home. Elmo and Nancy built their new abode on an acre of land nestled in the foothills of the beautiful Sierra Nevada Mountains in southwest Reno. It is a testament to both Elmo and Nancy that their retirement has produced some of the most exciting times of their lives.

It gives me great pleasure to offer my sincerest congratulations to Elmo and Nancy on the occasion of their golden wedding anniversary.

SERBIA AND THE HAGUE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, March 31, is the deadline in our law for the Secretary of State to certify that the Federal Government of Yugoslavia—now the Government of Serbia and Montenegro—is meeting three conditions enumerated in Section 572 of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act of 2004. The first of those conditions is that the Government of Serbia and Montenegro is ''cooperating with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia including access for investigators, the provision of documents, and the surrender and transfer of indictees or assistance in the apprehension, including making all practicable efforts to apprehend and transfer Ratko Mladic.'' I am informed by the State Department that the Secretary declined to certify that Serbia has met this condition. I applaud his decision.

This law, first enacted in 2000, was instrumental in pressuring Serbian authorities to apprehend Slobodan Milosovic and transfer him to the ICTY. It has also been the impetus for further arrests of other indictees.

But over the years, Serbia's cooperation with The Hague has been inconsistent, often grudging, and usually only on the eve of a cut-off of U.S. assistance. President Kostunica has made no secret of his disdain for the tribunal. This is unfortunate, because unless the Serbian Government, and the Serbian people, support efforts by the ICTY to bring individuals accused of war crimes to justice, Serbia's political and economic development will continue to suffer. The fact that Ratko Mladic, who was responsible for some of the worst atrocities of the Balkans war, remains at large, is unacceptable.

Senator MCCONNELL, the Chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, and I have worked together to maintain U.S. assistance to Serbia in the Foreign Operations budget, subject to the conditions. I join him in commending the Secretary for declining to make the certification. I also agree with Senator MCCONNELL that if Mr. Mladic is turned over to the ICTY, we should review the certification law. While it is necessary that the other indictees be apprehended and surrendered, the capture of Mladic would be a very important, positive step.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

On Saturday, March 13, 2004, nine large holes were punched in the windows of the only gay bar in Newport, RI, just 6 days after its opening. Mayor Richard C. Sardella said the incident was likely motivated by hate. A detective who is investigating the incident also stated that it didn't appear to be random.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION—2003

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate passed S.733, the Coast Guard Authorization bill of 2003, which I cosponsored. I am hopeful that the Senate can work quickly with the House and pass a final bill in both houses in the near future.

The Coast Guard has always taken on an impressive array of tasks that are important for our security, for the protection of our resources, and for the safety of our mariners. After the tragic events of September 11, 2001, we have asked the Coast Guard to take on even more in the area of maritime security, while asking them to continue to carry out their traditional missions as effectively as before.

This legislation provides authorizations for Coast Guard's Fiscal Year 2004 and Fiscal Year 2005 budgets, and also includes important new authority for the Coast Guard to better carry out its missions. While the President's budget request for these two years provided some increases, it was still far from adequate to ensure that the Coast Guard will be able to carry out all that we demand of it.

Thus, I am particularly pleased that I had the support of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation in adding to the Fiscal Year 2004 authorization $491 million in authorizations not requested by the President. For Fiscal Year 2004, the bill authorizes approximately $7.032 billion. This is a 15-percent increase for the Coast Guard's budget over what Congress appropriated last year, and about 5 percent above the President's request for fiscal year 2004. The bill includes authorizations of $246 million in Fiscal Year 2004 for port security not requested by the President, including $100 million for operating expenses, to cover the increases in operating tempo that the Coast Guard has experienced over the past few years, $70 million for analyzing port security plans, and $36 million for three additional Marine Safety and Security Teams. These additional amounts are essential to the security of our ports and waterways, and of our maritime transportation industry.

For Fiscal Year 2005, the bill authorizes approximately $7.787 billion, a 10-percent increase over Fiscal Year 2004 authorized and enacted levels, including for port security operations. This is $327 million greater than the President proposed, over 4 percent higher than the President's request.

I have also been a firm supporter of the need to provide the Coast Guard with the tools it needs to get the job done. The Coast Guard needs to upgrade its core assets, in particular, its aging fleet of cutters. The Integrated Deepwater Program is the Coast Guard's program for achieving these upgrades, and the President has not requested sufficient funding in its budgets to even keep this program on its original track. I therefore strongly support the inclusion of an authorization of $702 million for this program in Fiscal Year 2004, which is $202 million above the President's budget request, and $708 million in Fiscal Year 2005, or $30 million over the President's request. These increases will allow the program to get back on its original schedule.

At the same time, I have significant concerns with respect to how well the Coast Guard is managing this procurement, and whether the unique method for procurement utilized by the Deepwater Program will be able to achieve the stated goals of minimizing costs and providing operational effectiveness. The Deepwater project is the single largest procurement program that the Coast Guard has managed to date. The Senate has voiced concerns about this program on numerous occasions over the past few years. A GAO analysis of the Deepwater project published in May 2001 entitled ''Coast Guard: Progress Being Made on Deepwater Project, but Risks Remain'' highlighted risks with the project, including concerns with the Coast Guard's ability to control costs by ensuring competition among subcontractors, and the Coast Guard's ability to effectively manage and oversee the acquisition phase of the project. GAO has identified the Deepwater Program as a ''high risk'' procurement.

GAO recently produced a new report on this subject, entitled ''Coast Guard's Deepwater Program Needs increased Attention to Management and Contractor Oversight.'' The report's major conclusions indicate that there is a need for significant improvement of the program and its oversight by the Coast Guard. First, GAO found that over a year and a half into the Deepwater program, the Coast Guard has