

motion. I am getting ready to borrow Senator LOTT's bloodhounds to go looking for the House conferees.

We have an immense undertaking before us in terms of getting a balanced and comprehensive energy bill to the President's desk. The House bill is over 500 pages and the Senate bill is nearly 1000 pages. There are some similarities between the bills, but some very important differences, as well.

Conferences on authorizing legislation are never easy. The bioterrorism bill, for example, took months to conference. The bankruptcy bill has been in conference for over a year. To have a successful conference on the energy bill will take a lot of careful planning on the part of the leadership on both sides in both Houses of Congress. As I mentioned before the recess, even the most elementary questions, such as who should chair the conference, seem to be in dispute, although I think that the precedents are clearly in the Senate's favor.

We need to get going, and the actual naming of conferees by the House of Representatives, whenever it happens, will only be a start to a process of figuring out how the conference will be structured, whether there will be sub-conferences, and which issues to address first. I am anxious to start to work with whomever the House of Representatives decides will be my counterpart to initiate the organizational discussions.

To be most effective with the use of our time, we may have to think about taking on the big issues first to see if there is an overall energy bill that can achieve a critical mass of support on both sides of both House and Senate. If we adopt an incremental approach of working on minor issues first, and leaving all the hard issues to the end, we may be still working on clearing the legislative underbrush in December.

I hope that we can see some progress soon on starting the energy conference.

SUPPLEMENT TO RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, pursuant to rule XXXVI, paragraph 2 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I am submitting for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a supplement to the Rules of Procedure of the Select Committee on Intelligence for purposes of the joint inquiry into the events of September 11, 2001, being conducted by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

I ask unanimous consent they be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE—SUPPLEMENTAL JOINT INQUIRY RULES

In connection with the Joint Inquiry with the House Permanent Select Committee on

Intelligence into the events of September 11, 2001, authorized by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence ("SSCI") pursuant to section 5(a)(1) of Senate Resolution 400, 94th Congress, and Rule 6 of the SSCI's Rules of Procedure, and pursuant to Rule XXVI.2 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the SSCI adopts the following Joint Inquiry Rules to supplement the SSCI's Rules of Procedure for purposes of the Joint Inquiry only:

JOINT INQUIRY RULE 1. JOINT PROCEEDINGS

1.1. The SSCI may conduct hearings jointly with the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. All joint hearings shall be considered hearings of both Committees.

1.2. The Rules of Procedure of both the SSCI and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence shall apply in all hearings and other proceedings of this Joint Inquiry, except where superseded by these Joint Inquiry Rules, provided that, at any joint hearing, if any rules of the two Committees are inconsistent, the rules of that Committee whose Chairman or his designee is presiding shall apply.

1.3. For the purposes of the proceedings of this Joint Inquiry, all employees on the staff of either Committee working on the Joint Inquiry shall be considered to be acting on behalf of both Committees.

JOINT INQUIRY RULE 2. HEARINGS

2.1. All testimony at hearings shall be taken under oath or affirmation.

2.2. Subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses, or the production of documents, records, or other materials, at hearings may be authorized by vote of the SSCI pursuant to SSCI Rule 2, or by the SSCI's Chairman and Vice Chairman, acting jointly.

JOINT INQUIRY RULE 3. DEPOSITIONS

3.1. All testimony taken, and all documents, records, or other materials produced, at a deposition of the SSCI shall be considered part of the record of both Committees.

3.2. Subpoenas for depositions and notices for the taking of depositions may be authorized by vote of the SSCI pursuant to SSCI Rule 2, or by the SSCI's Chairman and Vice Chairman, acting jointly, and shall be issued and served as provided in SSCI Rule 7. Deposition notices shall specify a time and place of examination and the name or names of Committee members or staff who will take the deposition. Depositions shall be in private and shall, for purposes of the rules of both Committees, be deemed to be testimony given before the Committees in executive session.

3.3. Witnesses shall be examined upon oath administered by a member of the SSCI or by an individual authorized by local law to administer oaths. Questions may be propounded by members or staff of either Committee. If a witness objects to a question and refuses to testify, the Committee members or staff present may proceed with the deposition, or may, at that time or subsequently, seek a ruling on the objection from the Chairman of the SSCI or any member of the SSCI designated by the Chairman. The SSCI shall not initiate procedures leading to civil or criminal enforcement unless the witness refuses to testify after having been ordered and directed to answer by the Chairman or a member designated by the Chairman.

3.4. Procedures for the attendance of counsel for witnesses at, and for the inspection, correction, and filing of transcripts of, depositions shall be as provided in SSCI Rules 8.4 and 8.7.

PROFESSIONAL BOXING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2002

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, on May 22, I was joined by my colleague, Sen-

ator DORGAN, in introducing the Professional Boxing Amendments Act of 2002. This legislation would strengthen existing Federal boxing laws by making uniform certain health and safety standards, establish a centralized medical registry to be used by local commissions to protect boxers, reduce arbitrary practices of sanctioning organizations, and provide uniformity in ranking criteria and contractual guidelines. This legislation would also establish a Federal regulatory entity to oversee professional boxing and set uniform standards for certain aspects of the sport.

Since 1996, Congress has acted to improve the sport of boxing by passing two laws, the Professional Boxing Safety Act of 1996, and the Muhammad Ali Boxing Reform Act of 2000. These laws were intended to establish uniform standards to improve the health and safety of boxers, and to better protect them from the sometimes coercive, exploitative, and unethical business practices of promoters, managers, and sanctioning organizations.

While the Professional Boxing Safety Act, as amended by the Muhammad Ali Act, has had some positive effects on the sport, I am concerned by the repeated failure of some State and tribal boxing commissions to comply with the law, and the lack of enforcement of the law by both Federal and State law enforcement officials. Corruption remains endemic in professional boxing, and the sport continues to be beset with a variety of problems, some beyond the scope of the current system of local regulation.

Therefore, the bill we are introducing today would further strengthen Federal boxing laws, and also create a Federal regulatory entity, the "United States Boxing Administration", USBA, to oversee the sport. The USBA would be headed by an Administrator, appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The primary functions of the USBA would be to protect the health, safety, and general interests of boxers. More specifically, the USBA would, among other things: administer Federal boxing laws and coordinate with other Federal regulatory agencies to ensure that these laws are enforced; oversee all professional boxing matches in the United States; and work with the boxing industry and local commissions to improve the status and standards of the sport. The USBA would license boxers, promoters, managers, and sanctioning organizations, and revoke or suspend such licenses if the USBA believes that such action is in the public interest. No longer would a boxer like Mike Tyson be able to forum-shop for a State with a weak commission if he is undeserving of a license.

The fines collected and licensing fees imposed by the USBA would be used to fund a percentage of its activities. The USBA would also maintain a centralized database of medical and statistical information pertaining to boxers in the