

satellite bill. That provision was dropped.

While it was unfortunate that this provision was removed from the final bill, I am pleased that it is here today, albeit in another form.

It is my hope the Senate will move quickly to adopt this measure and will resist accepting amendments that would threaten its ultimate enactment.

I thank the Chair and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

SENATOR TED STEVENS— ALASKAN OF THE CENTURY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I wish to say a couple of words about one of my oldest and best friends in the Senate, the senior Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS.

Last week, Senator STEVENS was named "Alaskan of the Century." Most of us feel pretty fortunate if we get named for the day, or possibly for the week, and sometimes even the month in our States. He was named "Alaskan of the Century."

Well, my good friend, TED STEVENS, deserves that. He has a way about him, as we all know. He keeps me humble. I might talk about the hardships of a cold winter day in Vermont. But then I see his eyebrows go up when he explains to me that 40 degrees below zero is just beginning to get nippy—it gets to 75 below in Fairbanks. At that point, I know I am beat.

TED STEVENS is a tireless legislator, a respected leader. He helped create the State of Alaska. How many of us could actually say something like that? He actually helped create a State with his tireless work and brought it into the Union. He did this having already served his country in so many ways. He was in the Air Force in World War II, served as a U.S. attorney in Fairbanks, and was also an Alaskan State representative. And this was on top of so many other things he has done. Today, of course, he serves with great distinction as one of the three most senior Members of the Senate and chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Senator STEVENS has consistently been a leader for our Nation's defense issues and has chaired the Senate Rules Committee, Governmental Affairs Committee, and Ethics Committee among others.

Senator STEVENS and I have served together for a long time. As members of the Appropriations Committee, both of us have worked to find economic op-

portunities for the rural communities that so many states, including our own, share. TED and I have also worked together through some of this Nation's most challenging times. During the divisive days of the impeachment trial, Senator STEVENS and I were chosen to fly to Jordan together as representatives of one, united Senate mourning the death of King Hussein.

Senator STEVENS is also a strong proponent of Title 9 and women's equality in sports. In fact, just this year he sponsored the Women in Sports Awards luncheon where Monica Seles was honored for her excellence on tennis courts throughout the world. I am sure that TED, an avid tennis player, tried to set up a game with her himself.

While he is unquestionably a great legislator, Senator STEVENS is also a proud father of six children and has a beautiful wife, Catherine. Senator STEVENS is an accomplished man with whom I am proud to serve in this United States Congress. Alaska, land of the aurora borealis and the Midnight Sun, has every reason to be proud of its senior Senator and this award shows Alaskans' gratitude and respect for his tireless work.

TED, congratulations on your well-deserved recognition as Alaskan of the Century.

TED and his wife, Catherine, have long been friends of myself and my wife, Marcelle. I consider him very much a member of the old school—when he gives his word, that is it; go to the bank with it.

I have seen several pieces of complex and important legislation go through this body because TED STEVENS gave his word they would go through—a word that he never broke with either Republican or Democrat. That is why TED STEVENS has gained so much respect.

LAUNCHING OUR COMMUNITIES' ACCESS TO LOCAL TELEVISION ACT OF 2000—Continued

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I was a conferee last year on the satellite television bill. I worked very hard, along with a number of my colleagues, to put in a provision that would have ensured the benefits of this bill would be shared by rural America through a loan guarantee program.

I appreciate the work of the Banking Committee under the leadership of Senator GRAMM and Senator SARBANES to report out a bill which provides a strong framework in which to move forward with this program.

I appreciate the majority leader, Senator LOTT, and the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, who worked out an agreement with the committee leadership that put the bill before the Senate today.

Senator MAX BAUCUS of Montana introduced legislation with me last year. He has now joined with me on some very constructive amendments which I hope can be accepted.

I am here today to stand with rural America. I am proud to be a son of rural America. I know that oftentimes

the needs of this special part of our Nation must be heard on the Senate floor.

I am not trying to change the main thrust or the intent of this committee-reported bill. My amendments don't alter the structure of the bill. My amendments simply say that I want the board, which will have the job of approving these loan guarantees for local-into-local television, to look at one thing. If we are going to have loan guarantees for local-into-local television, we should give additional consideration to the projects that can provide high-speed Internet access and emergency Weather Service reports to rural America.

If rural America is going to have high-speed Internet access, it is going to have to rely on satellite service; cable companies are not going to put wire out for it. For most of those parts of the country, they are not going to have the kind of fiber optics that might do it. But they can do it with satellite service.

I hope we will not allow a digital divide between urban America and rural America. Give us the special access through the satellite system.

For example, say the board that is going to do the loan guarantees has two equally balanced satellite systems that might give the same level of service, and at about the same cost, but one would offer high-speed Internet access to rural families; I say give that one the loan guarantee.

In America, there is a growing disparity between the digital haves and have-nots as portions of our society get left behind at the same lightning pace at which Internet develops. Our amendment closes this digital divide.

Having broadband, especially in rural areas, can provide opportunities to the handicapped, to the elderly, to education, and everyone, along with business opportunities and entertainment. Whether you are sitting on the dirt road at my home in Middlesex, VT, whether you are out in rural Utah, or whether you are in rural California, it means you can have the same kind of Internet business, the same kind of access to information, and the same kind of access to educational opportunities.

My amendment would ensure that as long as the loan guarantee is to be made, the high-speed Internet access ought to be financed under the loan guarantee program, if there is excess capacity.

All we say is, before the board gives a satellite company a loan guarantee to provide rural satellite service, ask, first and foremost, Will you provide high-speed Internet access for the people in rural America? If you do, you have a better chance of being supported.

I want to provide a little history on this matter. A provision which we offered to conferees last year would have provided up to \$1.25 billion in loan

guarantees to help finance the delivery of local broadcast stations to rural America. I pushed for that amendment because certain satellite companies were concerned that they could not cost-efficiently provide "local-into-local" satellite service to markets more rural than about the top 60 to 70 markets. That meant that bigger cities would get the local broadcast television service but that rural areas, by and large, would not.

Other Senators, not on the conference were also vitally interested in providing this service to rural America. I know that Senator BURNS and his key staffer on this issue Mike Rawson worked long and hard to get this language included in conference.

In addition, Senator BAUCUS introduced a bill which I cosponsored to address these rural concerns after efforts to include it in the conference report failed.

I do not want to be misunderstood, I want to point out that the leaders of the satellite industry—such as Charlie Ergen of EchoStar who is known for his creative and innovative ideas—want to provide this local service.

I want to congratulate Charlie Ergen for his recent partnership with iSKY which will offer consumers two-way wireless broadband access via satellite along with satellite television service. This broadband access will be 30 times faster than current dial-up speeds of 56k according to news accounts. Charlie has often been a leader in this arena and he has done it again.

I also want to point out that in Montana or my home state of Vermont, or in Alaska, or a Great Plains state, or elsewhere, receiving local broadcast television over satellite is more than entertainment.

Local television provides local weather, local news about emergencies, and local public affairs programming. It is a way for residents to better participate in government and to more effectively influence local government, school board or zoning decisions.

This bill that we are debating is indeed very important.

I need to emphasize a very important point. Section 336 of the Communications Act of 1934 sets forth requirements for the rollout to digital television. This bill in no way is intended to alter or change those requirements.

Thus, it is imperative for the Board to only approve loans made to finance a local television signal delivery system that will be forward compatible and in compliance with the digital television rollout requirements in the Communications Act.

It is thus common sense that applicants for loan guarantees under this legislation must be able to show that the proposed signal delivery system will be forward compatible. Applicants should be required to show how their proposed delivery system can be readily adapted to deliver local television signals in a format compatible with the digital rollout requirements. Without

this, I do not see how the loans could be other than risky.

This conversion to digital television also cannot be ignored. I have met with Jim Goodman, the CEO of Capitol Broadcasting, on this matter and appreciate his visionary role and his willingness to take the lead. Digital TV is more than just a crystal clear moving picture. Digital TV can use multiple channels and datacasting on their single digital channel to better serve the public. I have been advised that the same digital bandwidth used to broadcast HDTV can also transmit as many as three video channels and a data signal on the single digital channel.

Thus, during the recent floods that devastated North Carolina, WRAL-HDTV, a digital station in Raleigh, was able to simultaneously broadcast on one digital channel: coverage of a basketball game; continuous local news on flood conditions; the continuous sweep of the local Doppler radar showing where the rainfall was the most severe and the direction of the storm; and, a data broadcast alongside the video services that enabled home computer access to specific flood, traffic, rainfall and emergency information. Jim Goodman and his staff down in Raleigh did a great job during this crisis and I commend them.

Thus, I do not want loans under this bill to interfere with the rollout under the Communications Act. Rural America deserves digital service along with urban America.

I want to raise an additional matter. I am concerned that additional steps will be needed to assure full competition in rural areas and convenience to consumers. In a nutshell, multiple providers of satellite service may be needed in many areas to provide service to rural customers. However, if the set top boxes and satellite dishes are incompatible with these systems then competition will be reduced and consumers will receive fewer services or have to purchase additional satellite receivers at an additional cost of hundreds of dollars.

This same integration or interoperability problem exists regarding program and schedule information. Access to program and schedule information would enable third party satellite providers to create integrated program guides. This would enhance consumer choices and provide more competition.

Resolving these interoperability problems so that multiple satellite TV signals, offered by competitors, can be accessed by consumers in a convenient and inexpensive way is in the public interest. The FCC should use all its authority to resolve these matters.

In addition to the points I have just made, and the amendments I have offered, I want to point out improvements in the bill which I hope can be addressed at conference. I believe that the three-person Board should have more of an oversight and loan approval role and less of a day-by-day management role. The management of the pro-

gram should be with the Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service. For example, references to the Board on page 28 should be struck and the Administrator and the Board should work out the regulations together.

Also, the Board should delegate responsibility for loan guarantees of up to \$50 million to the Administrator.

It is also important, to assure that this bill is not biased toward the cable industry, that spectrum rights be allowed to be purchased or leased with the guaranteed loans. If cable borrowers will be able to purchase cable and install that cable using the guaranteed loans then satellite borrows should be able to use the loan proceeds for spectrum rights, which is their medium to deliver signals.

I also support the amendment offered by Senators THOMAS and JOHNSON that would allow the Federal Financing Bank and the National Rural Utilities Cooperative Finance Corporation to participate in these loan guarantee programs. They could offer borrowers a lower rate than commercial banks and should not be excluded from this process.

In section 4(f) the full \$1.25 billion in aggregate for all loans should not be artificially limited by including other debt in the \$1.25 billion. In section 5(h) the Administrator, in consultation with the Board, should establish and approve the credit risk premiums and amounts.

To ensure that the Administrator can best protect the interests of the United States the text on lines 3 through 10 of page 38 should be replaced with the following: "after exercising of rights and remedies by the Administrator any shortfall in the guarantee amount". This would allow the Administrator working with the Board to restructure a loan if that were the best way to protect the government's interest. I am very nervous about section 5.

The Administrator should have more responsibility to manage the program. Daily management by a 3-member board that does not meet daily will not work very well. Also, section 5(1) appears to give state courts jurisdiction over the United States.

I am also worried about that unless more flexibility is provided under section 4(d)(2) and (3) that excellent loans for excellent projects will be needlessly denied because of the timing of when paperwork is done, or when the FCC approves certain regulations, or when spectrum rights are obtained. Also, the unnecessarily constraining collateral, security, insurance and lien requirements will make it very difficult for the program to work well. These duplicative constraints do not provide additional protection for the United States.

I will urge the conferees to provide a strong oversight role for the Board, greater ability of the Administrator to manage the day-to-day operations, more flexibility for the Administrator, a more level playing field with respect to cable TV, and other improvements.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I commend my good friend and colleague from Vermont for his leadership on this issue, as well as Senator GRAMM from Texas, and my colleague from Montana, Senator BURNS, and others who are addressing this issue. Frankly, there is a great need in rural America. I compliment him and thank Senator LEAHY for his work.

I am a cosponsor with Senator LEAHY in his efforts not only to help bring faster local-to-local service via satellite to rural America but also to help provide stimulus for more broad bandwidth coverage to rural America as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2900

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. ROBB, proposes an amendment numbered 2900.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 25, line 10, insert after "local television stations" the following: ", and related signals (including high-speed Internet access and National Weather Service broadcasts)."

On page 30, strike line 9 and insert the following: "means by which local television broadcast signals, and related signals (including high-speed Internet access and National Weather Service broadcasts)."

On page 33, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

(B) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Board should give additional consideration to projects which also provide related signals (including high-speed Internet access and National Weather Service broadcasts).

On page 33, line 24, strike "(B)" and insert "(C)".

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment be temporarily laid aside and that the previous amendment then pending be the pending business.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of S. 2097, the Launching of Our Communities' Access to Local Television Act of 2000. I commend the senior Senator from Texas, Chairman GRAMM, for the great work he has done to bring the bill to this point. The bipartisan effort he has encouraged and the painstaking process by which he has produced this bill is to be commended. He has done a tremendous job of watching it from the banking perspective to make sure we could have the loan guarantees and that there would be neither favoritism nor the potential of putting banks or other institutions in financial trouble. He spent a great deal of time and effort on it. I appreciate the willingness of all the members of the Banking Committee to work together to get this bill to this point.

As many of you will recall, last year during the appropriations process, this bill would have been a part of that, but there was a lot of concern about how loan guarantees should work, not just loan guarantees for satellite television but loan guarantees, and this is a landmark effort to develop a pattern for banking loan guarantees.

Last November, Congress passed the Satellite Home Viewer Improvement Act to bring the law governing the direct broadcast satellite industry up to date and reflect the current state of technology. As part of that bill, Congress authorized, for the first time, satellite companies to retransmit local stations back into their local markets. However, due to satellite capacity, the two national direct broadcast satellite companies—DirecTV and EchoStar—will only be able to serve the top 50 of 210 television markets. That is about 75 percent of the households in the Nation, but that leaves 160 markets, which is 25 percent of the Nation—a very important part, as Wyoming is included in that—without satellite-delivered local television stations. The two media markets in Wyoming are ranked 197 and 199. Remember, we are serving the top 50 out of 210. So 197 and 199 are way down the list, meaning that without some sort of incentive, local television will probably not be available in Wyoming.

The bill before us will provide that incentive. It establishes a Federal loan guarantee program to promote the delivery of local television signals at places such as Wamsutter, WY. The bill provides the criteria to protect the taxpayer to the maximum extent. The Congressional Budget Office estimates this bill could cost American taxpayers about \$100 million less than previous versions. There is a cost involved, a potential cost.

The Banking Committee had to balance its need to protect the taxpayer and its need to provide a reasonable incentive to make investing in rural television service a worthwhile project for private risk capital. During the committee's deliberations on the bill, we looked at all the other existing govern-

ment loan guarantees and examined what either made the program successful or, in some cases, caused it to fail. We have taken great care to ensure the loan program is fair and has the greatest chance of achieving the goal of providing local television service to rural America.

People rely on TV not just for entertainment but for news and weather and special warnings of impending disasters. Children rely on it for educational programming, and soon students will need improved access to the information superhighway. The more rural a person is, the more that person needs to have access to TV for critical information as well as for entertainment. Almost 40 percent of Wyoming television households are satellite subscribers, the third highest penetration rate in the Nation. People are not choosing satellite over cable or some other system but are satellite subscribers because it is the only way to receive any sort of television programming.

Wyoming has television stations in only three cities: Casper, WY, about 48,000 people; Cheyenne, 50,008; and Jackson, which fluctuates during the season but I think is listed at about 6,500 people. The rest of the State is served by stations from out of State or by relay transmitters that bring Wyoming stations to outlying towns.

Wyoming has vast open spaces. The borders on Wyoming are about 500 miles on a side, with that big square out there. It gives us a little difficulty with lapel pins because we are not recognizable.

We have low populations and lots of distances. We have high altitudes and low multitudes. We have tall mountains that make the best efforts by over-the-air broadcasters and cable companies even more difficult. For households that are in remote areas of the State beyond the reach of cable and relay, satellite is the only reliable and cost-effective choice.

But until now, satellite has had one distinct drawback. There was no way to get the news or other local programming through reliable access to a local Wyoming television station. It is doubtful that without some kind of Federal encouragement local television stations would be available to rural households. This bill provides the proper incentive. It gives equal opportunity throughout the United States. It is important to rural Americans, and I do urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wanted to come back this afternoon—I

talked some this morning—to talk about this bill. It is a very important bill to us. It is one that provides an opportunity for us to have local television in rural areas. There is great support for this idea. We are trying to find a way to put it into the proper perspective in terms of the lending of money to guarantee loans that will cause this to happen—I agree with the chairman—where we have 80 percent of a loan guaranteed by the Federal Government, but that the remaining 20 percent be done in the private sector without further guarantees by the Federal Government, by the taxpayers, so there is that sharing of risk and that incentive to continue to be very careful with these kinds of expenditures. There is no question that this is a somewhat risky operation, something that is new and technically different.

The conversation we are having currently, of course, is to provide an opportunity for CFC, the Cooperative Finance Corporation, to be a participant. CFC was formed in 1969 by the Rural Electric Cooperatives and provides private capital. I have worked with it a great deal, having been manager of a rural electric association in Wyoming for a number of years.

CFC was not created by the Federal Government and does not receive Federal funds. This is a private corporation. CFC has 31 years of experience in lending to rural electric systems, and since 1987 has provided more than \$3 billion to rural telecommunications projects.

Our Wyoming rural electrics, starting 15 years ago, were involved in bringing satellite TV to rural consumers and have been doing that from a programming standpoint. Unfortunately, we could not get our local stations, and that is what this is all about. This is something the rural electrics have been involved in for some time.

CFC is AA rated. It has \$16 billion in loan assets. Over 31 years, CFC has had only \$77 million in losses and has loss reserves of \$235 million.

This is a strong organization and one that is capable of doing this work. Furthermore, it is owned and operated by citizens, by rural people, by boards of directors of the rural electrics, by people who are elected to serve.

What we want is to give an equal opportunity for this unit to give loans and to participate as well as others.

CFC has backup lines of credit with 50 banks. These lines of credit amount to about \$5 billion. This is a large group. We have heard some information about the allegation that a loan loss by CFC will result in rate increases to 25 million consumers. I think that is very farfetched. I do not believe it is accurate.

If CFC incurs a loss, CFC, as a private corporation, will incur the loss, with no liability to the Federal Government.

If CFC incurs a loss and its interest rates increase, rural utilities are free

to borrow from other lenders, including banks and other finance companies.

Co-ops are not responsible for repaying CFC losses or obligations. What we need to do, of course, is to ensure they are treated like others in the private sector. But this idea that they somehow have a special advantage in that any losses can be passed on to rural electric consumers in the electric business is not true. We have heard a great deal about that.

The bottom line is, in the worst case scenario, CFC's rates could increase and co-ops would then borrow from other entities.

CFC is a private cooperative. It is paternalistic to set up this private organization to have people governing under the rules of private sector and private enterprise and to suggest the Senate ought to design for them their rules. I reject that idea.

I am happy to say we are seeking to find some language that will satisfy the need to move forward with this bill and also to provide an equal opportunity for CFC to participate without unwarranted supervision. I am hopeful we can find that arrangement.

We ought to make that discipline work. I think we can, and I certainly look forward to working with others this afternoon so we can pass this bill and move toward rural communications and local-to-local communications.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Johnson amendment No. 2898.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, because an amendment is pending, rather than ask it be set aside to offer another amendment, I will make a few comments about something I intend to do. I am glad the distinguished chairman of the Banking Committee is here, so he has a chance to listen to some of the comments and maybe have a dialog on what I am attempting to do.

First, I congratulate the chairman of the Banking Committee and the Senator from South Dakota and all those on the Banking Committee who have worked so hard to bring this legislation to the floor. It truly addresses a very important need for rural America, and that is the guarantee that people in rural America are not going to be treated as second-class citizens when it comes to their access to the information age.

This legislation addresses a problem of allowing companies that provide satellite television and broadcast signals getting into rural parts of America and providing them the same type of quality information services that someone in the city of Washington, DC, or any of the large metropolitan areas of our country are already receiving because that is where the people happen to live.

The people in rural Texas or in rural South Dakota or the people in rural

Louisiana are no less important than people in the large cities of America. Without this legislation, it is very clear that people in these areas will not have access to this information because, in many cases, it is not economically feasible to spend large sums of money to provide information to sparsely populated areas of our country. That is unfortunate, but that is recognizing the way things are.

The purpose of the legislation, as I understand it, is to lower the overall cost of bringing satellite and television broadcast to rural America, something that has almost unanimous agreement and is in the national interest. Without this legislation, people in rural areas would simply not have the same advantages as we do in urban areas. Clearly, this is very important.

One of my concerns, I say to the distinguished managers of the bill, is that when you look at what it costs to bring broadcast signals to rural America, it is not only a question of building satellites for rural areas and moving into these areas.

That represents about 45 percent of the cost of the actual satellite. But getting the satellite, obviously, launched into space represents about 37 percent of the total cost of bringing broadcast signals, through satellites, to any part of this country.

I think you have to agree that a significant cost associated with all of what we are trying to do today is actually launching the satellite into space in order to bring the broadcast signals to all parts of the United States. Forty-five percent is the actual satellite cost; insurance is 12 percent; the ground costs are another 6 percent. But a very significant portion of the cost of bringing a satellite into working condition is the cost of launching it. More than one-third, as I have said, of the cost of the satellite is expended when the actual satellite is launched into space.

Clearly, it would further our goal of lowering the cost of bringing these services to rural America if we could also lower the cost of transportation, which is a very significant cost throughout our country.

Launch costs, obviously, are a very significant component of the overall satellite costs, but I think they can be reduced. That is why I take the floor this afternoon to make a suggestion.

The authors of the legislation, again, who are to be commended for their vision, have clearly indicated that launch costs were on their mind when they crafted the bill.

I was looking at the legislation, and clearly the legislation, on page 30 of the actual bill that is pending before the Senate, talks about the type of loans this bill envisions. It says:

... a loan may not be guaranteed under this Act unless—

It spells out what the “unless” is. But what it actually says is that, in other words, it will be allowed if it does the following. In other words, a loan

can be guaranteed under the legislation pending before the Senate if:

the loan is made to finance the acquisition, improvement, enhancement, construction, deployment, launch, or rehabilitation of the means by which local television broadcast signals will be delivered to an unserved area or underserved area . . .

Therefore, the bill, as it is currently pending before the Senate, talks about trying to make loans available to cover a number of things, one of which specifically mentioned in the bill is the launch of satellites designed to bring broadcast signals to rural parts of America.

As I tried to point out initially, 37 percent of the whole cost of this project is in the launching of the satellite. Obviously, without the launching of the satellite into space, you, in fact, are not going to ever complete the rest of the project. I think it is very relevant, when the bill talks about a loan guarantee program, that the launch is listed as one of the means by which broadcast signals are ultimately brought to all parts of America.

I think, for that portion of the industry that launches the satellites into space, the loan guarantee is very important. An interesting thing that I would point out is, when you are in the launch satellite business, when you are in the business of building a spaceship to, in fact, launch a vehicle, you have been competing against other countries where their governments do it. You are competing against industries that are totally financed by their respective governments because it has been in their national interest to do so.

In the past, that is also what we have done in this country through the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, where NASA has used the shuttle to launch the satellites into space, and the taxpayer has been paying for the cost of those vehicles. But, clearly, NASA is getting out of the business. We are trying to say to the private sector: We want you to move into this business. We want you to build the launch vehicles. We want to create a new industry in the private sector, get the Government out of the business of launching broadcast satellites, and let the private sector do it.

But one of the disadvantages our private sector has is that they are competing against other countries that are involved in doing this, and they cannot compete on a level playing field. What we are suggesting is that we help the U.S. industries become involved in this in a competitive fashion, which I think is very important.

U.S. companies that are having to compete against other countries are not able to compete on a level playing field. Therefore, when the country of China or the country of France—highly subsidized by their Governments—is trying to sell their launch vehicles to the United States, obviously, they can do it at a price that makes our companies not able to compete.

I think the authors of the bill are right on target. Some might say: The

Government should not be in the business of loan guarantees. It is not a function of our Government. The exact opposite is true.

Historically, the U.S. Government has sought to assist the private sector by saying, we are going to help—we are not going to monopolize it; we are not going to do it, but we are going to help the private sector do it. One way we can help certain activities that are important to our country is by loan guarantee programs.

I point out, for the commercial shipbuilding industry—very important to my State and to the State of the Senator from Texas, as well as all the States along the coast that have the shipbuilding industry—we have had a title 11 shipbuilding guarantee program, in which companies have been able to go into the private market, borrow money from the private sector, from private banks, from private insurance companies, and having a certain portion of that loan guaranteed by the Federal Government. It allows them to get a better interest rate and allows them to get financing for something that may not be able to be financed otherwise.

Where we have tried it before, in the area of shipbuilding, it has worked very well. It has worked at a profit to the U.S. Government because the loans have been paid back. The Government has made money. The work was done. The ships were built. The Loan Guarantee Program was an integral portion of it.

Currently, when you look at whether financial assistance is available in this area in the private sector, without any help from the Government, it is interesting to see what the comments are from those in the financial markets.

We have had hearings on this legislation before the Senate Commerce Committee. One of the companies that does the bulk of financing these launch vehicles is Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette. When they testified before the Senate Commerce Committee, as the largest group of investment bankers in the country, they talked about the problem of being hampered by the inability to find the necessary private financing for these types of ventures, particularly when they are, in fact, competing against other countries that are government-financed 100 percent.

They pointed out in their testimony that in some cases the cost of the launch vehicles, and the insurance that goes with it, almost equals the entire cost of the satellite itself. So if we want to help bring broadcast signals to rural areas, we cannot just look at the satellite itself that needs to be constructed, you also need to look at the vehicles that would be built in order to launch those satellites into the sky.

It was really interesting, colleagues, that last week we had the head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA, before our committee. Dan Goldin was testifying. I asked him a question about this con-

cept. He said the provision was very innovative. He said this provision:

. . . would help small and big rocket companies to overcome critical barriers so that we have technology that will allow us to improve the reliability ten times and cut their cost by a factor of ten. This will enable us to have private launch services not involving the Government. This bill makes sense to me.

This is the person who is the head of NASA saying that this idea of having a loan guarantee for the launch vehicles is something that makes sense to him, that it would allow us to increase the reliability by 10 times, and that it would allow us to decrease the cost by a factor of 10, which is very significant.

Obviously, we should be looking for more reliable launch vehicles. We should be looking at vehicles that cost a lot less. The Government should not be in the business of building the launch vehicles, but we can assist companies—small companies and large companies—by making it easier for them to get adequate private sector financing for these very important ventures. I have not offered an amendment, I say to the distinguished Banking Committee chairman, because there is an amendment pending at the current time, I did want to outline the concept of an amendment I am prepared to offer, and will offer, as to the feasibility of saying that if you are going to have a loan guarantee program for the actual satellite, there is a desperate need for a loan guarantee program for the vehicles that will be required in order to launch the satellites.

We have in the past used foreign launch vehicles from France, China, and the Ukraine, using Ukraine launch vehicles because there is not an adequate supply of launch vehicles in this country. Those rockets and launch vehicles have been inadequate. They have been imperfect. They have had failures and at a great expense to the satellite industry in this country. How much better would it be if we were to have a viable, growing private industry in this country that were assisted by a loan guarantee program to enable them to get adequate financing in the private sector in order to launch the satellites for the purpose of bringing broadcast signals to rural areas as well as to urban areas in the country.

Due to the fact that an amendment is pending, I will not be able to offer my amendment at this time. I yield the floor until such time as it is appropriate for me to offer an amendment. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I thank our colleague from Louisiana for raising the obvious point that one of the

technologies that would be potentially subsidized under this bill is satellite technology. If you are going to have a satellite, you have to put it into orbit. We have been for some time in the process of trying to commercialize space. There are companies now that are beginning to respond to that potential with real investment and real potential.

The question the Senator from Louisiana asked was, Would not this be a good time to address this additional problem? Personally, I believe this is something that will have to be addressed and looked at. The big difference is, on the loan guarantee proposal before us, we have had a series of hearings. We have gone to great lengths to try to minimize the potential exposure to the taxpayer. We have tried to call in technical expertise to be sure we understand what we are doing.

In terms of expanding this program now on the floor of the Senate to launch vehicles, I don't see how we could possibly get that job done. I think this is, in terms of this bill, a bridge too far. I think it is something that will be looked at. I know, from having talked to them personally, there are at least two private companies that are interested in commercial launching to try to do in America what we are contracting out to France and to China.

We have two problems in considering this today. One is that under unanimous consent, only relevant amendments are in order. This amendment would be deemed to not be relevant, in my opinion.

Secondly, I could do my due diligence as chairman of the Banking Committee to agree to an add-on loan guarantee on the floor of the Senate when we have not held a hearing, when we have not looked at it, when we know relatively little about the technology, the public/private competition, the economic feasibility of the project. We don't have any scoring from CBO as to what it would cost. It may very well be at some point, someday, we will be in a position of looking at the proposal that has been made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I don't believe we are at that point today.

Obviously, the Senator has a right to offer his amendment. I do not believe we should adopt his amendment today. I think we are already carrying a pretty heavy load on this bill. In order for this to go forward as it is now written, the Appropriations Committee is going to have to appropriate a quarter of a billion dollars. I believe we would have a train that would be overloaded if we added this loan guarantee to it today.

I am not hostile to what the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is trying to do. I simply do not know enough about it to make that decision today on the floor.

Before I could get to the point of making a decision on it in the Banking Committee, we would have to meet

with a lot of different people, a lot of different competing technologies. We would have to meet with NASA. We would have to analyze this in detail. We would have to do our due diligence. We would have to hold public hearings. We would have to go through a markup in the Banking Committee to try to refine it, as we have the bill that is now before us. We are just a long way from that.

I am sorry I am not in a position of being able to support the Senator from Louisiana. As of today, I am not.

Mr. President, I withdraw amendment No. 2897. That will pull down my amendment and pull down the Johnson amendment with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The question is on agreeing to the Bunning amendment, No. 2896.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Bunning amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the amendment be stacked after the first vote we have today.

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

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I will address my remarks to some of the points the Banking Committee chairman made, if he will give me his attention, regarding some of the concerns he raised in his comments about the amendment I outlined but have not yet offered.

On the point the chairman raised, that we do not have a scoring on the amendment, the scoring is very simple. It is \$250 million. That is what is authorized. We don't authorize a nickel more or a nickel less. It is not difficult to figure out the scoring and the cost of an amendment that authorizes \$250 million. It is \$250 million, if that amount is in fact appropriated.

He also said we needed to have hearings on this amendment. The Congress has had hearings on the amendment. We had hearings in the Senate Commerce Committee. We had people from industry testify. We had large and small companies testify. We had the head of the National Aeronautics and

Space Administration testify. We had a sufficient number of people testifying about the pros and cons.

He raised the point that we should hear from NASA as to their opinion. I provided the opinion of NASA when I quoted from the statement of the distinguished Administrator of NASA, Dan Goldin, in which he said this amendment could conceivably increase launch vehicle reliability by 10 times and decrease the cost by a factor of 10.

So there could not be a clearer statement. He concluded by saying: "This bill makes sense to me." You can't get a clearer statement from NASA as to what they think about the amendment. There could not be a clearer statement about the cost of the amendment other than the fact that we authorize \$250 million, not a nickel more, not a dime less but \$250 million.

So it is very clear. One, we know what the costs are; two, we have in fact had hearings in the Senate on this question; three, we have heard from industry, both large companies and small companies; and finally, we have heard from NASA, which said that it makes a great deal of sense to them, including the fact of reducing the cost of launching vehicles by a factor of 10. I don't know who else we can possibly ask to come before the Congress and address this question.

The final point—and I will not prejudge the ruling of the Chair—is on the question of the relevancy. It is clear that the bill before the Senate right now covers the cost of launching satellites to bring broadcast signals to rural America. It is in the bill. The bill clearly says that the loan guarantees are for the acquisition, improvement, enhancement, construction, deployment, and launch of satellites—the means by which local television broadcast signals will be delivered. Well, launching a satellite is absolutely essential and totally relevant to putting satellite broadcast signals into rural America. It could not possibly even be more relevant to the bill before the Senate. The bill itself talks about launching satellites.

My amendment provides a loan guarantee to launch satellites. If that is not relevant, I am not sure what would ever be relevant. We are not talking about germaneness. We are talking about relevant to the bill before the Senate, and this is a loan guarantee for launching satellites to bring broadcast signals to rural areas. My amendment creates a loan guarantee program to launch satellites to bring broadcast signals to rural America. It does it through a different department, but obviously it has to be relevant. You don't have to have exactly the same language in an amendment as the bill for it to be relevant. It has to be relevant to what the bill does that is pending before the Senate. I think the question of relevancy is very clear.

The fact that we have had hearings in this Congress on this specific amendment, and the fact that we have had

NASA testify in favor of this amendment and say it would reduce the cost by 10 times, reduce the liability by a factor of 10, and the fact that we have had industry, both small and large companies, appear before Congress and testify as to their opinions on this means that we have had hearings, we have the support, and it is certainly relevant, and I think it is the right public policy.

While I can't offer the amendment at this time because another one is pending, we will do it at the appropriate time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, what is the current business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, No. 2896.

Mr. BREAUX. The yeas and nays have not been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been ordered.

Mr. BREAUX. Is it in order to ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside that amendment in order to offer an amendment?

Mr. GRAMM. Reserving the right to object, people yell at me so much, I don't hear so good. Will the Senator repeat that?

Mr. BREAUX. I am asking to set aside the pending amendment to offer my amendment. Is that appropriate?

Mr. GRAMM. That is fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order to make that request.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily set aside in order to offer my amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2901

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) proposes an amendment numbered 2901.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

Section 4(d)(2)(a) of S. 2097 is amended by striking the word "launch,".

S. 2097 is amended by inserting the following Section 5A:

"SEC. 5A. APPROVAL AND ADMINISTRATION OF LOAN GUARANTEES RELATING TO LAUNCH VEHICLES.

"(a) AUTHORITY TO APPROVE LOAN GUARANTEES RELATING TO LAUNCH VEHICLES.—To further the purposes of this Act including to reduce costs necessary to facilitate access to local television broadcast signals in unserved and underserved areas, without unnecessarily creating a new administrative apparatus, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized, subject to the provisions of this Section, to approve loan guarantees relating to space launch vehicles. For this purpose, the credit assistance program established in Section 1503 of Chapter 1 of Subtitle E of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, Pub. L. No. 105-178, is expanded to include projects for the design, development, and construction of space transportation systems and infrastructure, including launch and reentry vehicles subject to the licensing requirements of Section 70104 of Title 49, United States Code.

"(b) FUNDING.—To fund the cost to the Government of loan guarantees provided under this Section for space transportation systems and infrastructure projects, there is authorized to be appropriated \$250 million for Fiscal Year 2001, and such other sums as may be necessary for each of Fiscal Years 2002 through 2005. From funds made available under this subsection, the Secretary of Transportation, for the administration of the program, may use not more than \$2 million for each of Fiscal Years 2001 through 2005. For each of Fiscal Years 2001 through 2005, principal amount of Federal credit instruments made available for space transportation systems and infrastructure projects shall be limited to the same amounts set forth in Section 1503 of Chapter 1 of Subtitle E of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, Pub. L. No. 105-178.

"(c) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—To carry out the provisions of this Section, the Secretary shall, within 120 days after enactment of this Act, adopt such regulations as he reasonably deems necessary. Such regulations shall not be inconsistent with the provisions of Section 5 of S. 2097, the "Launching Our Communities' Access to Local Television Act of 2000."

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I made remarks earlier about the intent to offer this amendment. I will not repeat the arguments in favor of it. I will only summarize by saying the Senate Commerce Committee had a complete and full hearing. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is on the floor today. We had the privilege of hearing NASA Administrator Dan Goldin testify on this amendment, saying it would save as much as 10 times the cost of a launch vehicle and improve the reliability of those by a factor of 10. We are hearing from big launch companies and also small launch companies that are interested in this industry, and trying to improve it.

We had testimony from people in the finance business who speak to the difficulty of getting adequate financing in the private sector because of the questionable nature of the launch vehicle industry and testifying to the fact that a loan guarantee program would be very helpful.

The final point is that when you talk about bringing satellite broadcast sig-

nals to rural America, you cannot just talk about the "big ball" that, in fact, is the satellite. You also have to talk about how you get the satellite into orbit around the country. Thirty-seven percent of the cost of bringing that broadcast signal to rural America involves the cost of the launch vehicle.

Currently, the United States relies on China, France, Ukraine, and other countries that are not market-based countries but, rather, are countries in which their industry is financed 100 percent by the government. Our companies cannot compete unless we have a level playing field.

Therefore, the concept of providing a loan guarantee program of a definitive amount of money we know will cost \$250 million. That is the money authorized. It would have to go through the Appropriations Committee to get the appropriations, but it could not be any more than \$250 million to create a loan guarantee where they could go to the private sector and get a loan from the banks. Having a percentage of it guaranteed by the Federal Government is good, sound economic policy. It is good broadcast industry policy. It is a policy this country should embrace. In areas where we have done it before, as in shipbuilding, it has worked very successfully.

I suggest this amendment is very relevant because the bill itself is clear that the Loan Guarantee Program "is for the acquisition, improvement, enhancement, construction, deployment and launch"—emphasizing launch—"rehabilitation or the means from which local TV broadcast signals will be delivered to an unserved area or underserved area."

It is clearly relevant, and both amendments are an effort to try to help through loan programs the delivering of broadcast signals to rural America.

This is not a germaneness question. It is a relevancy question. If this is not relevant, I don't know what would be relevant on an amendment on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, as I said before, I have some sympathy for the Senator from Louisiana. I think this is obviously a very real issue to be considered. But the bottom line is we are on the floor with a bill that has been a year in the making having to do with our goal of trying to see that everybody who lives in rural Texas or rural America has access to their local news and local weather and to the local television station.

You could write volumes about what we don't know about this subject, even though we have worked on it for a year, even though we have had extensive hearings, even though we have had innumerable private meetings, and even though we have gone through a markup in committee where we have

debated it at some length and reached some consensus on it—not total consensus.

The problem with the Breaux amendment is that this is an area, while it is obviously of importance in terms of one potential technology that might be used in the bill—and that is a satellite—we in our bill are not setting out technology as such. We are letting the marketplace decide that. The point is we have had no hearings. We have heard from no one. We have not discussed, analyzed, or studied this in any detail. We are not ready to make a decision on this today.

Under the unanimous consent agreement entered into on November 18, no amendment is in order which is not deemed to be relevant—not relevant to mankind, not relevant to any problem facing us in the future, or any opportunity but relevant specifically to the bill that is pending before the Senate.

I make a point of order that the amendment offered by Senator BREAUX is not relevant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment is not relevant and the point of order is sustained.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I take it that the Chair is not in the position to give a reason behind the ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The program in the amendment is not what was envisioned by the unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. BREAUX. I inquire of the Chair: Is that not an argument for the question of germaneness as opposed to the question of relevancy?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Germaneness is a different test which is not at issue here.

Mr. BREAUX. Further parliamentary inquiry: Is not the statement of the Chair relevant to a question on germaneness as opposed to a question of relevancy?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement of the Chair was with regard to the relevancy standard.

Mr. BREAUX. I will not pursue it. Obviously, I accept the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

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

TERRORISM

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, back in February of 1993, as we all remember so

vividly, the World Trade Center in New York City was bombed. Over 1,000 people were wounded and 6 people were killed. Two years later, the Federal building in Oklahoma was bombed; 168 people died, including many children.

These two very tragic events highlight the potential threat this country is subjected to and, in fact, has been subjected to in the area of terrorism. The threat of terrorism was further reinforced with the events in Africa where two of our embassies were bombed 3 years ago.

The Commerce, State, Justice, Appropriations Subcommittee, which I chair, directed the Attorney General to develop a plan to address terrorism which would be a Governmentwide plan, an interagency counterterrorism plan. The Attorney General, in a very conscientious effort, put together a 5-year interagency counterterrorism and technology crime plan. It was an excellent proposal. This proposal was put together by the Attorney General 3 years ago. It basically became known as the bible—for lack of a better or more descriptive word—as to how we should proceed in the area of developing a Governmentwide strategy in order to address terrorism, something we hadn't done up until that point.

It wasn't just to focus on Federal Government agencies but, rather, it went beyond that and talked about how we needed to integrate the private sector and State and local governments in our efforts to address terrorism. It had a large number of functions within it, a large number of areas that had to be addressed, as was obvious to those of us who took even a cursory look at the issue of terrorism.

Unfortunately, we, as a culture, were not ready to address terrorist acts because we are an open culture. The essence of our culture is freedom, the ability of people to move freely among our society. It is very difficult for us to deal with people who are willing to kill indiscriminately simply to make their points of view known. It requires a lot of thought and effort for us as a nation to address a problem such as terrorism. That is why we asked for this 5-year plan to be developed.

As part of this 5-year plan, one of the key things we believed we needed to address was the fact that there really wasn't anyplace where all of the issues of terrorism were being brought together. There were something like 43 different agencies addressing some element of the terrorist threat. This was not counting the issues of State and local government involvement and the issue of the private sector. For instance, how would the private sector address a terrorist threat to our power grid and our telecommunications systems.

One of the first things deemed necessary to do was to develop a centralized place where people could go, whether they happened to be in the Federal Government, State and local government, or whether they happened

to be in the private sector, a centralized place where people could go and find out how to approach the issue of preparing our Nation to be able to handle the terrorist threat. An office was designated to be created called the National Domestic Preparedness Office, or the NDPO.

The NDPO was essentially to be a one-stop shopping center on the issue of how we address the threat of terrorism as a nation, a very important activity. It was to include participation by DOD, the Department of Defense, by FEMA, by HHS, Health and Human Services, by the Department of Energy, by the Environmental Protection Agency, by the Attorney General, and by the FBI. State and local authorities were to be included for participation in this office. It was to be a central agency which had all the players needed to be at the table—up and functioning and continually available as a resource to address the threat of terrorism.

Unfortunately, this administration has treated the issue of terrorism as a stepchild. When there is a terrorist event, they react. In some instances, they react arbitrarily and ineffectively, as they did in reaction to the African situation where they essentially ended up targeting a facility in Sudan. It is still very much an issue, as to whether the facility was actually producing any chemical weapons. Also, they attacked a facility in Afghanistan. Rather than assisting our ability of tracking down the terrorist Bin Laden, it made it obvious to him that he could never again have a joint meeting of his terrorist forces. Thus, he scattered them to the wind and we have had much more trouble tracking them down.

The response of this administration has been a PR response, to be quite honest, on the issue of terrorism at many levels. When it comes to actually substantively addressing the issue of terrorism, this administration's response from the top has been woeful.

I will acknowledge, in fact I will cite and congratulate, that at the agency level there is an ongoing, aggressive, and very positive effort to address terrorism. But, for some reason, there is an unwillingness in the White House to genuinely focus on this issue in a way that produces results.

One of the most glaring examples of that unwillingness to focus is the fact that the NDPO—the office which was supposed to be the one-stop shopping center for people who wanted to get ready to address a terrorist event—hasn't really been allowed to wither on the vine because they never even planted the seeds to get the vine growing. The office has not been funded. In fact, the travel funds which were supposed to be applied to it have been cut off. The office has been unable to get reprogramming through OMB, even though the Attorney General has requested on a number of occasions to get reprogramming through OMB to allow the office to function effectively.