

as he addressed the families of the fallen soldiers in Gettysburg: "We cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here." This statement is just as true today as it was nearly 150 years ago, as I am certain that the impact of Chris' actions will live on far longer than any record of these words.

It is my sad duty to enter the name of Christopher E. Hudson in the Official Record of the United States Senate for his service to this country and for his profound commitment to freedom, democracy and peace. When I think about this just cause in which we are engaged, and the unfortunate pain that comes with the loss of our heroes, I hope that families like Chris' can find comfort in the words of the prophet Isaiah who said, "He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces."

May God grant strength and peace to those who mourn, and may God bless America.

OPPOSITION UNDER ATTACK IN BELARUS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, in recent days the Belarusian Prosecutor General's office opened criminal proceedings against one of the leaders of the embattled Belarusian democratic opposition, Anatoly Lebedka. Anatoly, who is chairman of the United Civic Party, has been accused of defaming Belarusian dictator Alexander Lukashenko during an interview with Russian television last month where he linked the recent Belarusian-Russian dispute over gas deliveries with the Belarusian authorities' failure to build an efficient economy. Anatoly also mentioned a shadow budget replenished through illegal arms sales and the cover-up of the truth about political disappearances in Belarus.

Given the pattern of behavior of the Lukashenko regime, it is crystal clear that this case is politically motivated and designed to suppress dissent. Lebedka's United Civic Party is a member of the Popular Coalition Five Plus, an opposition bloc which is planning to field candidates in this fall's parliamentary elections.

The action against Anatoly Lebedka and on the opposition fits squarely within a pattern of the suppression of independent thought and action in Belarus. Lukashenko's repression of those who would dare to challenge him has only intensified over the past year. Just last week, a criminal case was opened against the Belarusian Helsinki Committee chairperson Tatiana Protska and accountant Tatiana Rudkevich. This comes after politically-motivated economic sanctions were imposed on the Committee re-

cently. Also within the last few days, a court seized property of Iryna Makavetskaya, a correspondent for one of Belarus' leading independent newspapers, Beloruskaya Delovaya Gazeta.

Lukashenko has a choice—he can continue to act as a pariah, suppressing the voices of democracy in Belarus, or he can realize that the only way to reverse his self-imposed isolation from the international community and increasingly, from his own people is to end his offensive against democracy and civil society.

Meanwhile, it is essential that the United States back up its rhetorical support for democratic forces in Belarus through concrete assistance. Earlier this Congress, I introduced the Belarus Democracy Act, a measure with bipartisan support designed to promote democracy, human rights and the rule of law in Belarus. In light of the campaign of repression against democratic forces in Belarus, timely consideration of the Belarus Democracy Act is warranted. I urge colleagues to support this important legislation.

CLOSING THE GUN SHOW LOOPHOLE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, three weeks ago the Senate passed an amendment during consideration of the gun immunity bill which would close the gun show loophole. I supported this amendment because I believe it is common sense gun safety legislation.

Under current law, when an individual buys a handgun from a licensed dealer, there are federal requirements for a background check to insure that the purchaser is not a person prohibited from purchasing or possessing a firearm. However, this is not the case for all gun purchases. For example, when an individual wants to buy a handgun from another private citizen who is not a licensed gun dealer, there is no requirement to ensure that the purchaser is not in a prohibited category. This creates a loophole in the law, which makes it easy for criminals, terrorists, and other prohibited buyers to evade background checks and buy guns. This loophole is the gateway to the illegal market because criminals know they are not subject to a background check and no record is made of the sale.

I cosponsored the amendment offered by Senators JACK REED and JOHN MCCAIN, which would close the gun show loophole, because I believe it is a critical tool in preventing guns from getting into the hands of criminals and other ineligible buyers. This amendment would have simply applied existing law governing background checks to individuals buying firearms at gun shows. Preventing easy and unchecked access to guns is critical in preventing gun violence.

This amendment also had the support of major law enforcement organizations including the International Asso-

ciation of Chiefs of Police, the National Troopers Coalition, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, the Police Executive Research Forum, the Major Cities Chiefs, the National Association of School Resource Officers, the National Black Police Association, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, and the Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association.

The gun industry immunity legislation would have provided unprecedented protection from liability to gun manufacturers and dealers, even in cases where their own gross negligence or recklessness led to someone being injured or killed. I opposed the bill and it was defeated in the Senate. However, before the bill was defeated, the gun show loophole amendment passed with bipartisan support. Given that, I hope the Senate will take up and pass gun show loophole legislation this year.

CBO REPORT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, at the time Senate Report No. 108-233 was filed, the Congressional Budget Office report was not available. I ask unanimous consent that the report, which is now available, be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 22, 2004.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for S. 1107, the Recreational Fee Authority Act of 2004.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Deborah Reis, who can be reached at 226-2860.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS HOLTZ-EAKIN,
Director.

Enclosure.

S. 1107—RECREATIONAL FEE AUTHORITY ACT
OF 2004

Summary: S. 1107 would authorize the National Park Service (NPS) to establish, charge, and modify admission and user fees at units of the National Park System. Section 3 of the bill would allow the NPS to retain and spend all offsetting receipts collected under this authority without further appropriation. Both the authority to collect and to spend NPS recreation receipts would become effective on January 1, 2006, the day after the existing recreation fee demonstration program expires. (Created in 1996, the demonstration program authorizes the NPS and other federal land management agencies to charge higher recreation fees than would otherwise be permitted and to spend the proceeds.)

The effect of S. 1107 on total recreation fee receipts and spending would partly depend on how the NPS would use the bill's authorities in conjunction with current law following the expiration of the current demonstration program. For this estimate, CBO assumes that the NPS would use the authorities provided under S. 1107 to continue the

recreation fee demonstration program permanently. We estimate that direct spending would increase under the bill by \$592 million over the 2006–2014 period because the bill would authorize the spending of fee collections that would not otherwise be available.

This legislation contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated net budgetary impact of S. 1107 is summarized in the table below. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 300 (natural resources and environment).

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—										
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
DIRECT SPENDING											
NPS Recreation Fee Program Net Spending Under Current Law:											
Budget Authority ¹	0	0	-63	-79	-81	-82	-84	-86	-88	-89	-91
Estimated Outlays	6	30	76	5	-59	-79	-84	-86	-88	-89	-91
Proposed Changes:											
Authorization Level	0	0	63	79	81	82	84	86	88	89	91
Estimated Outlays	0	0	-4	33	62	77	82	83	85	86	88
NPS Recreation Fee Program Net Spending Under S. 1107:											
Authorization Level	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	6	30	72	38	3	0	-2	-3	-3	-3	-3

¹ The current law amounts represent net direct spending of the NPS under the existing recreation fee demonstration program (which expires on December 31, 2005) and under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (LWCFA), which will govern the collection and spending of NPS recreation fees after December 31, 2005.

Basis of Estimate: For this estimate, CBO assumes that the NPS would collect and spend recreation fees at all park units under the authority provided by S. 1107, at rates similar to those it now charges under the recreation demonstration program. S. 1107 would provide broad, permanent authority to collect and spend recreation fees at NPS sites similar to that contained in the temporary recreation fee demonstration program. Unlike that program, however, the bill would not specifically repeal or override the fee-related provisions in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (LWCFA). The LWCFA will govern the collection and spending of recreation fees after December 31, 2005. Moreover, the bill would not apply to other federal land management agencies that offer similar, often competing, recreation opportunities. This estimate is based on information provided by NPS and assumes that the NPS determines that the fee caps, fee prohibitions, and other fee limitations contained in the LWCFA would not apply to fees that would be established under S. 1107.

CBO estimates that enacting S. 1107 would essentially continue the current recreation demonstration program. The bill—like the demonstration program—would allow the NPS to spend 100 percent of all receipts. Starting in 2006, the LWCFA would otherwise authorize the spending of 15 percent of recreation receipts.

The net effect of these changes would be an increase in direct spending authority of \$63 million for fiscal year 2006, \$79 million in 2007 (the first full year after the new authority would become effective), and \$745 million through fiscal year 2014. CBO estimates that outlays from this new spending authority would total \$592 million over the 2006–2014 period.

Under the bill, recreation fees could also increase by as much as \$32 million in 2006 and between \$41 million and \$47 million a year thereafter, but any new receipts would be offset by an identical increase in new spending. If the NPS were to determine that it must abide by specific restrictions in the LWCFA when establishing fees under S. 1107, the agency would probably not implement any significant increase in offsetting receipts. In the event that no new receipts could be collected under S. 1107, the NPS would be authorized to spend recreation fees under the bill, and the net budget impact would be similar.

In addition, because fees charged by other land-management agencies would not be increased under S. 1107, it is possible that the NPS might not be able to charge higher fees at some parks without putting itself at a competitive disadvantage with other federal recreation providers. In that event, the NPS may not be able to increase rates to the level estimated here; however, the net budget im-

pact would be the same because spending would fall by the same amount.

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact: S. 1107 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Deborah Reis (226-2860); Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Marjorie Miller (225-3220); and Impact on the Private Sector: Selena Caldera (226-2966).

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

STAND-ALONE RELIABILITY

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to begin the process of placing directly on the Senate calendar stand-alone electric reliability legislation.

As all my colleagues in this body are well aware, devising a comprehensive policy that will help this nation achieve its energy independence is a task that has divided the Energy and Natural Resources Committee on which I serve, the United States Senate and the Congress as a whole for three years now. Regardless, I believe that there is at least one thing on which every Senator can agree—and that is the need to pass legislation giving the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, working closely with regional entities, the statutory authority to put in place mandatory and enforceable reliability standards.

The call for legislation of the kind we are introducing today dates back to at least 1997, when both a Task Force established by the Clinton Administration's Department of Energy and a North American Electric Reliability Council, or NERC, blue ribbon panel independently determined that reliability rules for our nation's electric system needed to be mandatory and enforceable.

In response, the Senate passed stand-alone legislation on this matter, authored by my predecessor Senator Gorton, in June 2000. Since then, under the leadership of both parties, the Senate has twice passed consensus-based electric reliability provisions—most recently, last July.

There is no doubt that this nation's consumers and businesses cannot af-

ford further delay in improving the reliability of the electricity grid. Last August's Northeast/Midwest blackout, which affected 50 million consumers from New York to Michigan, again sounded the wake up call for federal electric reliability legislation.

I would like to quote from a January 1, 2004 letter published in the New York Times from North American Electric Reliability Council President and CEO Michehl R. Gent. Mr. Gent wrote that interim steps NERC has taken to improve grid reliability since last August's blackout does "not reduce the need for federal legislation that would provide authority to impose and enforce mandatory reliability standards. Whether legislation is adopted on a stand-alone basis or as part of a comprehensive energy bill, passage is essential. If reliability legislation had been enacted when first proposed [in 1999], I believe that the blackout would not have occurred."

Mr. Gent reiterated this position in February 24, 2004 testimony before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. I asked Mr. Gent whether in fact it wouldn't be irresponsible of this body not to pass reliability legislation this year, even if we are to pass it on a stand-alone basis. Quite simply, Mr. Gent replied, "I agree."

We are beginning the process of putting this legislation directly on the Senate calendar because we believe American consumers have waited long enough for Congress to take this simple step, putting in place mandatory and enforceable reliability standards to govern operation of the electric transmission grid—the backbone of our nation's economy.

There are those who will argue that we are ill-advised to take this step. They ill argue in favor of taking up and passing last year's failed energy bill conference report (H.R. 6), or S. 2095—the so-called "slimmed down" energy bill introduced this year, which happens to be 100 pages longer than the original. However, I am of the firm belief that we cannot allow these crucial reliability provisions to be held hostage to a flawed comprehensive energy bill.

Now, I know that the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Energy and