahy, Ted Kennedy, Slade Gorton, Evan Bayh, Daniel K. Akaka, Paul Sarbanes, Herb Kohl, Patty Murray, John Edwards, Frank R. Lautenberg, John Breaux, Diane Feinstein, Barbara Boxer, Bill Frist, Fred Thompson.

INDIVIDUAL FISHING QUOTAS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, one of the most important issues we consider here in the U.S. Senate is how to balance our economic needs with our responsibility to conserve our natural resources.

I believe we can strike the right balance. With that hope, I'd like to talk about America's fisheries. In the Pacific Northwest, fishing is more than just a way of life. It is an important part of our economy and contributes to our region's culture.

Unfortunately, that way of life is becoming more difficult. Many fishing families are struggling because some fish stocks are at very low levels. For example, the West Coast salmon and groundfish and the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands crab fisheries have declined dramatically in recent years. Washington's fishing families contribute to our economy and feed consumers both here and abroad, but too often they work within a system that threatens their safety and their livelihood. I've met with harvesters and processors from my region, and I've visited small towns in Washington state that depend on fisheries. The problems they face aren't limited to Washington state. They can also be seen in Alaska and other states.

In an effort to recover decreasing numbers of fish in our waters, fisheries managers have developed complex management systems to limit fishing. In some cases, our current policies encourage fishers to catch as many fish as possible over a limited period of time. This creates a dangerous and inefficient ''race for fish'', which requires fishermen to venture out in bad weather. In fact, one of the most dangerous occupations for young people today is to work in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Island crab fishery. The ''race for fish'' is one way to manage fisheries in which too many fishermen are competing for too few fish. However, there are alternatives to this management approach.

I'm proud that there is a growing interest in an innovative management tool called individual fishing quotas. This creative approach uses the marketplace to encourage a safer, more productive, and more sustainable fishing industry. In some cases, it would be a significant improvement over the status quo.

Individual fishing quotas or IFQs would bring some regularity to what are currently short-lived, intense fishing seasons. Under this system, each participant in a fishery would be allocated a percentage of that season's total fish catch. Because they are guaranteed a certain amount of fish, fishermen wouldn't have to ''race for fish.'' They could stretch their fishing out over longer, more balanced fishing seasons.

I believe that individual fishing quotas can help fisherman, fisheries, conservation, and consumers. IFQs can help fishing families because boats won't need to go out in dangerous weather. In addition, because of the slower pace, fishermen would be less likely to lose fishing gear, a common problem in some fisheries. This new system can help fisheries because fishermen will be able to sell or lease quota. That means there will be fewer boats, which can mean cleaner, more efficient fisheries.

In addition, IFQs can improve conservation. In some cases when the fishery slows down, fishermen take better care of their catch and are more careful with bycatch. Let's look at just one example of how the speed of the current system hurts conservation. Currently, some North Pacific crabs that are too small to be caught legally end up trapped in crab pots. Under the race for fish, these pots are harvested so quickly that undersized crabs don't have time to escape. Under a slower fishery, those small crabs would have time to crawl out of the crab pots and grow to maturity, thereby helping to sustain the fishery into the future.

For consumers, IFQs mean they can enjoy fresh fish later in the seasons. For example, fresh halibut is now available more often as a result of a fish quota program put in place to manage halibut harvesting. Clearly, individual fishing quotas can be an effective management tool and can solve a lot of the problems facing fisheries today.

I'm pleased that many of my colleagues have expressed interest in IFQs. In fact, a number of members would like to see a national policy on IFQs developed. Since 1996, I've supported fish quotas and a national policy, and I reiterate my support again today.

But in the meantime, there are important steps we can take. When Congress reauthorized the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act in 1996, Congress placed a