

cent back to the Treasury. Here we have a situation where, instead of the Forest Service saying, OK, you can cut down a few of these trees, we need it for certain public purposes, they are out of the game. They give it to the logger, and the logger decides what tree to cut down.

I think this is a stunning reversal of a program that started out to be one that was in the public interest.

In closing, I will give you one last example.

Under this new rule—and, again, I apologize for the crudeness of these charts, but we did not know about this until a few hours ago. It is now a stewardship goal, if the Forest Service so states, to provide wood to lumber mills. That becomes a forest stewardship goal. It is unreal.

Our people think we are protecting our forests, but our new goal is to invite the loggers in, with no limits on these projects. I am distraught and disturbed about this. I only hope that the courts will do what they have done in the past and say this is in violation of the forest plans. Maybe they will save us from ourselves. This is miserable.

I wish I could offer an amendment to strip this out. I am prohibited from doing it, but I will bring this back to my colleagues at a time when we have more opportunity to discuss it in detail.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report to accompany H.J. Res. 2 under the previous agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the conference report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 2) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, having met have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment and the Senate agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of February 13, 2003.)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this is probably a historic occasion because we are presenting to the Senate—as my colleague, Chairman BILL YOUNG, presented to the House—11 appropriations bills in one omnibus bill, a bill that covers the balance of this fiscal year, fiscal year 2003.

We are in this position because of considerations of the last Congress. I will not take the time of the Senate to try to discuss why we did not pass those bills last year, but when we commenced this year and I became chairman of the Appropriations Committee once again, it was my determination that we should proceed with those bills and make sure we had them completed and to the President for his signature before we were forced to enter into the budget process for fiscal year 2004.

It was a very difficult process. I want to thank my good friend and Chairman BILL YOUNG in the House, who did as we requested to get the Senate to adopt two continuing resolutions. One we passed and it has extended the time for consideration of these bills. That time will expire on February 20. We will soon get another continuing resolution to take us over to, I believe, February 24, so the President will have a chance to review these bills before he must sign them. I do believe the President will sign this bill when it is received by him.

It was early this morning that the conference report on H.J. Res. 2 was filed in the House. I was discussing with other Members of Congress as early as 2 a.m. this morning some of the provisions of this bill. It is a very controversial bill, I know. There are many portions of this bill that if I were alone and had the sole right to write the bill, I would not incorporate in this bill. This bill includes 11 separate appropriations bills. The conference report includes 16 divisions. It is a long bill.

I see my friend from Arizona in the Chamber. I acknowledge it is a very difficult bill to go through in a very short period of time. I appreciate the consideration he and his staff are giving to the bill, as he usually gives to our appropriations bills.

I see my colleague from West Virginia is in the Chamber, and when he is ready we will ask that the Senate turn to the consideration of the bill. I want to talk about some of the background of the bill before we begin making statements on the bill and what is in it.

This has been a very difficult process for all of us. I want to say to the Senate that following the election, I outlined to our staff, and our staff director Steve Cortese, a process I hoped we would follow to get these bills passed. The Senate Appropriations Committee staff has been working on these 11 separate bills since the end of the year. We have had bipartisan cooperation. The process we followed in the Senate was that we had 11 teams. They were made up of the 11 subcommittees that would have handled the bills had they been handled individually. These bills were primarily the result of the interaction of the staff director of each of those subcommittees with the staff and the membership of the subcommittee.

We took the product of those 11 teams and put them together into the

omnibus amendment I offered to H.J. Res. 2, the one that was brought before the Senate. I might add that in addition, the conference report contains \$10 billion in addition to the funds for the Department of Defense and intelligence community for the global war on terrorism. These were added to the bill. This was a reserve that was set aside by my great friend from West Virginia when he was chairman, a reserve for Defense pursuant to the request of the President as he presented the budget for the fiscal year 2003.

It would be my intention to ask the Senate to proceed with statements pertaining to H.J. Res. 2 before it is actually received, before we go on the bill. I hope that meets with everyone's approval. Right now it is a matter of discussing the various provisions of the bill.

There are several other legislative initiatives in the bill. They include \$3.1 billion for drought and other agricultural disasters. These funds are offset by reductions in mandatory programs. Medicare and the TANF short-term extensions would give the Finance Committee time to address their matters in a reconciliation bill later this year. There is a .65 percent across-the-board cut to all discretionary accounts in this bill to assure that the total remains within the top line that was agreed to by myself, House Chairman BILL YOUNG, and the President. That is an arbitrary line, I will admit, but in order to get the bill signed, if we joined them together, it was my judgment we could not risk a final veto from the President of the United States after working so hard to put them all through in one package. So we have worked as closely as possible with all concerned to try and make certain that the bills will be in a form the President could sign it.

I have to admit I am sure he will be as disturbed about some of the provisions as I am myself, but I do believe all in all the bill is one the President should be able to sign because we have kept the agreement. We have stayed within the line of the requests made by the President of the United States for funds for fiscal year 2003.

I will take a moment to address the total spending levels in the bill. Last November, Chairman BILL YOUNG and I met with the President to discuss how we might complete the work on these fiscal year 2003 bills. At that time, the President asked that we would hold to the total provided in his budget request, as amended by him. We asked that funds needed for the western firefighting be added to that total to address that emergency. We also agreed at that time there would be no emergency money per se—no amounts added to the bill above the President's request. The President agreed to our request that he would send in a supplemental request for the monies needed for the western fires.

In addition, we discussed the need to fund the election reform bill enacted

by the last Congress and respond to the severe drought facing Midwestern and Western States.

To accommodate all these competing pressures, the bill I presented to the Senate in the form of an amendment to the second continuing resolution sent to the House included a 1.6 percent across-the-board cut to ensure the total spending did not exceed the new total we then faced, which was \$751.325 billion.

During consideration by the Senate, amendments were adopted that necessitated increasing that across-the-board cut to 2.85 percent of the total of the bill. That level could not be sustained, and it became a driving factor in our conference with the House and with the administration. We understood that as we went to conference. We took those across-the-board cuts so in conference we could discuss all the programs with the House and with the administration and work out an acceptable compromise.

The challenge facing the conferees was to integrate all the priorities of both the Houses and the administration within the top line of the total requested by the President of the United States. Each of the subcommittee chairmen and ranking members managed to negotiate to resolve their portion of the bill. In other words, as they got to conference, the 11 teams were still involved with working primarily with their portion of this bill. Both the House and the Senate worked to accommodate a set of allocations that would ensure we stay within our fiscal goals.

By allocations, I mean the amount of money available to each subcommittee for the portion of this bill and the portion of the budget that pertained to matters under their jurisdiction.

During the course of these negotiations, we turned on several occasions to the Vice President for his counsel, consideration, and leadership in bridging the gaps between the Congress and the administration. This has been one of the most interesting periods of my life as a Senator, being able to work this closely with the Vice President, who undertook, despite the problems facing the Nation, to give us his attention whenever I called and whatever time I called. In every case, the Vice President worked hard with us to find solutions to the problems that beset this conference.

The conference report, based on the give and take between the House and the Senate, between the Congress and the White House, meets the fiscal targets agreed to by both the House and the Senate. Discretionary spending for fiscal year 2003 will be a total now of \$762.713 billion. That total reflects our original base of \$751.325 billion, in addition to \$1.5 billion for election reform, which the President endorsed over the base request, and the \$10 billion for the defense reserve.

The White House also accepted \$2.241 billion in advance appropriations for

the 2004 education programs, which was an initiative we began on the floor as we tried to increase the moneys allocated to education under the President's No Child Left Behind education program.

In short, we set a target which was the total amount requested by the administration. We met the target and we bring this bill to the Senate, reflecting the priorities of the administration, the House, and the Senate. A great deal of hard work went into this final agreement, with all parties making compromises—and, I must say, sacrifices—to get the job done.

On my own account, as I mentioned earlier today, I was disappointed that a more complete resolution of the Alaska timber problem could not be included in this bill. There have been comments made about my trying to add something behind the scenes and some sort of dark way of moving an amendment that should not have been considered by the conference. There was a provision in this bill as it went to conference dealing with the Tongass Forest in Alaska. We tried to resolve the total dispute over that forest. That has not been possible. As I said this afternoon, I will address the Senate again and again and again until it is resolved.

At the conference meeting, I was compelled to ask Senator BOND to withhold a more comprehensive proposal on the Missouri River, a goal he has sought, and sought very hard, and on which he has worked very hard. I know it was a very difficult thing for my great friend from Missouri.

The House advocated language on coal company compensation that the Senate could not agree to. The House also accepted compromises on Amtrak from the positions advocated by the subcommittee chairman.

The toughest portion to resolve was the drought relief package. I am deeply grateful to the efforts and leadership of Senator COCHRAN in resolving this matter and meeting the needs of those farmers devastated by recent droughts. His joint role as chairman of the agriculture subcommittee and the authorizing committee made him a pivotal figure in this process and brought before the Senate a proposal which I hope will be acceptable to all involved in farm matters.

I know many others wish to speak at this conference report, and I will reserve any time that might be allocated to me. I thank the distinguished ranking member and our former chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator BYRD, for his partnership and assistance in preparing this bill for the Senate. I know he did not agree with the process. I know he wished we had more time to deal with these individuals bills. But without the work undertaken by Senator BYRD in the committee, reporting all the 13 bills last year, we could not have completed our work under the timetable we faced. It was because of the work he led last

year that gave us the ability to deal with 11 different bills that had a prior approval by the Senate and past Congress and gave a jumping off point to play catchup with this process.

I have the deepest respect for the House chairman, Congressman YOUNG, and the ranking member, Congressman OBEY. Their constructive approach and determination to finish the work, these 2003 bills, were vital to the conclusion of this conference.

It is with a great deal of humbleness that I come before the Senate and ask the Senate to approve this conference report because I know it is a difficult process. We will approve the largest appropriations bill in the history of the United States because there are 11 together in one package. It is very difficult. There will be portions of this bill with which some people disagree; they could disagree with 1 and love the other 10.

But the process here is such that if we are to do our work for the remainder of this year, if we are going to be able to address the year 2004 appropriations bills, if we are going to be prepared to deal with the possibility of a supplemental for our men and women in uniform who are being deployed throughout the world, if we are going to be able to be partners with the administration in dealing with the crises that face this country in Iraq and Korea, we have to clear this deck.

We have to make up our mind to vote for this bill. I urge every Member to search his or her soul about this process. It is not a perfect process. It is absolutely not perfect. This bill is certainly far from perfect, but it is the best we can do under the circumstances that face us. There are many people here disappointed, as I am, about provisions that affect their own personal State. All I can say is, there will be another day and perhaps we can address some of those provisions on an individual basis as the year goes by.

I deeply thank the staff of the Appropriations Committee on a bipartisan basis. I will later ask to put all their names in the RECORD because every one of them has been involved. My staff director sent me an e-mail last night at 2:45. I am surprised he thought I was still awake to get it—but I was. But the real problem is this has been a product of hard labor. I hope the Senate realizes that as we proceed tonight.

It is my deep hope that we will vote on this bill tonight because it will add 1 more day to the time that the President has to review the bill. It will take at least 2 days, maybe 3 days, for the enrolling process of this bill to take place. In all probability the President cannot receive this bill, if we pass it tonight, until Monday night or Tuesday of next week. He is entitled the time to review this; all of the staff have to review this before he will sign it.

Having been part of the administration one time, I know what they call the "enrolled bill process" in the administration. Each department gets its

time to review a bill passed by the Congress and present their recommendations to the Office of Management and Budget to be put together and given to the President for his consideration before he will sign a bill. That process must have time. We should accord the President of the United States the respect due his office, to give him time to review this bill. I regret deeply I did not get more time for my friend from Arizona to review the bill.

As the years have gone by, we have come to appreciate each other more in terms of the roles we play in this process. The Senator from Arizona is the watchdog of the Treasury as far as this process is concerned. I admire and respect that as far as the Senator is concerned, and I look forward to comments he will make tonight.

Mr. MCCAIN. I see the Senator from West Virginia. I appreciate the indulgence of the Senator from West Virginia. I will take just a minute.

I thank the Senator from Alaska for the hard work he and his staff have done. I also hope Members understand that we did not receive this bill until sometime late morning and it is, as the Senator from Alaska pointed out, the largest bill in the history of Congress. I see it sitting to his right. I think it is several thousand pages. I believe, in all candor, in order to review it, my staff would have to stay up all night.

I understand the urgency of voting tonight, but I hope the Senator will indulge me and my staff another hour and a half for us to get through at least a majority of the bill, and then I would be asking for an hour, but I will not use a complete hour to comment on the bill. That way, I hope it can accommodate Members so we could have a vote relatively early this evening.

We are not finished by a long shot reviewing the bill. It is the largest appropriation in the history of this country. At least in my mind, it deserves scrutiny and comment.

I thank the Senator from Alaska. I thank the Senator from West Virginia. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations, I thank my friend, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, TED STEVENS, and I also thank House Appropriations Committee Chairman BILL YOUNG as well as the ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee, Representative DAVID OBEY, for their hard work in bringing H.J. Res. 2, a joint resolution making consolidated appropriations for fiscal year 2003, to the floor. I thank all of the conferees on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses for their hard work on this legislation.

I join with my chairman in paying our respects to and thanking our staff people, on both sides of the aisle, who have worked long hours for long weeks and for long months on this bill. We are now over 4 months into the fiscal

year and the domestic agencies of our Government have had to operate under eight continuing resolutions. Unfortunately, the House of Representatives has not passed a regular appropriations bill since July—since July of last year. That is over 29 weeks without sending a regular appropriations bill to the Senate for consideration.

I have been in these premises for more than 50 years. I have never seen such a performance in this half century in which I served in this body and the other body. I have never seen such a dismal performance.

When Democrats were in the majority in the Senate, we produced 13 responsible bipartisan bills. I owed, always owed and sought to give due credit to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Alaska, because he was always so helpful, so cooperative, always so courteous in his treatment toward me and I have always recognized that and always sought to assign due credit, proper credit to him and to his colleagues on that side of the aisle.

The President's budget for fiscal year 2003 was seriously deficient in a number of critical domestic programs such as homeland security, education, veterans medical care, highway construction, and Amtrak. In the bills that were approved in the Senate Appropriations Committee by unanimous votes last summer—the votes of every Republican and Democrat, all 29, 15 Democrats at that time and 14 Republicans, all 29 votes voted unanimously—we added about \$11 billion or about 3 percent to the President's request to respond to these shortfalls.

Regrettably, the conference agreement that the House and Senate Republican leadership bring before us this evening cuts back domestic spending by nearly \$8 billion, with cuts in homeland security, land conservation programs, Head Start, State and local law enforcement, water infrastructure grants, mass transit, the National Park Service, embassy security, and many other programs.

I am particularly troubled about the cuts in homeland security programs, given the increased threat level under which we are all now living. My colleagues, the security of this Nation is on thin ice. This administration has held back support for critical investments in homeland security, in police officers, in firefighters, in border, airport, and seaport security. As a result of this White House's intransigence, America is woefully unprepared to prevent or respond to another terrorist attack.

In this conference report, spending for our Nation's first responders has been cut by \$1.6 billion from the levels approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee last summer. Funding has also been cut for border security by \$182 million, embassy security by \$42 million, and for hiring COPS on the beat by \$130 million, enough to hire 1,360 police officers and other personnel.

The American people should know that if there is a chemical or biological attack in their neighborhood, the odds are that the police, the firemen, the medical personnel who will respond may not have either the equipment or the training necessary to help when that help is needed most.

For example, the National Fire Protection Association and FEMA estimate that only 13 percent of the fire departments around the country have fire personnel with the specialized training and equipment to handle chemical or biological attacks.

Why is America so vulnerable? Because this White House is hoping to protect the American people on a shoestring homeland security budget, held together with duct tape.

Since September 11, 2001, the President, with great fanfare, has signed legislation to authorize improvements in security at our airports, security at our ports, and on our borders. The President also announced a plan for State and local governments to vaccinate 10 million first responders for a potential smallpox attack. But the President has not funded that effort, nor has he requested money for it in his budget.

Time after time after time, the administration has talked about homeland security, but time after time after time the administration has failed to invest in homeland security.

Add it up. Add it up. The President turned his back to \$2.5 billion in emergency homeland security funds last August. This past fall the President forced \$1.5 billion in cuts to homeland security initiatives in the appropriations bills that unanimously passed the Senate Appropriations Committee last July. Just last month the administration opposed two homeland security funding amendments which I offered on this floor, one for \$5 billion, another for \$3 billion, and the administration labeled these funds as "extraneous."

Those are billions of dollars in homeland security protections that could be at work right now. Those are billions of dollars that could be in place today for new police and firefighter training, for expanded border security, for vaccines against smallpox. Those are billions of dollars that could be helping to protect American lives today. But time after time after time after time, this administration said no, calling those homeland security funds "extraneous" and "wasteful."

Now, when the President signs the omnibus bill, the administration will proclaim with great fanfare that it held a hard line on Federal spending. I hope that the White House hard line will not result in Americans becoming hard targets for terrorists.

No longer can we nickel-and-dime our first responders. These firemen and police officers and emergency medical teams simply cannot do the job we expect them to do, and that the American people expect them to do, without enough financial support from the Federal Government.

We should not accept the alarming deficiencies in our seaport security—an area that many experts have identified as perhaps the Nation's single greatest vulnerability. We should not accept the fact that first responders and local doctors and nurses do not have sufficient training and equipment to handle wide-ranging threats involving madmen who may have gotten their hands on weapons of mass destruction. With these looming gaps, what is the administration's great homeland security plan?

What will protect the American people? Will it be duct tape, plastic sheeting, and a new federal bureaucracy? We did not create a new Department of Homeland Security just to be told to buy duct tape and plastic.

When it comes to fighting overseas, this Administration's attitude is to spare no expense. In fact, the Vice President interceded personally over the weekend to include billions of new dollars for Defense Department efforts in this omnibus bill. That is all well and good. But when it comes to fighting the war here at home, this administration relies on duct tape and plastic.

We are in new and dangerous times. No threat can be ignored. The men and women who send us here demand that we protect them. The fathers and mothers who send their children to school each morning expect us to invest their hard-earned dollars to keep their little ones safe. That is a solemn duty. It is a basic and sacred duty. When the people ask for our best efforts to protect them from madmen, we must not respond with duct tape.

Chairman Stevens and House Appropriations Committee Chairman Young did all they could to produce an omnibus bill that meets the needs of the American people within the low spending level imposed by the administration.

I believe that the most damaging result of the 2003 appropriations process for the Nation and for our States would be for our domestic agencies to be forced to operate under a continuing resolution for the entire fiscal year. Such a full year continuing resolution would reduce domestic spending by up to another \$14 billion below the levels in the omnibus.

Chairman STEVENS of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Chairman BILL YOUNG of the House Appropriations Committee, and Mr. OBEY, my counterpart on the House side, did everything they could to avoid operating their Government on a continuing resolution that would go to the end of the fiscal year.

Therefore, I am going to support passage of this legislation. However, I must raise a concern about how this legislation was produced. Over the past several weeks, the Appropriations Committee has worked to craft a conference report to include the eleven spending bills for fiscal year 2003 that were not concluded during the 107th Congress. The Appropriations Committee takes great pride in the bipar-

tisan approach we have maintained over the years to produce bills to fund this nation's necessary programs. The bipartisan spirit of this Committee enables us to carefully balance the needs of all Americans and to successfully craft bills that, with few exceptions, are signed into law.

We all recognize the unusual circumstances surrounding passage of most of the fiscal year 2003 appropriations bills. Still, I am pleased to report that the general rule of bipartisan cooperation among the members and staff of this Committee has continued to prevail and, thereby, we have before us now a conference report that strives to provide fair treatment for all Senators, at least in terms of the regular 2003 appropriations provisions.

However, notwithstanding the bipartisanship exhibited at the subcommittee level, there have been some serious problems encountered in the formulation of the conference agreement on the omnibus appropriations legislation.

Today's headline in *The Washington Post* reads, "GOP Wraps Up Spending Package." There is some truth to that statement. Behind closed doors, the Senate Majority Leader, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees met and settled on a number of the big issues. Vice President Cheney provided the administration's views.

At these partisan meetings, decisions were made on such issues as the overall top line total of the omnibus appropriations legislation, the size of the across-the-board cut, the matter of environmental riders and the substance of the \$3.1 billion drought package, along with the offsets from the previously enacted farm bill that were included at the insistence of the White House. These farm bill offsets became necessary when the White House refused to raise the top line by \$3.1 billion to accommodate the mandatory spending in the drought package.

More specifically, Division N of omnibus legislation includes a title to provide disaster assistance for farmers and ranchers due to drought and related conditions. This item was included in the bill passed by the Senate in January. However, when this bill went to conference, this item was not made part of the normal bipartisan conference process. In fact, no appropriations subcommittee was even involved in the conference negotiation on disaster assistance. Rather, it seems, the entire negotiation was conducted by the majority authorization committees, and no discussions with minority appropriations or authorization committee staff ever occurred until the final product was presented to the Appropriations Committee just as the finishing touches to the overall omnibus appropriations legislation were being made.

In summary, with no Democrats in the room, the House and Senate Repub-

lican leadership designed a program that assessed the \$3.1 billion offset against a farm program which one of our colleagues had labored for 5 years to get enacted. The House and Senate Republican leadership chose to cut domestic programs by nearly \$8 billion from the bi-partisan bills approved by the Appropriations Committee last summer. There also was no discussion of the decision to include an arbitrary across-the-board cut on domestic programs.

The package was approved by the House and Senate Republican leadership and given to the Appropriations Committees to be laid into the omnibus legislation. The conferees never met to approve the final conference report.

This is no way to develop legislation. When minority Senators are excluded from discussions, it has the effect of disenfranchising the millions of American citizens who are represented by those Senators like myself.

There is not much we can do about this problem now. We are faced with the alternative of operating on a continuing resolution for the rest of the year—which I don't want to do, which Chairman STEVENS, Chairman YOUNG, and Mr. OBEY have labored valiantly to avoid—which would have the effect of reducing domestic spending by up to another \$14 billion below the levels in the omnibus legislation.

It is my hope that in the future there will be a resumption of full bipartisan cooperation for all items that are included in any appropriations bill. If members want to add items to an appropriations bill that are the product of an authorization committee, that committee must adhere to the bipartisan standards of the Appropriations Committee. If they choose not to do so, I strongly suggest that they find a legislative vehicle other than an appropriations bill on which to attach their measure.

Again, I thank the truly distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Mr. STEVENS, for his cooperation, for his many courtesies towards me and towards my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and for his friendship and the friendship of all members of the Appropriations Committee on both sides of the aisle.

I also thank the staff of the committee. I cannot find the words to adequately express my deep appreciation to the staff people on this committee. They work hard. They work long hours. They work long weeks. They work weekends and are away from their families. And they labor under very difficult conditions in order to help to bring to the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee a measure which can then be brought to the floor and voted on. These staff people performed admirably under tight deadlines, especially during the last 6 weeks.

I look forward to working with my colleague, Mr. STEVENS, on the fiscal

year 2004 appropriations process which will begin very soon.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, I commend the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for an excellent statement and associate myself with his remarks. They were extremely well put.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend for his comments. And I thank him always for his statecraft, for his handiwork in the development of legislation on the floor, and for his courage and ability to stand up for what he believes.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, who really is a role model for so many of us. I thank him.

Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss the provisions in the omnibus spending bill, adopted unanimously by the Senate earlier, that will protect the privacy and civil liberties of each and every law-abiding American citizen.

I am going to discuss this over the next few minutes. I see the distinguished chairman of the full committee, Senator STEVENS, in the Chamber. Before I begin my remarks, I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He and his staff have been so gracious and so kind with respect to this issue.

The program I am going to discuss, the Total Information Awareness Program, is the most far-reaching and most expansive program of surveillance ever proposed. Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE, in particular, with the help of Senator BYRD and Senator FEINSTEIN, and Senator GRASSLEY, colleagues on both sides of the aisle, worked very closely with me.

But we simply would not have this amendment in the legislation, it would not be bipartisan, if Senator STEVENS had not been working with us. Because he is in the Chamber, I particularly thank my colleague for all his help.

Mr. President, and colleagues, the amendment I am going to discuss tonight would prohibit spending for technology research and development in the Total Information Awareness Program, or TIA, unless the Department of Defense reports to the Congress on its plans for the technology.

The provision also establishes proper congressional oversight of this surveillance program by requiring explicit congressional approval for deployment of any Total Information Awareness technology that would be used to spy on U.S. citizens on U.S. soil.

The Defense Department itself has had a virtual database—and I will quote—that was described as “a new kind of extremely large, omnimedia, virtually centralized and semantically rich information repository.” In my mind, such a novel and broadly proposed program—a program that has

fingers snaking into so many areas of Americans’ lives—is a textbook case of a program that needs vigorous congressional oversight.

In recent days, the Department of Defense and the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency, or DARPA, have announced the formation of two oversight boards for the TIA Program—one within the Total Information Awareness Program and another Federal advisory board. In my view, this is a positive development. It indicates that they understand the growing concern of the American people about the Total Information Awareness Program.

But I am very pleased that Chairman STEVENS and the conferees shared my view, and that is that the establishment of these panels in no way reduces the need for congressional oversight of the Total Information Awareness Program. The conferees understood that these oversight boards, while useful, are not an argument for abdicating the responsibility of the Congress on this issue.

As I mentioned, this has been a bipartisan effort with Senators FEINSTEIN and REID—the distinguished Senator from Nevada is in the Chamber, Mr. REID—who have been very helpful. Suffice it to say, not one Member of Congress—no one in the Senate, no one in the other body, Democrat or Republican—has disagreed with the proposition of our amendment, and that is that it is the responsibility—indeed, the duty—of this Congress to insist on oversight of the Total Information Awareness Program. Not one Senator said: Look, Congress does not need to put brakes on the most far-reaching Government surveillance effort ever proposed.

On the contrary, what Congress said was: We are going to insist that this program is not going to be allowed to grow unchecked and unaccountable. In fact, it is the duty of the Congress to protect the civil liberties and privacy of the people we represent. The call for strong safeguards has come through loud and clear, and that call has been recognized in the conference.

One publication in my home State, the Newport News-Times, put it very well. I will quote it. That publication said:

Just visiting the web site of what is affectionately billed as [the Total Information Awareness Program] is a trip into a future we hope not to meet. If our government still believes in the sanctity of the constitution this week, let’s hope for the President’s signature.

All across the Nation, Americans have said that while a vigorous response to terror is necessary, a system designed to spy on Americans in America is not. It is not only unnecessary, it is contrary to the freedoms that the war on terror aims to protect.

The total information awareness concept requires keeping track of individuals and understanding how they fit into models. For instance, does a seem-

ingly innocent individual conduct himself or herself according to a pattern that terrorists have exhibited in the past?

To find out whether any current U.S. citizens fit the model of a terrorist living among us, the Total Information Awareness Program would develop a way to integrate the databases that already track our daily lives—bank records, online purchases, and travel plans, for instance. Once integrated, these disparate databases would serve as one giant repository of information on most or all of the computer-linked transactions an individual makes. Then you run the models, then you make a judgment of who looks like a terrorist. TIA’s technology would give any Federal agency the capability to develop risk profiles for millions of Americans as they look for questionable conduct.

When I first heard about this program—I am sure there are many others who came to think this as well—when you hear this initially, you say, this sounds like a good idea. If you snoop on everybody all the time, you are more likely to spot a few criminal someones at the moment they are up to no good. But the fact is, the police can’t just stop someone on the street and frisk them for no reason. Current privacy law is supposed to prohibit private companies and the Government from rummaging through your online records.

Unfortunately—and this is what you learn when you look at the total information proposal in depth—as it stands, the Total Information Awareness Program would use technology to pick regular Americans up by the ankles and shake them to see if anything funny falls out.

Now, I understand that terrorists are not going to hang a shingle outside their hideaways announcing they have set up shop. They are not technological simpletons. And I know, as a member of the Intelligence Committee, that extraordinary times such as this call for extraordinary measures to track down these terrorists. I do not take a back seat to anyone with respect to tracking down terrorists.

I believe one of the most important things I have been able to do as a Member of this body is to write the Terrorist Identification Classification System, a bipartisan effort, that became law in the last session, that allows us, on an ongoing basis, to watchdog terrorists, the Mohammed Attas of the world. But there is a clear line between something that allows for tracking individuals where there is a known track record of terrorist activity—suspicious activity linked to terrorism—and, in effect, standing by while the Government shines an indiscriminate spotlight into the private lives and dealings of law-abiding Americans in this country on their own soil.

It is a question of striking a balance. The Terrorist Identification Classification System is an appropriate approach

for the Government to take in seeking to weed out terrorism.

The Total Information Awareness Program is over the line. It is invading the civil liberties of law-abiding Americans on U.S. soil. That is why the conferees have wisely chosen to impose checks on it. The intention of the Total Information Awareness Program and those who support it is undoubtedly to protect the America that we love. But the reality is that the program as proposed encroaches on the freedoms that make us love America in the first place.

Millions of Americans understand that. They have made it clear that they don't want this program to move forward unchecked and unaccountable, and that is why there has been such an outcry about it.

A few weeks ago I stood with a coalition in a room not far from this sacred Chamber that does not flock together all that often: Americans for Tax Reform, the Eagle Forum two groups that are certainly conservative by anybody's calculus stood with the American Civil Liberties Union and a variety of groups that would be considered liberal, as they supported efforts to put vigorous oversight in place over this program. Suffice it to say, in my time in the Congress, I have never seen a program that has generated more ideological concern across the political spectrum. We have seen Democrats, Republicans, liberals, and conservatives all saying this is a program that warrants vigorous oversight and scrutiny by elected officials.

Just because the administration has promised in recent days to institute oversight panels and to not use their awesome power for nefarious purposes, does not mean that future leaders would not abuse this program. So what we have said is that we are not going to let this program move forward without first ensuring permanent safeguards and protections that without them would threaten Americans not just today but many years in the future.

Some who advocate this program will say that the concerns of Members of Congress and others are overblown. Some say the program will not do what I described and it doesn't threaten the privacy of American citizens in the way that first appears. I hope that is the case. If that is the case, if in fact the Total Information Awareness Program does not threaten the civil liberties and privacy rights of the American people, then the folks over at the Defense Department need to come to the Congress and make that clear.

They need to do what they have not done to date, and that is to explain more about what this program will do and how it will do it.

The fact is, this body is in the dark about the Total Information Awareness Program, the most expansive and far-reaching surveillance program ever proposed. Congress has not been informed as to what safeguards and constitutional protections would be in

place when this program goes forward. Therefore, my view is this Congress has no choice but to pursue answers and explanations before allowing the program to proceed. That is what our amendment to the omnibus spending bill does, and that is what the conferees have wisely chosen to do.

My view is that these are reasonable provisions. The amendment calls on the Department of Defense to explain in a report to be delivered to the Congress within 90 days what technology they intend to develop and what they intend to do with it. Then the amendment further states that when any technology is developed for this program, it may not be developed without the express approval of the Congress. If the Total Information Awareness Program is something that is less invasive or smaller in scope or different than I have described, then the administration will have an opportunity to tell us.

This amendment does not prevent those who support the program as initially outlined to have the chance to come back and show why additional threats warrant additional action. What this amendment does is ensure that if this program moves forward, it does so in a fashion that is sensitive to American freedoms, sensitive to constitutional protections and safeguards, while still ensuring that our country can fight terrorism.

Finally, it all comes down to how we come forward and address a special task. What we must do now is to be vigilant, to make sure we are doing what is necessary to fight terrorism, but not approve actions or condone actions that could compromise the bedrock of this Nation—our Constitution.

I thank my colleagues, particularly Senators STEVENS, INOUE, FEINSTEIN, GRASSLEY, REID, and others, who said repeatedly that Congress should not shirk its obligation. The conferees who were appointed to reconcile this spending bill had a unique opportunity to defend the Constitution and the United States. That is what we are elected to do. That is what we get election certificates for. They answered that call. For that, I offer the thanks of Oregonians and all Americans for whom civil liberties remain so special and precious tonight.

I yield the floor.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS TRAINING INSTITUTE

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I want to speak about the United States Telecommunications Training Institute (USTTI).

The statement of the managers accompanying the fiscal year 2003 Omnibus Appropriations Act, H.J. Res. 2, recommends \$500,000 for USTTI compared to \$1,000,000 that was included in the Senate bill. However, this funding level is the result of a misunderstanding between my office, Senator MCCONNELL's office, and Senator INOUE's office. The Foreign Operations Subcommittee was under the impression that Senator INOUE want-

ed \$500,000 for USTTI, as had been the case in prior years. However, Senator INOUE is sure that he had informed the Subcommittee that he wanted \$1,000,000 for this organization. Does the senior Senator from Hawaii agree with my recollection?

Mr. INOUE. I do. I would add that I have strongly supported USTTI for a number of years, and have worked successfully with this subcommittee to get funding for it. I would ask the Senator from Vermont if the amount that is provided for USTTI in H.J. Res. 2 is a ceiling, or is it his understanding that USAID may provide additional funding for this organization if it is justified?

Mr. LEAHY. USAID could provide additional funding to USTTI, if it is justified. Moreover, members of the House and Senate subcommittee give great weight to the views of the senior Senator from Hawaii, and I have little doubt that additional accommodation could have been made at the conference if this misunderstanding had not occurred.

Mr. INOUE. I am informed that USTTI is in need of additional funds to accommodate a range of important training programs that it implements. Would Chairman MCCONNELL and Senator LEAHY support the provision of additional funds to USTTI?

Mr. LEAHY. I would support additional funding, and would encourage USTTI to discuss their specific needs with USAID. I have a short note from Chairman MCCONNELL, also indicating his support for this project, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, February 13, 2003.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PAT: Please know that I support additional funding to the United States Telecommunications Training Institute (USTTI)—at the Senate reported level of \$1,000,000.

I would appreciate your conveying my support for this funding level to our friend and colleague from Hawaii.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,

MITCH MCCONNELL,
United States Senator.

TECHNICAL CLARIFICATION

Ms. MIKULSKI: Madam President, I would like to bring to his attention an inaccuracy in the manager's statement, and ask for a technical clarification. As the Senator is aware, the manager's statement includes language on a project within the Department of Commerce/National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration/National Marine Fisheries Service/Habitat Conservation Research and Management Services account: "Chesapeake Bay Oyster Research" for \$2 million.

Will the chair recognize that \$2 million included in the Department of

Commerce/National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)/National Marine Fisheries Service/Habitat Conservation Research and Management Services account for "Chesapeake Bay Oyster Research" is actually for "oyster restoration" activities in the Chesapeake Bay?

Mr. GREGG. The Senator from Maryland is correct. The committee included these funds in the National Marine Fisheries Service account to, in part, further oyster restoration and replenishment efforts in the Chesapeake Bay. It is the committee's expectation that NOAA will use the sums indicated for oyster restoration efforts in the Chesapeake Bay.

INTENT OF SECTION 211

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I want to take a moment to clarify an issue that may lead to some confusion with respect to the intent of section 211 of the Commerce, Justice, State title of this bill. The Statement of Managers incorrectly states that two foreign cruise ships will be allowed to reflag under U.S. registry for operations in the U.S. coastwise trade. This was a drafting error and should have stated, to reflect the bill language, that three ships will be allowed to reflag under U.S. registry. I simply want to confirm with my friend from Alaska that the bill language is controlling.

Mr. STEVENS. My friend from Hawaii is correct. The bill language is the law and controls the operation of the provision. I regret that the Statement of Managers was incorrectly drafted. It should have reflected that three cruise ships will be allowed to reflag under U.S. registry.

Mr. INOUE. I thank my friend for that clarification and for all of his hard work on this bill.

Mr. HARKIN. One of the key provisions of the bipartisan Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 signed into law by President Bush last year was a significant new conservation initiative called the Conservation Security Program (CSP) which will, if properly implemented, significantly improve conservation practices and result in cleaner air and water.

I want to clarify the intent of provisions related to this program included in this conference report and actions that will be taken to preserve current law provisions. First, it is my understanding that it was the intention of the conferees that the CSP be implemented and operated according to the terms of the 2002 farm bill. Second, it is my understanding that the provisions in this conference report were only intended to apply to years following expiration of this measure and were not intended in any way to modify operation of the program prior to the beginning of fiscal year 2008. Third, it is my understanding that as soon as possible this year a conference report that is expected to become law will be brought before the Senate that contains provisions that assure that the CSP will operate as established and intended in

the 2002 farm bill for the duration of that bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. I understand the Senator from Iowa's concerns. I intend that the provisions of the conference report relative to this program would not have any effect on the operation of the program during the life of this farm bill. I would be pleased to work with him to insure that the program funding is restored.

Mr. STEVENS. I also concur with the statements of the chair and ranking member of the Agriculture Committee about the intent of provisions included in this conference report related to the CSP. It was not our intention, in any way, to modify the operation of this program prior to the beginning of fiscal year 2008. I join Senator COCHRAN in my determination to resolve this matter in an appropriate conference report this year. He has my commitment to work with my colleagues to assure that the Senate acts at the earliest possible date this year on a conference report that is expected to become law that will assure that the CSP operates as established and intended in the 2002 farm bill for the duration of that bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. The Conservation Security Program was an important part of the 2002 farm bill. It holds tremendous potential to help our farmers and ranchers clean up the environment. I, too, concur that the Senator from Iowa's statements about the intent of this conference report. I truly appreciate the bipartisan commitments of my colleagues to ensure that the CSP is implemented and operated as we intended.

Mr. FRIST. I look forward to working with my colleagues in this regard.

FUNDING FOR THE OGLALA SIOUX TRIBE

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, it is my understanding that the omnibus appropriations bill includes \$300,000 for the Oglala Sioux Tribe to automate the functions of the tribe's court system. I would like to enter into a colloquy with my colleague from South Carolina regarding this funding, which is included in the Omnibus Appropriations bill.

It is my understanding that the funding in question is intended to be used by Cangleska, Inc., a non-profit organization located on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota that is dedicated to the prevention of domestic violence and sexual assault, to help enhance the capacity of the Oglala Sioux Tribe to arrest, prosecute, and rehabilitate offenders.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the Senior Senator from South Carolina for his clarification regarding this matter.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, I rise today to express my deep disappointment with the so-called drought aid provisions included by the White House and Republican leadership in the fiscal year 2003 omnibus appropriations bill.

Coincidentally, 1 year ago the Senate first adopted drought aid—as part of

the Senate farm bill—to cover losses experienced by farmers and ranchers in 2001. At that time, 68 Senators joined me and voted in bipartisan cooperation to support the victims of drought. However, one year ago was also the first time the administration voiced in the strongest possible terms their opposition to emergency aid for farmers and ranchers. The White House declared that assistance to farmers and ranchers had to be cannibalized from the farm bill—a position never before taken by any administration with respect to a natural disaster. As Mother Nature turned the hands of time in 2002, the drought conditions became even more persistent. By autumn, more than half the counties in the U.S. were affected by drought conditions and "ground zero" unfortunately was the Northern Plains of South Dakota and our neighboring states. In fact, the drought dealt so much damage to the South Dakota economy that South Dakota State University estimated the total economic loss to reach nearly \$2 billion. Senator DASCHLE and I led an effort in the Senate to enact emergency legislation providing at least \$6 billion for farmers and livestock producers who experienced crop and forage losses in 2001 and 2002. Our drought relief plan was consistent with the approach Congress would always take with respect to the aftermath of a natural disaster—our relief was emergency in nature because droughts, floods, fires, and hurricanes are historically addressed by emergency assistance. Despite the clear need for emergency aid, the White House hard-line prevailed last year and multiple efforts to enact drought relief were defeated by White House foot soldiers in Congress.

I firmly believe that in order to help agricultural producers coping with the drought, the relief must be comprehensive. But the plan advanced in the omnibus today shortchanges producers in a number of ways. First, the relief plan written by Vice President CHENEY and House and Senate Republicans provides inadequate aid for losses occurring in either 2001 or 2002, but not both. Second, the \$3.1 billion offered in the omnibus does not adequately cover the severe crop and forage losses producers suffered as a result of the drought. Third, cutting the new Conservation Security Program (CSP) in the farm bill to pay for the disaster aid is a terrible precedent to set. When a hurricane damages the Gulf Coast or an earthquake occurs in California, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) budget is not raided, rather emergency aid is provided to natural disaster victims. A drought is no different, and it's a crippling mistake to cut the farm bill in order to pay for a drought emergency. Fourth, the special-interest provisions slipped into the omnibus drought plan by Republican authors leaves much to be desired. While the proposal that Senator DASCHLE and I advanced would cover

all crop losses, the omnibus makes special grants to cotton and tobacco farmers. Moreover, the omnibus contains a special section to address hurricane losses and \$10 million to the State of Texas. This simply is not fair.

How did White House and Republican negotiators find the farm bill funds to pay for this woefully inadequate disaster aid? I am told they asked the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to revise the estimated cost of the CSP. CBO's re-estimate reportedly grew the cost of the new conservation program to around \$6.8 billion over ten years. This level is substantially above CBO's initial estimate of the cost of the CSP—\$2 billion over 10 years. I am very disappointed that Republicans employed a budget gimmick to inflate the cost of the CSP in order to launder funds through the program and pay for disaster aid. This entire process is a dis-service to farmers, ranchers, and conservationists and is sure to create hard feelings among these groups. According to the Congressional Research Service (CRS), not in three decades has a program in the farm bill been cut in order to pay for a natural disaster. This historically outrageous move to eliminate money from a conservation program in the farm bill to address a drought emergency may prove a precedent that hurts farmers, ranchers, and the environment for years to come. It is terribly short-sighted and I cannot support such a step.

Less than 6 months ago, 77 Senators joined Senator DASCHLE and I in support of \$6 billion in drought aid for farmers and ranchers suffering losses in 2001 and 2002. Today, it appears producers will get less than half of what they need and pay the price in the long run with a cut to the farm bill. I am disappointed that nearly thirty of my colleagues in the Senate dropped their support for comprehensive and emergency drought aid totaling \$6 billion in order to satisfy the White House for half that much.

My record on drought relief for farmers and ranchers is clear. On three occasions in the last Congress, the Senate passed relief that would have compensated all drought victims for their loss. Unfortunately, each time objections from the White House and the House Republican leadership stopped this aid from making it to producers. South Dakota's farmers and ranchers deserve better and for this reason I will not support the so-called drought aid in the omnibus.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, the Senate is now considering and will soon adopt the omnibus conference report on H.J. Res. 2. I will vote for the conference report. I know from my work on the Appropriations Committee that this bill represents a genuine effort by many in both bodies to finally finish the fiscal year 2003 appropriations bill.

I want to begin my remarks by thanking our leader on this side, Senator ROBERT BYRD. Senator BYRD was

the chairman of the Appropriations Committee when the fiscal year 2003 appropriations process began. He steered all 13 appropriations bills through the committee with bipartisan support from every member of the committee. Senator BYRD was instrumental in putting this conference report together. I know the Senator has many concerns about this bill. I share many of his concerns and particularly those regarding the many cuts to homeland security in this bill. The Senator has been a leading voice for homeland security funding and I look forward to working closely with him in the days ahead as this body works on this important issue.

I also want to acknowledge and thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. We are here tonight because of the determined leadership of Senator TED STEVENS. I know many of my colleagues did not want to see the Congress agree to fund the government with a continuing resolution for the rest of the fiscal year. This would have represented a huge failure on the part of the Congress, setting a dangerous precedent for the legislative branch's working relationship with the Executive Branch. Chairman STEVENS is a tough but fair chairman. I appreciate the work he has put in to manage and successfully complete this very unusual process.

I appreciate the inclusion of funding for many projects and programs that directly benefit the environment and natural resources in my beautiful home State. The bill includes funding for salmon recovery work from the Elwha River in northwest Washington to the Snake River in southeast Washington and nearly every community between. Funding is also provided to fight the Spartina infestation in Willapa Bay and to acquire important ecological lands around the State. However, while I am very grateful for my colleagues willingness to support my work to secure this funding, I must express my dismay over anti-environmental provisions included in the bill and its failure to adequately fund the conservation trust fund created 3 years ago.

The conference considered many different provisions related to the Tongass National Forest which sought to strip away environmental considerations in the management of the forest. I appreciate the conference removing these provisions, but wish the one remaining provision could have also been deleted.

Also of concern to me is a provision retained in the omnibus that significantly expands the Forest Service's stewardship contracting program. This had been a pilot project intended to see if the stewardship contracts were a constructive tool in addressing forest health issues. The problem with the provision in the bill is that it creates a permanent program before we have received any data from the pilot projects already authorized. There is simply no data yet in upon which to make the de-

cision to provide unlimited expansion of the program. I want to make clear that I support the pilot program and believe stewardship contracting could be a valuable tool in addressing forest health issues, but in order for this to be a valuable tool, it must be one that has the trust of Congress and citizens. There is simply not enough data to have created that trust yet.

There are many great accomplishments in this bill. I am particularly proud of the work we did in the transportation title. The Senate worked very hard to keep my amendment to fund the Community Action Program or CAP at \$120 million for the fiscal year. I appreciate the Senate's hard work to stand for this small program that is making a difference all across the country. This bill provides increased funding for a number of education programs. Importantly, education programs like Head Start are exempted from any across the board cuts associated with this bill.

As we conclude the fiscal year 2003 appropriations process, I hope we can move forward on the coming fiscal year with a renewed commitment to finish all 13 appropriations bills on time. We will need the help of our House colleagues and of course, the administration is an important contributor to the appropriations process too. We must avoid a repeat performance of fiscal year 2003.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I rise today to thank the conferees for helping the City of Boca Raton, FL, and the County of Palm Beach, FL, begin to deal with the bio-terrorist attack on the American Media Building in October of 2001, and the death of Robert Stevens, who worked in the building, due to anthrax.

That building remains closed off with 24-hour security, still infested with anthrax, within a short distance of homes, schools, and other office buildings. But, now the U.S. Congress has authorized the General Service Administration to receive title to the building within 12 months of enactment of the omnibus bill.

The residents of Boca Raton and the surrounding communities will be relieved to know that, with this language in the omnibus bill help is on the way. I am confident that the General Service Administration, the Florida Congressional Delegation and the owners of the American Media Building will be able to carry out the language in the omnibus bill and transfer the building to GSA or another appropriate agency to rid south Florida of this public health hazard.

The omnibus language provides for a report by GSA to Congress within 270 days of enactment of the bill describing the expected agreement between GSA and the owners of the American Media Building regarding the transfer of the property to the Federal Government.

The language further requests that a public health risk be shown. The local

public health officials and the Governor of Florida both have acknowledged that the AMI Building poses a public health threat. And since it is the first attack of its kind in the United States, the amount of danger posed is still unknown.

Another provision talks about the liability of the owner of the property. It is logical that the owner of the building would remain liable until title is transferred to the Federal Government.

All of these provisions can be easily worked out to reach an agreement on the transfer of this building to the Federal Government.

And, as this process moves forward, I know that each party will carry out their responsibilities under this language with the utmost integrity and with the concerns of the residents of Palm Beach County in mind. I look forward to monitoring the parties' progress toward an agreement.

In fact, I encourage the parties to meet on a regular basis with members of the Florida delegation so that this issue is resolved in the most efficient manner.

As we all live with the increased threat of a chemical or biological attack, we need to keep in mind that a biological attack is not a mere threat to south Florida and it is not something that occurred in the past and was taken care of—the anthrax attack remains.

Let us employ the powers of the Federal Government as the Founding fathers intended.

In Federalist Paper No. 23, Alexander Hamilton outlined the four principal reasons why the Federal Government was formed.

And the very first reason was for the common defense—national security. An attack from an unknown source was perpetrated on this community and the Federal Government has the power and the expertise to protect and safeguard these citizens.

I look forward to the day when I can walk on the Senate floor and declare that this community is finally free of anthrax.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I want to alert you and my fellow Senators to a particularly egregious rider that was included in the omnibus appropriations conference report. After the conference committee met and behind closed doors, this special interest rider will gut the organic standards just recently enacted by U.S. Department of Agriculture.

I understand this special interest provision was inserted into the bill on behalf of a single producer who essentially wants to hijack the "organic" certification label for his own purposes. He wants to get a market premium for his products, without actually being an organic product.

This provision will allow producers to label their meat and dairy products "organic" even though they do not meet the strict criteria set forth by USDA, including the requirement that

the animals be fed organically grown feed. This approach was considered and outright rejected by USDA last June. The entire organic industry opposed this weakening of the organic standards. If beef, poultry, pork and dairy producers are able to label their products as "organic" without using organic feed, which is one of the primary inputs, then what exactly is organic about the product?

This provision is particularly galling because so many producers have already made the commitment to organic production. For most, this is a huge financial commitment on their part. I have already heard from some large producers General Mills, Tyson Foods—around the country who are enraged by this special loophole included for one company that does not want to play by the rules.

I am also very disappointed that just because one company could not create this loophole to the organic rule in public during the USDA process, the Republican leadership decided to bury it within the 2-foot tall spending bill. It was done behind closed doors after the conference committee met in public.

I will be introducing legislation today to strike this rider from the Omnibus Appropriations Act and I hope to move it through Congress quickly before it does gut the organic meat and dairy industry. We need to send a message to all producers that if you want to benefit from the organic standards economically, you must actually meet them. When I included the "The Organic Foods Production Act" in the 1990 farm bill, it was because farmers recognized the growing consumer demand for organically produced products, but needed a tool to help consumers know which products were truly organic and which were not. The act directed USDA to set minimum national standards for products labeled "organic" so that consumers could make informed buying decisions. The national standard also reassured farmers selling organically produced products that they would not have to follow separate rules in each state, and that their products could be labeled "organic" overseas.

The new standards have been enthusiastically welcomed by consumers, because through organic labeling they now can know what they are choosing and paying for when they shop. This proposal to weaken the organic standards would undermine public confidence in organic labeling, which is less than a year old.

Getting the organic standards that are behind the "USDA Organic" label right was a long and difficult process, but critically important to the future of the industry. Along the way, some tried to allow products treated with sewer sludge, irradiation, and antibiotics to be labeled "organic." The public outcry against this was overwhelming. More than 325,000 people weighed in during the comment period,

as did I. The groundswell of support for strong standards clearly showed that the public wants "organic" to really mean something. Those efforts to hijack the term were defeated and this one should be too.

Consumers and producers rely on the standard. I hope members will cosponsor my bill and send a message to special interests that they cannot hijack the organic industry through a rider on the spending bill. This provision is an insult to organic producers and to consumers around the country.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I would like to express my concerns about a provision that has been buried in the fiscal year 2003 spending package. The language would make contract air traffic control (ATC) tower construction costs eligible for Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding.

On the face of it, this provision looks acceptable. The concept of making contract ATC towers eligible for Federal assistance under AIP has wide support in Congress. Many small and rural airports lack an ATC tower and do not share the safety benefits of having an air traffic controller to assist aircraft on takeoff and landing. Pilots at these airports are on their own, responsible for seeing and avoiding traffic. A number of smaller airports would like to use AIP funding to build a tower but are barred under current law. If these airports can make critical safety upgrades with this funding, they should have that option.

The problem with the provision included in the fiscal year 2003 omnibus bill is that while it would properly allow small airports to use AIP money to build new or replacement FAA contract towers, it would also allow airports that built contract ATC towers after October 1, 1996, to be eligible for reimbursement of their construction costs. The Federal Government already pays to operate these towers, and as a condition of this assistance, these airports agreed that the government would not pay the cost of constructing them.

This reimbursement would affect at least 21 contract towers that were previously built and provide up to \$25 million in total for these airports from current AIP funding. In this era of having our Federal resources limited by reduced revenues and the expense of ensuring the security of our homeland, it is irresponsible for this Congress to provide funds from the AIP program to reimburse these airports for costs that have already been accounted for.

The AIP program is vital to the safety, security and capacity needs of our Nation's airways. I am hopeful that we will carefully consider the potential ramifications of this issue as we proceed later this year with the reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I want to recognize the hard work of my Senate colleagues, especially Senator STEVENS, for putting together a conference report for our consideration tonight.

Last year the Senate Appropriations Committee under the leadership of my distinguished colleague from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, reported all 13 appropriations bills. Those bills formed the basis of the omnibus bill we are considering tonight. Unfortunately, this bill makes unwise reductions in many of the most important areas of our Federal Government, including education and homeland security. This bill also includes a provision that would make reckless changes to our Nation's forest management policy. This rider—which would provide the long-term authorization to contract the management and unfettered harvesting of national forests to timber companies—was so controversial when it was proposed in the farm bill that Democrats removed the entire forestry title rather than take it.

Rather than write individual timber contracts, the Forest Service has engaged in pilots of this stewardship idea for the last few years. It is a process by which the normal limits on contracting are avoided and timber companies are given broad leeway to harvest;

Some 84 stewardship contract pilots have so far been approved; none are complete; none have been evaluated to see if they meet the claim that the timber industry "stewards" are managing the pilots well;

Despite the fact that pilots haven't been evaluated, this rider contains a broad authorization for stewardship contracting;

It allows the Forest Service to pay contractors with trees rather than appropriated money, hence increasing incentive for harvest of large trees and making the Forest Service more directly dependent on timber sales.

Currently the Forest Service supervises sales, marking trees for cut; under this proposal, oversight is gone. It would be up to the timber company to decide what to cut. The rider enables the Forest Service to allow timber companies to take over large swaths of public forests by affording giving them long term management authority as part of these contracts. This is an important issue that deserves the full debate and consideration of the Senate. I am disappointed that it was included in this must-pass spending measure.

I also want to discuss in detail some of the funding priorities in this bill. This funding bill provides \$4.5 billion less in funding for homeland security and emergency responders than the appropriations bills passed by the Senate last year. Just last year, we passed a bill to create a new Department of Homeland Security. Republicans and Democrats came together to approve the largest reorganization of the Federal Government in decades. Without sufficient funding that new agency won't translate into improved safety on the ground, in our neighborhoods, cities and rural areas. This is an issue that is particularly important for my State of Nevada. We have one of the

most important facilities and some of the most talented personnel for training emergency responders.

Just today, one of the managers of this program spoke to me about how many trainers they would be able to train this year with the \$35,000,000 approved by the Senate. He told me that he could train 8,000 emergency responders this year. This facility at the Nevada Test Site is one of five counterterrorism training facilities that formed a consortium several years ago. Together these five facilities could train nearly 35,000 first responders with the amount of money the Senate provided. Every \$4,000 less we spend is one less first responder we train. These are the police and firefighters in communities throughout the country. These are the emergency responders who are already overworked by the increased threat level we are experiencing. These are the first responders who still are not sure how to change their patrols and activities in response to the elevated orange threat level. They need to know. They need to be trained.

Instead of the \$35 million approved by the Senate, the final conference report agreed to provide \$20 million for the training. While this is a large amount of funding, it will only meet a small portion of the need for training. I hope as the year continues that the administration will request additional funds to ensure that at least one member of every police, fire and emergency response unit in the country receives homeland security training.

I also want to comment on the funding this bill provides for education. Every person who wants to get an education in Nevada, and throughout the country, deserves to have the opportunity to get one. Whether we are talking about the 230,000 students in the Clark County Public Schools or the 11,000 students who attend Truckee Meadows Community College, every person who wants an education in Nevada, and throughout the country, deserves one.

During the last Congress, we worked together in a bipartisan fashion to pass a sweeping education reform bill. This bill showed the best of what the Congress can do when Republicans and Democrats work together. This omnibus bill does not live up to the promise of that crucial bill. Instead of ensuring that we leave no child behind, this bill leaves much to fund.

In summary, I again want to thank my colleagues for their tireless effort to complete this conference report for our consideration this evening. This bill does not do enough to ensure every American can live up to his or her potential. We have an obligation to provide our states with a clean, safe environment, a secure homeland, and the ability to educate every person. This bill could do more to accomplish these goals, and next year, I hope we will do that.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, America is on high alert. This is no

time to shortchange our security at home. Yet, that is precisely what this bill does.

Simply creating a new bureaucracy for homeland security is not enough. We must increase protection at our borders, provide the Coast Guard with additional resources, and provide more security at our ports. We must also assist local authorities to prepare for the worst. Our homes will not stay safe with duct tape alone. Our communities need help to fund law enforcement personnel, firefighters, rescue workers, and medical personnel.

Today, I asked mayors in Massachusetts whether the Federal Government is doing its share to help local communities with homeland security. Not one—not one—has received sufficient help from the Bush administration to meet local homeland security needs. Mayor Fred Kalisz of New Bedford tells me that since the Bush administration declared a Code Orange emergency last week, he has posted a 24-hour police presence at his small local airport. And he ordered round-the-clock security for a tanker that is docked in New Bedford's harbor. The budget crisis in Springfield, MA, forced Mayor Michael Albano to cut 76 police officers and 57 firefighters from the city payroll. Police, fire, and rescue officers in Springfield are stretched to the limit to cover continuing duties with fewer officers. Springfield simply cannot afford the additional duties of homeland security without federal help. The same is true in Worcester, where Mayor Timothy Murray is facing cuts to his police and firefighting force by more than ten percent. And his officers not only fight crime in Worcester, but they have protection duties with a strategic reservoir near Worcester as well as major rail hub. And the city of Boston has already spent \$2.6 million in scarce city funds for homeland security.

These local officials care about their communities. They are doing all they can amid an avalanche of budget cuts just to meet the ongoing needs of their citizens. It is unfair of the Bush administration and the federal government to leave them high and dry in the face of terrorist threats at home. Despite promises of funding from Washington to help with these urgent needs, he has received nothing—and this bill provides no new money beyond what administration promised long ago, and has yet to deliver. Washington must do more—much more—to be a real partner with our local cities and communities to protect our citizens.

I am also deeply concerned that this bill is yet another leap in the Republican campaign to undermine years of progress in protecting our environment. This bill contains provisions that allow the indiscriminate logging of irreplaceable forests, and lays the seeds for the destruction of one of our country's greatest natural treasures, the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve.

In addition, while I commend the fact that this bill represents a step forward

on education, and rejects the administration's anti-education budget, I believe that parents and teachers and students across the country will agree that more should have been done. Education is about fulfilling the hopes and dreams of the next generation. And it is about the security and economic future of America.

For these reasons I oppose this bill.

I ask that unanimous consent that a recent Boston Globe article that describes what our mayors are doing with little or no Federal help to meet homeland security needs in their communities be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From The Boston Globe, Feb. 9, 2003]

SECURITY COSTS RISE FOR LOCAL OFFICIALS,
TERRORISM ALERT PUTS A STRAIN ON BUDGETS

(By Megan Tench and Jenna Russell)

With the nation on heightened alert for terrorist attacks, Massachusetts officials said yesterday that the added responsibility will tax local budgets already facing a fiscal crisis.

The Bush administration hiked the terror alert to the second-highest level on Friday as Attorney General John Ashcroft cited an "increased likelihood" that the Qaeda terror network would attack Americans, noting that hotels and apartment buildings were possible targets.

However, Congress's failure in the last session to provide additional funding for security for cities and towns prompted criticism from several Massachusetts mayors as they attempted to cope with increased security mandates at a time of state aid reductions.

"Obviously there are targets that need to get additional attention, but the fact of the matter is that this is a major concern," Worcester's Mayor, Timothy P. Murray, said yesterday.

"We have thousands of police and firefighters out there, yet the president and the Congress failed to supply, equip, and fund these departments," Murray said.

Like other municipal leaders around the state, Salem Mayor Stanley Usovich Jr. said cities and towns are on the front line in the war on terrorism, but have not received the money they need to keep up the fight.

"I think everybody is willing and quite able to do their jobs, but no one at the federal and the state level understands that there is a bill to be paid," he said. "We are at war, and . . . I don't know how anyone can fight a war without giving money to the front lines. They cannot continue to ask for more without paying for it."

Still, few residents voiced concern yesterday over the possibility of attacks, which officials said could target Jewish communities or institutions.

"We heard about that on the news, but we are not afraid. We feel safe," said George Ullevinov, a Reading resident who was touring the Holocaust Memorial in Boston yesterday with his family.

Authorities believe that terrorists connected to Al Qaeda could be planning to time an attack or attacks with the end of the five-day Muslim holy period of the Hajj, the pilgrimage to Mecca, which began yesterday.

Officials have been particularly concerned about the use of a "dirty bomb," which would use conventional explosives to disperse radioactive material, but they also cited the possibility of suicide bombings and assassinations.

"Well, we can't run and hide under the bed," said Boston resident Philip West, as he checked his luggage with American Airlines at Terminal B at Logan Airport yesterday. West, a helicopter pilot, was headed to Dallas for a pilot's convention.

"We have to go out," he said. "I believe if it's our time to go, it's our time to go."

At Logan, tighter security was visible, with more State Police and trained dogs on patrol and more car inspections on entry to airport garages, during curbside stops, and an additional roadblocks on airport roads.

The increased presence seemed to comfort Dorchester resident Marlene Francis, who, along with her 4- and 10-year old children, was preparing for a flight to Jamaica.

"I believe in the security people here, and I try not to think about these things because I am traveling with my children," Francis said, as she waited in line at a security checkpoint. "What's meant to be will be."

At malls and hotels in and around Boston, security directors were reluctant to discuss what precautions they were taking. Law enforcement and transportation officials also were reticent about the heightened alert.

FleetCenter managers urged ticket holders to arrive an hour early for a Bruins game yesterday to comply with added security procedures, including the use of metal detectors at entrances. And the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority also increased security to reflect the orange alert, according to spokesman Joseph Pesaturo.

The Coast Guard also stepped up patrols around Boston, a spokeswoman said, and the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority increased security and patrols at key spots around the state's water supplies.

Bridges also became a focus of attention. "We've instructed our maintenance people who patrol the roads on a daily basis to be extra vigilant and keep an eye out for any stalled vehicles, particularly near bridges," said Jon Carlisle, a spokesman for the Executive Office of Transportation and Construction.

Boston's mayor, Thomas M. Menino, could not be reached for comment on the terrorism response yesterday. However, Menino, who also serves as president of the US Conference of Mayors, expressed concerns about the cost of the fight against terrorism during his address to the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce two months ago.

There, Menino announced that he is assembling a national coalition of state and local officials to urge Congress to pass the security funding measure as part of Bush's federal budget proposal when lawmakers return next month.

Boston has spent \$2.6 million in extra security since Sept. 11 terror attacks, Menino said. It's unclear how much the city would reap if the federal package were approved.

"This is money we were promised for police and fire and terrorism protection," he said in his address. "We cannot allow Congress to keep fiddling while the states and cities burn their reserves and exhaust their funds."

Other local officials echoed that sentiment.

"It's a very difficult situation. There are no additional dollars," said New Bedford's mayor, Frederick M. Kalisz, whose city is bracing for substantial cuts.

"The alert requires a certain level of patrol visibility at our airport and waterfronts, and the federal dollars just haven't come down to local governments yet," he said. "In a time of taxed dollars, we have to increase the patrols with local patrol officers that we use in our neighborhoods."

In Springfield, Mayor Michael Albano said 57 firefighters will receive layoff notices by Monday, in addition to the 76 police officers

he just laid off. Albano said the state budget cuts hurt more than the failure of the federal government to fund local security.

Downsizing police and fire departments "is inconsistent with national policy, and it should be inconsistent with state policy," he said. "The governor has weakened our front lines during a national alert."

Eric Fehrstrom, a spokesman for Governor Mitt Romney, said federal, state, and local governments "should spend whatever is necessary" to protect local cities and towns. "There has to be more federal involvement," he said. "Governor Romney will stand shoulder to shoulder with the state's mayors in making sure they receive adequate federal dollars to respond to the needs of our local communities."

After the boost in the national alert, Romney flew back to Boston two days early from an Olympics anniversary celebration in Utah, to make sure he would be here in the event of an emergency, Fehrstrom said.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the fiscal year 2003 omnibus appropriations bill. I oppose this bill because it is a significant step backward from the bills that the Appropriations Committee reported last year unanimously.

The most troubling departure from these committee-passed bills is in the critical area of homeland security. Compared to the levels unanimously approved last year by the Senate Appropriations Committee, this bill makes deep cuts in the Transportation Security Administration, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, community policing, FEMA disaster assistance, the DOT Office of Domestic Preparedness, firefighter grants, port security, American embassy security, and many other homeland security needs.

The agricultural disaster assistance provisions in bill are also of great concern to my State of South Dakota and many other States. The provisions provide limited assistance to producers by cutting important conservation assistance in the Farm Bill. The provisions provide only half the assistance needed to address the scope of natural disaster across the country. Finally, the provision provides assistance to select producers who did not suffer from natural disasters. The Senate voted three times last year for a measure that would have compensated all drought victims for their loss. Unfortunately, objections by the White House and the House Republican leadership stopped this aid from making it to producers.

I am also very concerned about the anti-environmental provisions in the bill. One provision would dramatically expand the forest stewardship contracting program until 2013. This provision would eliminate the current cap on pilot projects and require the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to open up more than 70 million acres to potential logging. The timber companies, not the Forest Service, would pick the trees to be harvested. In addition, the bill would eliminate judicial review for the Tongass National Forest land management plan; remove language protecting the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge;

exempt the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System from environmental review; and cut funding for important conservation programs.

For these reasons, I oppose this conference report and urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, the Senate proceed to vote on the adoption of the conference report with no intervening action or debate.

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

The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, before we vote I will take a minute to outline the schedule. This will be the last vote prior to the Presidents Day recess. The Senate will be in session tomorrow. However, no rollcall votes will occur during Friday's session.

At the conclusion of Friday's business, we will adjourn until Monday, February 24, under the order. At noon on Monday, February 24, Senator CHAMBLISS will deliver George Washington's Farewell Address. Following the address, the Senate will resume consideration of the Estrada nomination. In addition, on February 24, we will consider S. 151, the Protect Act. Members should expect to vote on passage of that bill at approximately 5:30. I will notify all Members when the exact time is locked in.

I thank all Members for their cooperation during this busy period. Again, this will be the last vote before the recess. The vote will be conducted in a few minutes, and the Senate will be in session tomorrow.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Mr. REID. Madam President, will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. FRIST. Yes.

Mr. REID. Can Members be assured that there will be no vote prior to 5:30 on the Monday we come back?

Mr. FRIST. That assurance will be given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back for debate on the conference report?

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask that the time of the ranking member be yielded back.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FRIST. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) are necessarily absent.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 34 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Akaka	DeWine	Mikulski
Alexander	Dole	Miller
Allard	Domenici	Murkowski
Allen	Dorgan	Murray
Baucus	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Feinstein	Nickles
Biden	Frist	Reed
Bond	Graham (SC)	Roberts
Breaux	Grassley	Santorum
Brownback	Gregg	Schumer
Bunning	Hagel	Sessions
Burns	Harkin	Shelby
Byrd	Hatch	Smith
Campbell	Hollings	Snowe
Cantwell	Hutchinson	Specter
Carper	Inhofe	Stabenow
Chafee	Inouye	Stevens
Chambliss	Johnson	Sununu
Clinton	Kohl	Talent
Cochran	Kyl	Thomas
Coleman	Landrieu	Voinovich
Collins	Lincoln	Warner
Cornyn	Lott	Wyden
Craig	Lugar	
Crapo	McCain	

NAYS—20

Bingaman	Durbin	Levin
Boxer	Edwards	Lieberman
Conrad	Feingold	Pryor
Corzine	Fitzgerald	Reid
Daschle	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Dayton	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Dodd	Lautenberg	

NOT VOTING—4

Graham (FL)	Leahy
Kerry	McConnell

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. FRIST. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business.

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

SALTONSTALL-KENNEDY GRANT PROGRAM AND CREATION OF THE ALASKA FISHERIES MARKETING BOARD

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, the Saltonstall-Kennedy (S-K) Grant Program is a competitive program administered by the National Marine Fisheries Service of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, Department of Commerce. The S-K program was established by the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act of 1954 to promote U.S. seafood products around the world and generally support our Nation's fisheries. For the first time in 1979, S-K receipts from import duties on fishery products were transferred to NOAA's base budget to fund an indus-

try/government partnership. However, without my amendment in fiscal year 2003 NOAA would transfer \$75 million to its base budget, leaving only \$220,000 for the original purposes of this program—promoting domestic seafood production. This provision ensures that a little less than 15 percent of those receipts transferred to NOAA will be used for their intended purpose—promoting domestic seafood from Alaska, home to half of the U.S. domestic seafood production.

This bill includes \$10 million from the S-K program to market Alaska seafood products and creates the Alaska Fisheries Marketing Board to administer these funds. This program will help develop and promote high-value fresh and fresh-frozen Alaskan seafood products, allowing Alaska fishermen to better compete in the global and domestic markets.

The Secretary of Commerce will appoint the members of the board and the executive director. In appointing members to the board, the Secretary shall fully consult with and seek recommendations from the Governor of Alaska. The membership should reflect the various aspects of seafood production, distribution, State oversight and the retail of Alaska seafood products. This would include three individuals with experience in harvesting Alaska seafood, two individuals with experience in fish processing, one individual from the Alaska transportation industry, one individual from the Alaska State legislature—preferably with experience on the State of Alaska's Salmon Task Force, one individual with experience in mass market food distribution, one individual with experience in mass market food retailing, one individual with experience in niche marketing of Alaska seafood products, and one individual recommended by the Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute.

The board will solicit grant proposals for marketing Alaska seafood from the public, review them, and fund those that will do the most to help reinvigorate struggling sectors of the Alaska seafood industry. These proposals can promote region-specific or species-specific marketing programs that do not undermine existing statewide "Alaska Seafood" marketing efforts.

The board may choose to promote the development of new processing technologies to insure the commercial viability of Alaska seafood and improve related transportation costs in delivering these products to market, and will work to improve the overall marketability of Alaska seafood.

I look forward to working with the Secretary of Commerce on establishing the Alaska Fisheries Marketing Board and helping the Alaska seafood industry get its message out to the world.

HAPPY 100TH ANNIVERSARY TO THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, tomorrow the smallest of our Cabinet