

have made to this country's history, and to its future.

Any Missourian can name George Washington Carver's most famous invention, peanut butter, but few realize the role Carver played in the agricultural revolution that went on in the South in the early 1900s—Carver's work to wean the South from its single-crop cultivation of cotton. His development of commercial uses for alternate crops like peanuts and sweet potatoes helped modernize Southern agriculture, paving the way for a better life for the entire South.

Scott Joplin led a revolution of a different kind. While living in Sedalia, Missouri he created a blend of classical and folk music that took America by storm. Ragtime, as his style came to be called, has become America's unique contribution to classical music and a prelude to jazz.

In literature, Missourians are proud of the heritage of Langston Hughes of Joplin, MO. A poet of international renown, Hughes' poetry helped to create the Harlem Renaissance, the artistic and cultural awakening among African-Americans in the 1920's and early 1930's. His first two books of poetry daringly fused jazz and blues with traditional verse. Also an advocate for children, Hughes wrote over a dozen still popular children's books on jazz, Africa and the West Indies.

Another Missourian became famous not only as an inventor but also as the most outstanding jockey of his time. Tom Bass, of Mexico, MO, trained some of the finest race and show horses of his day. At the peak of his career he rode in the Inauguration of President Grover Cleveland and gave a command performance before Queen Victoria. In addition to being a famous jockey, he invented the "Bass bit" which is still used today.

Missouri has borne some notable civil rights leaders as well. Perhaps the most prominent of them is Roy Wilkins, who served as executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People from 1955–1977. Appointed during the most turbulent era in the civil rights movement, Wilkins kept the NAACP on the path of nonviolence and rejected racism in all forms. His leadership and devotion to the principle of nonviolence earned him the reputation of a senior statesman in the civil rights movement.

All of these great Missourians, and others history may have forgotten, struggled against bigotry and violence, but all showed—through their natural talents—that racism was not just wrong, but un-American. So it is fitting that we take this month to learn more about the history of African-Americans in this country, to ensure that these Americans are recognized, and to celebrate their contributions to our great nation.

TRIBUTE TO THE NEW ENGLAND PATRIOTS—NFL CHAMPIONS

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Robert Kraft Family, Coach Bill Belichick and the New England Patriots team on their achievement as victors of Super Bowl XXXVI.

The people of New Hampshire and the entire New England region are proud of the exemplary accomplishments of the Patriots organization. The talented players and coaches of the team have demonstrated that hard work, perseverance and unity are the foundation of success.

I commend the New England Patriots for the benchmark that they have created for all Americans who seek to achieve the highest of standards in their lives. Each player on the team cast aside ego and self promotion for the good of the team realizing the best talents individually transformed into a power house of skill and sense of purpose.

I applaud the contributions of the New England Patriots organization including the team owners, the Robert Kraft Family who have steadfastly stood by the Patriots since the origination of the franchise in 1962. I congratulate Robert Kraft and his family for this tremendous achievement and wish them well as the franchise grows and flourishes.

On behalf of the citizens of New Hampshire, I want to sincerely thank the players and coaches of the New England Patriots for providing sports fans with some of the best football competition seen in the United States in years. We will not easily forget the excitement of the talented skill and ability of kicker Adam Vinatieri during game winning field goals at the Oakland Raiders snow bowl game nor the thrill of his dramatic kick more recently as the clock ticked down to 7 seconds at Super Bowl XXXVI.

I commend the efforts of the mastermind of the operation, Coach Bill Belichick and the National Football League Champion team for their efforts, accomplishments and contributions to the New England region. We are all very proud of you and thank you for being the best of the best in a very competitive and talented industry. It is truly an honor and a privilege to represent you in the United States Senate.

MORE EVIDENCE THAT BACKGROUND CHECKS WORK

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, in 1994, the Congress passed the Brady Law, which requires Federal Firearm Licensees to perform criminal background checks on gun buyers. However, a loophole in this law allows unlicensed private gun sellers to sell firearms at gun shows without conducting a background check.

In April of last year, Senator REED introduced the Gun Show Background

Check Act which would close this loophole in the law. The Reed bill, which is supported by the International Association of Chiefs of Police, extends the Brady Bill background check requirement to all sellers of firearms at gun shows. I cosponsored that bill because I believe it is critical that we do all we can to prevent guns from getting into the hands of criminals and terrorists. A recent report from Americans for Gun Safety demonstrates how successful the Brady law has been in this regard and why it is important to extend its provisions to firearms sales at gun shows.

According to Bureau of Justice Statistics numbers cited in the AGS report, in 2000 alone, Brady bill background checks blocked more than 153,000 felons and other illegal firearms purchasers from buying a gun. In addition, these checks were typically conducted without placing unreasonable burdens on gun buyers. According to the study, 72 percent of background checks were completed within minutes and 95 percent were completed within two hours. The study provides yet further evidence in support of common sense legislation to close the gun show loophole.

EXTENDING UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS TO WORKERS

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, in past recessions Congress has been quick to extend benefits for the unemployed. Every recession over the past thirty years resulted in an extension of unemployment benefits. Helping unemployed workers has never been a partisan issue, both Democrats and Republicans have worked to help unemployed workers in times of economic difficulty. During the recession of the early 1990's we extended a total of 33 weeks of additional benefits. Current data shows this recession started last March, and we are only now taking steps to finally extend unemployment benefits. We have waited too long, but I am glad the day for action has come at last. I hope the other body will be able to quickly pass this legislation so that this delayed assistance will not be delayed any longer.

While I am relieved the Senate has acted, I was disappointed we were not able to do more for workers. Helping people maintain health coverage while out of work would have gone a long way to making working families feel more secure. Covering part-time workers and the newly hired, and providing the States with the necessary funds to make those reforms, also would have helped this country on the road to economic recovery.

While some of my colleagues believe that what we have done today will have little or no positive effect on the economy, I disagree. Extending benefits puts money into the hands of people who really need it, and people who will be forced to spend it. The money we send out will be spent on groceries,

clothes, and mortgages. It will meet the day-to-day needs of working families, and it will be spent right in their communities. It will spur local economies and prevent the recession from deepening.

An unemployment check is always second best to a paycheck. The 142,000 workers in Wisconsin who have been forced to file for benefits want a job, they want to work, they want to contribute to the economy and pay taxes. Unemployment insurance is meant to help hard working people through difficult times. It is an insurance plan that workers and employers contribute to for emergencies just like today. American workers have paid for these benefits, they have earned them, and they deserve this extension.

RESTORING TEA 21 FUNDING LEVELS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, for the past 6 months Congress has been discussing the best ways to stimulate the economy. Even though we are no longer working on an economic stimulus bill, we face a real crisis that will negatively affect our economy. We face unprecedented losses to our highway program. Every state will lose money.

If we want to create true stimulus and maintain jobs for our citizens then there is an easy solution. Highways. For every \$1 billion dollars that goes into the highway program, 42,000 jobs are created. In an attempt to address unemployment concerns and immediate stimulus to the country's economy, I, along with others on the Environment and Public Works Committee, propose an increase in obligation authority for the fiscal year 2003. This would restore the authorized levels for that fiscal year. It doesn't get us all the way there, but it's a start.

This is about jobs. Skilled and unskilled jobs in highway construction are well-paid. These jobs would provide employment opportunities for workers who have lost manufacturing jobs, with minimal training requirements. In addition current jobs will not be lost in many of the supplier and heavy equipment manufacturing industries. This is money that can be spent quickly by state DOTs. Fast spending means fast jobs. Both state DOTs and contractors confirm that money can be spent and jobs maintained within the first 6 months. Without restoring TEA 21 levels, over 360,000 jobs will be lost.

There is \$20.5 billion in the Highway Trust Fund. We can afford at least the \$4.369 billion from that balance to be distributed over the next year. In fact, we can't afford not to.

This extra \$4.369 billion begins to take care of this huge problem that we face. It is a problem that we addressed the other day in the Environment and Public Works Committee hearing on TEA 21 reauthorization. We are looking at a highway program that is \$9 billion lower for FY 2003 than it was in FY 2002. For my state of Montana that

means a \$79 million loss to our highway program. And in Montana, highways are our lifeblood. We need the highways and we need the jobs created from new highway funding. Also, we can't afford to lose any highway-related jobs because of this under funding.

We passed a six year highway bill for a reason. So states knew how much was coming in from year to year. My State Department of Transportation is counting on at least the TEA 21 level.

Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta was at that hearing I just mentioned. And when I pressed him about this extra obligation authority for highways, his response was that highway money is good economic stimulus.

In conclusion, I propose that we give States at least what they were expecting for highway projects in fiscal year 2003. They say there is no such thing as an easy fix, but let me tell you—this idea comes as close as any.

THE FEDERAL REFORMULATED FUELS ACT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that documentation important for the legislative history of S. 950, the Federal Reformulated Fuels Act, be printed in the RECORD.

The first is a supply impact analysis of that legislation. The analysis concludes there is a significant probability that total gasoline production capacity would increase under the provisions of S. 950. The second is an estimate by the Congressional Budget Office of the effects of any private-sector mandates included within that bill.

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

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY,

Washington, DC, January 18, 2002.

Hon. JIM JEFFORDS,

Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of December 20, 2001, co-signed with Senator Bob Smith, requesting technical and economic analyses regarding the elimination of MTBE as a gasoline additive.

We are enclosing two documents that are responsive to your request. The first is a draft report prepared by PACE Consultants, under contract with the Environmental Protection Agency. This report is entitled, *Economic Analysis of U.S. MTBE Production Under the MTBE Ban*.

The second document is a draft EPA staff analysis entitled, "Supply Analysis of S. 950—The Federal Reformulated Fuels Act of 2001." This analysis, which was prepared in October 2001 by EPA staff who have technical expertise in matters relating to motor vehicle fuels, has never been released and should not be construed to be Administration policy. The analysis draws extensively from the findings of the above-mentioned PACE report.

As you know, the issue of MTBE is related to a current Clean Air Act provision that requires the use of oxygenates in reformulated gasoline. It is my understanding that Congress designed this provision to promote the

use of renewable fuels, enhance energy security, support the agricultural economy, and improve the environment. EPA welcomes the opportunity to work with the Congress to further these important goals.

Again, thank you for writing. If you have questions about these documents, please feel free to contact me or your staff may contact Diann Frantz in the Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-3668.

Sincerely yours,

CHRISTINE TODD WHITMAN.

Enclosures.

SUPPLY IMPACT ANALYSIS OF S. 950—THE FEDERAL REFORMULATED FUELS ACT OF 2001

There are four primary provisions in S. 950 that could have an impact on gasoline supply in the U.S. These include the nationwide ban on MTBE, rescinding the 1 psi RVP waiver for ethanol blended into conventional gasoline, the additional air toxics requirements, and the provision of grant money to support the conversion of merchant MTBE plants to the production of other gasoline blendstocks. The impact of each of these provisions is discussed below. The evaluation of the financial support for the conversion of merchant MTBE plants to the production of other gasoline blendstocks is combined with that of the ban on MTBE use.

A. NATIONWIDE MTBE BAN

Due to the attention that has been placed on the MTBE issue over the last several years, there have been a number of different MTBE ban scenarios that have been put forward and a considerable amount of analysis already performed for at least some scenarios. Differences in how the bans would be implemented, however, can cause significant differences in what impact they will have on the gasoline fuel supply. What follows is a summary of a recent analysis EPA conducted for a nationwide ban on MTBE use which mirrors relatively closely the MTBE ban provisions in S. 950.

Table A-1 shows the sources of the MTBE used in U.S. gasoline and estimated 2000 production volumes (from Pace Consultants). The total MTBE volume of 263,000 bbl/day represents approximately 3.1% of U.S. gasoline consumption. However, MTBE contains only about 80% of the energy density of gasoline. Consequently, on an energy equivalent basis this MTBE volume represents approximately 2.5% of total U.S. gasoline consumption.

TABLE A-1.—YEAR 2000 PRODUCTION VOLUME OF MTBE (BARRELS/DAY) IN THE U.S.

Type of MTBE plant	Physical volume	Gasoline equivalent volume
Captive refinery plants	79,000	64,000
Propylene Oxide based merchant plants	45,000	36,000
Ethylene based merchant plants	21,000	17,000
Natural gas liquids (NGL) based plants	67,000	54,000
Imports (NGL based)	51,000	41,000
Total	263,000	212,000

In support of EPA's analysis of restrictions on the use of MTBE, we hired Pace Consultants, a knowledgeable and reputable firm, to conduct an analysis of the economics of converting the different types of MTBE plants to produce either alkylate or iso-octane instead of MTBE, versus the plant completely shutting down.

MTBE plants react isobutylene with methanol to make MTBE. MTBE plants fall into two broad categories: those which use isobutylene which already exists or which can be produced at very low cost from existing material, and those which have to produce isobutylene at significant cost from other chemicals. Captive or refinery based