

EC-4979. A communication from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.606(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (DeRidder, DeQuincy, and Merryville, LA and Newton, TX)" (MM Doc. No. 02-56) received on October 30, 2003; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4980. A communication from the Deputy Division Chief, Policy Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Section 68.4 of the Commission's Rules Governing Hearing Aid-Compatible Telephones" (FCC03-168) received on October 27, 2003; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4981. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "In the Matter of Provision of Improved Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, Order on Reconstruction" (FCC03-46) received on October 20, 2003; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4982. A communication from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Parts 2 and 25 of the Commission's Rules to Permit Operation of NGSO FSS Systems Co Frequency with GSO and Terrestrial Systems in the Ku Band Frequency Range (Second Memorandum Opinion and Order)" (FCC03-25) received on October 30, 2003; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4983. A communication from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Parts 2, 25, and 97 of the Commission's Rules with Regard to the Mobile-Satellite Service Above 1 GHz" (FCC03-69) received on October 30, 2003; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

DISCHARGED NOMINATIONS

The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration was discharged from further consideration of the following nominations and the nominations were:

Paul S. DeGregorio, of Missouri, to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission for a term of two years.

Gracia M. Hillman, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission for a term of two years.

Raymundo Martinez III, of Texas, to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission for a term of four years.

Deforest B. Soaries, Jr., of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission for a term of four years.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CRAIG:

S. 1805. A bill to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued

against manufacturers, distributors, dealers, or importers of firearms or ammunition for damages resulting from the misuse of their products by others; read the first time.

By Mr. CRAIG:

S. 1806. A bill to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against manufacturers, distributors, dealers, or importers of firearms or ammunition for damages resulting from the misuse of their products by others; read the first time.

By Mr. McCAIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1807. A bill to require criminal background checks on all firearms transactions occurring at events that provide a venue for the sale, offer for sale, transfer, or exchange of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. LOTT, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. INHOFE, and Mrs. HUTCHISON):

S. 1808. A bill to provide for the preservation and restoration of historic buildings at historically women's public colleges or universities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DASCHLE (for Mr. EDWARDS):

S. 1809. A bill to provide grants for mental health and substance abuse services for women and children who have been victims of domestic or sexual violence; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DASCHLE (for Mr. EDWARDS):

S. 1810. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve treatment for the mental health abuse and substance abuse needs of women with histories of trauma, including domestic and sexual violence; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DASCHLE (for Mr. EDWARDS):

S. 1811. A bill to expand research for women in trauma; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. DODD, and Mr. HAGEL):

S. Res. 256. A resolution observing the 50th anniversary of the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of Korea, affirming the deep cooperation and friendship between the people of the United States and the people of the Republic of Korea, and thanking the Republic of Korea for its contributions to the global war on terrorism and to the stabilization and reconstruction of Afghanistan and Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 59

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) were added as cosponsors of S. 59, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit former members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability rated as total to travel on military aircraft in the same manner and

to the same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces are entitled to travel on such aircraft.

S. 1245

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1245, a bill to provide for homeland security grant coordination and simplification, and for other purposes.

S. 1353

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1353, a bill to establish new special immigrant categories.

S. 1612

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1612, a bill to establish a technology, equipment, and information transfer within the Department of Homeland Security.

S. 1630

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1630, a bill to facilitate nationwide availability of 2-1-1 telephone service for information and referral services, and for other purposes.

S. 1664

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1664, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to provide for the enhanced review of covered pesticide products, to authorize fees for certain pesticide products, and to extend and improve the collection of maintenance fees.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. McCAIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1807. A bill to require criminal background checks on all firearms transactions occurring at events that provide a venue for the sale, offer for sale, transfer, or exchange of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I take a backseat to no one in my support of Second Amendment rights. But this right, which Americans have fought and died for, does not extend to terrorists, criminals and illegal aliens. That is why I am pleased to announce today a landmark agreement on gun show legislation that I have reached with Senators JACK REED, MIKE DEWINE, and JOE LIEBERMAN.

The bill accomplishes two critical goals: It protects gun shows as a viable business and ongoing enterprise, and it slams the door on criminals, terrorists and illegal aliens who have successfully exploited a loophole in our gun

safety laws to acquire firearms at gun shows for nefarious purposes.

I know the gun safety issue is controversial in Congress and that there is a great deal of passion on both sides. This legislation replaces passion with pragmatism. It stakes out a sensible middle ground to solve the real problem of criminals and terrorists getting guns at gun shows without burdening gun show operators with punishing paperwork or treating enthusiasts who attend these shows as pariahs.

For gun rights advocates like myself, this bill does not retreat one inch in the battle to protect our Second Amendment rights. It treats gun show operators and patrons with respect and requires simply that background checks be performed on all firearms sales at gun shows. For those who are rightly concerned about gun violence, this bill simply and straightforwardly accomplishes the goal of closing a loophole that has fueled illegal gun trafficking in America.

I am a gun owner and I have attended many gun shows in my state of Arizona. More than most people, I know that the majority of gun show patrons and sellers are honest, law abiding citizens. But I also know that there is a sinister element that attends these shows and exploits this loophole.

Defenders of gun shows, like myself, cannot ignore the staggering statistic that gun shows are the second leading source of firearms recovered in illegal gun trafficking investigations conducted by ATF. Just this week, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch reported that ATF agents seized 572 firearms from five unlicensed sellers who were exploiting the gun show loophole in ways that threaten the safety of American citizens. The same article quoted an ATF agent saying "crime guns do originate at gun shows. That's been documented."

The fact that gun shows are a leading source of crime guns is reason enough to close the gun show loophole, but we also know of at least three cases where alleged terrorists used the gun show loophole to purchase firearms and that makes closing this loophole imperative.

On September 10, 2001, a Federal court in Detroit convicted Ali Boumelhem, a known member of the terrorist group Hezbollah on seven counts of weapons charges for smuggling shotguns, ammunition, flash suppressors, and assault weapons parts to Lebanon.

FBI agents followed Boumelhem to at least three Michigan gun shows in October 2000. According to the Middle East Intelligence Bulletin, the shipment in which he was finally arrested was part of a pattern—Boumelhem "traveled frequently to gun shows to buy arms and then hid them in cargo crates bound for Lebanon." According to the Associated Press, "Federal agents say they watched Boumelhem, a resident of Detroit and Beirut, travel to gun shows to buy gun parts and ammunition for shipment overseas."

On October 30, 2001, Muhammad Asrar, a Pakistani national with suspected al-Qaeda ties, pleaded guilty in Federal court in Texas to firearms-related charges. He was convicted of illegally possessing 50 rounds of 9mm ammunition. He was also convicted on an immigration charge—illegally overstaying his student visa since 1988.

Asrar was arrested after an anonymous informant told authorities that Asrar had asked him whether he would smuggle a foreign national across the border from Mexico. Asrar also allegedly asked the informant if he would take pictures of tall buildings for him during his travels. Police seized several photos of tall buildings from Asrar's store.

Asrar admitted to authorities that he had bought and sold a variety of guns at Texas gun shows over the previous 7 years, including a copy of a Sten sub-machine gun, a Ruger Mini-14 rifle, two handguns, and a hunting rifle.

Despite the final adjudication of the ammunition and immigration charges, which can carry a penalty of up to 10 years in prison, Asrar remains under investigation by a Federal grand jury. According to the New York Times, Asrar is being investigated for possible links to al-Qaeda.

Connor Claxton is an Irish national and an admitted member of the Irish Republican Army who is currently serving a prison term for attempting to smuggle guns bought in Florida to Ireland. At his trial he testified about how he came to the United States on IRA orders to buy weapons and ammunition for shipment back to Ireland and that he chose to come to Florida because "we don't have gun shows in Ireland, and you see things here like you never imagined."

According to his co-conspirator Siobhan Browne, Claxton "spent more than \$100,000 off the books on semi- and fully automatic weapons in sales from private dealers" who are not required to perform background checks. Browne also said that Mickey Couples, a senior IRA leader, told her that "the gunrunning mission had been going on for four years and that there were 50 IRA volunteers involved."

In an era where America is right to be concerned about security, it is absolutely imperative that we close this dangerous loophole that allows criminals, terrorists, and illegal aliens to claim a right that they don't deserve.

The McCain-Reed-DeWine-Lieberman bill requires instant criminal background checks for all firearm sales at gun shows. For licensed dealers selling at gun shows, this bill creates no new burdens. For unlicensed sellers, they will simply need to have an instant background check performed before they transfer a firearm. The instant check could be performed by a licensed dealer, local law enforcement, or by a new entity created by this bill called a special licensee—an individual or gun show employee who may perform instant background checks at gun shows only.

The bill also defines a gun show in a fair and rational way. Any public event where 75 or more firearms are offered for sale is defined in the legislation as a gun show. Collectors who sell their own guns from their own homes are exempt. In addition, private hunt clubs that buy, sell, or trade firearms between members are also free from the requirements of this bill.

Paperwork requirements under the bill are the minimum necessary to ensure compliance with the law. I made sure that gun show operators would not be buried under an avalanche of paper.

Finally, the bill allows States to seek a waiver to make the instant check even quicker for unlicensed sellers at gun shows once that State has automated the records necessary to make the check as accurate as possible. I am aware that some sellers are concerned that the law allowing up to three business days to complete a background check is burdensome for weekend gun shows.

Currently, because of improvements made by Attorney General John Ashcroft, 91 percent of all background checks are completed within five minutes and 95 percent are completed within two hours. For all intents and purposes, we now have a viable instant check system. But I would like to get that 95 percent success rate up to 100 percent and this bill will help entice States to get their felony, domestic violence and mental health records in order so that no one has to wait days to be approved or denied a firearm under instant check.

This legislation should appeal to all but those who either hate guns and believe that no one should own them or those who believe that even terrorists, criminals and illegal aliens are protected under the Second Amendment. In 1999, every member of the Senate voted for some form of a bill to close the gun show loophole, but neither side was willing to compromise for the sake of America. Let's stop playing politics with guns and support a bill that closes a serious loophole while respecting the rights of those who enjoy gun shows. This is our chance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleague Senator MCCAIN in introducing the Gun Show Loophole Closing Act of 2003. We offer this legislation to strengthen our Nation's gun laws by closing a loophole that has allowed criminals to buy firearms at gun shows for far too long. I look forward to working with Senator MCCAIN and our fellow cosponsors to offer this legislation to the first appropriate vehicle that comes before the Senate. In particular, it is our intention to offer this bill as an amendment to the gun industry immunity bill, S. 659. If the Senate is going to consider granting immunity from civil liability to the firearms industry—an industry that Congress already exempted from the consumer product safety laws that apply to virtually every other product sold in this country—it is critical that we protect

the American people by improving law enforcement oversight of commerce in firearms.

The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms reported to Congress in 2000 that gun shows are a major gun trafficking channel responsible for more than 26,000 illegal firearms sales during the 18-month period ATF studied. The FBI and ATF tell us again and again that convicted felons, domestic abusers, and other prohibited purchasers are taking advantage of the gun show loophole. At least three suspected terrorists that we know of have also exploited this loophole to acquire firearms, including one suspected al Qaeda member.

Under Federal law, Federal Firearms Licensees are required to maintain careful records of their sales, and under the Brady Act, to check a purchaser's background with the National Instant Criminal Background Check System before transferring any firearm. However, a person does not need a Federal firearms license—and the Brady Act does not apply—if the person is not “engaged in the business” of selling firearms pursuant to Federal law. These unlicensed sellers make up one quarter or more of the sellers of firearms at thousands of gun shows in America each year. Consequently, felons and other prohibited persons who want to avoid Brady Act checks and records of their purchases buy firearms at gun shows.

Four years ago, Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold killed 13 people at Columbine High School with weapons purchased from an unlicensed seller at a gun show. The woman who purchased those guns on behalf of Harris and Klebold testified to the Colorado legislature that she never would have purchased the weapons had she been required to undergo a background check.

We have united behind this bipartisan legislation—which brings together provisions from several previous gun show bills—to make gun show transactions safer for all Americans. The bill would require Brady Law background checks on all firearms transactions at any event where 75 or more guns are offered for sale. Three years after enactment, States could apply to the Attorney General for certification for a 24-hour background check for unlicensed sellers at gun shows. In order to be eligible for 24-hour certification, a State would be required to have 95 percent of its disqualifying records automated and searchable under NICS, including 95 percent of all domestic violence misdemeanor and restraining order records dating back 30 years. Before certifying any State for 24-hour background checks, the Attorney General would be required to establish a toll-free telephone number to enable State and local courts to immediately notify the NICS system any time a domestic violence restraining order is filed, and courts within a certified State would be required to use the telephone num-

ber immediately upon the filing of such an order. The bill also directs the Attorney General to work with States to encourage the development of computer systems that would allow courts to provide electronic records to NICS immediately. The Bureau of Justice Statistics would conduct an annual review of all certified States to ensure they continue to meet the conditions for 24-hour background check certification.

Some will say that this legislation is an attempt to end gun shows, but the experience of States that have closed the gun show loophole proves otherwise. California, for example, requires not only background checks at gun shows but a 10-day waiting period for all gun sales, yet gun shows continue to thrive there. No, we are not trying to end gun shows. What we are trying to end is the free pass we're giving to terrorists and convicted felons that allows them to simply walk into a gun show, find a private dealer, buy whatever weapons they want and walk out without a Brady background check.

In overwhelming numbers, the American people believe that background checks should be required for all gun show sales. The people of Colorado confirmed this after the Columbine tragedy when they approved a ballot initiative to close the gun show loophole. I urge my colleagues to support the Gun Show Loophole Closing Act of 2003 so that we can finally close this loophole in every State and make sure that convicted felons, domestic abusers, and other prohibited persons do not use gun shows to purchase firearms without a Brady background check.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today as an original co-sponsor of the Gun Show Loophole Closing Act of 2003. I would like to thank Senators MCCAIN, LIEBERMAN and REED for also sponsoring this common sense piece of legislation that aims to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and out of the hand of kids. It is a good bill—an important bill.

Gun ownership rights are clearly established in the United States Constitution. And, I am a firm supporter of the Second Amendment. I also strongly believe that we have an obligation to protect the safety of law-abiding citizens and the safety of our most precious resource, our children.

As a former county prosecutor, I learned that the best way to reduce the illegal and often fatal use of guns is to pass and enforce tough laws that severely punish criminals who use them. That is why I consistently have supported measures that keep firearms from getting into the wrong hands in the first place and that increase the punishment of those who use firearms in the commission of a crime. The Gun Show Loophole Closing Act helps achieve that goal.

Under the existing Brady law, when a purchaser buys a gun from a licensed dealer, he or she must undergo a background check through the Federal Gov-

ernment's National Instant Criminal Background Check System (“NICS”), into which States feed records of certain criminals and others not qualified to own a gun. NICS has up to three days to inform the dealer as to whether the buyer is qualified to purchase a gun. If the dealer receives no response by the end of the three-day period, the dealer is allowed to sell the gun to that buyer. Ninety-five percent of NICS checks, however, do not take three days. They come up with an instant or near instant response.

This bill we are introducing today simply applies the same common-sense checks to gun show sales. Right now, there is no statute requiring that all sellers at gun shows run NICS checks on potential gun buyers; however, according to Federal officials, gun shows are the second leading source of illegal guns recovered from gun trafficking investigations. By leaving this loophole open—by not requiring all gun show sellers to run NICS checks—we are presenting gun traffickers and other criminals with a prime opportunity to acquire firearms. This is terrifying and this is unacceptable. Only last week, Federal authorities arrested a Georgia man who sold large quantities of firearms at Georgia gun shows. These firearms have been recovered in subsequent crimes in New York, New Jersey, Michigan, and here in Washington, DC.

Furthermore, following the attacks on September 11th, it came to light that Al Qaeda produced a handbook in which it advised terrorists to purchase firearms at gun shows in the United States. In fact, at least three suspected terrorists have exploited this loophole to acquire firearms. Therefore, it is imperative, now more than ever, to enact legislation to protect our citizens from this potential area of terrorist exploitation.

This bill is common sense. The laws for purchasing firearms at gun shows and stores should be the same. We have the same responsibility to make sure that gun owners are qualified—regardless of where they buy their guns. This bill closes the gun show loophole in a way that respects the Second Amendment and honest, law-abiding Americans' right to buy and sell guns and attend gun shows. That's good law. That's good policy. That's why we should pass this bill.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I am proud to join Senators MCCAIN, REED, DEWINE, LAUTENBERG, SCHUMER and CHAFEE in introducing this important legislation. This bill aims to build common ground on gun violence—a problem that has too often divided Members of Congress. As citizens of this great Democracy, we have rights and we have responsibilities. We have the right to own guns, but we have a responsibility not to sell them to criminals. That is the simple but important set of values on which the legislation we introduce today is founded.

For several decades, our Nation has had a clear policy against allowing

convicted felons to buy guns, because we know that mixing criminals and guns far too often yields violent results. Through the Brady law, we established what seems like an obvious corollary to that policy—a requirement that those selling guns determine whether someone trying to buy a firearm isn't supposed to get one before they sell it to them. The Brady law has been an enormous success. Since its enactment, background checks have stopped almost one million gun sales to those who by law aren't allowed to own guns—convicted felons, spouse abusers, fugitives from justice, among others. This has saved an untold number of our citizens from the violence, injury or death the sale of many of these guns would have brought.

But the Brady law contained an unfortunate loophole that has since been exploited to allow convicted felons and other people who shouldn't own guns to evade the background check requirement by buying their guns at gun shows. The problem is that Brady applies only to Federal Firearms Licensees, so-called FFLs—people who are in the business of selling guns. Brady explicitly exempts from the background check requirement anyone “who makes occasional sales, exchanges, or purchases of firearms for the enhancement of a personal collection or for a hobby, or who sells all or part of his personal collection of firearms.” As a result, any person selling guns as a hobby or only occasionally, whether at a gun show, flea market or elsewhere, need not obtain a Federal license and therefore has no obligation to conduct a background check. This means that any person wanting to avoid a background check can go to a gun show, find out which vendors are not FFLs, and buy a gun. This situation is dangerous not only because it allows convicted felons and other prohibited persons to buy guns, but also because—in contrast to FFLs—non-FFLs have no obligation to keep records of the transaction, thereby depriving law enforcement of the ability to trace the gun if it later turns up at a crime scene.

Our bill will change that. We will make sure that no one will be able to buy a gun at a gun show without it first being determined whether that person is a convicted felon, a spouse abuser or a member of one of the other categories of people we all agree should not be allowed to buy guns.

Our bill does this, though, by taking into account some of the concerns that were expressed about previous efforts to close this loophole.

First, our bill has a simple definition of a gun show—an event where 75 or more guns are offered or exhibited for sale—and we make clear that that definition doesn't include sales from a private collection by nonlicensed sellers out of their homes.

Second, to respond to the argument that previous proposals made it too difficult for nonlicensed sellers to fulfill the background check requirement, our

bill makes sure that nonlicensed sellers will have easy access to someone who can initiate background checks for them, by creating a new class of licensee whose sole purpose will be to initiate background checks at gun shows.

Third, we have tried to respond to those who say that a three-day check is too long for gun shows, because those events only last a couple of days. It is worth noting that the length allowed for the check doesn't affect the overwhelming majority of gun purchasers, because over 90 percent of checks are completed almost instantly. But to allay the concerns that have been expressed, we have come up with a compromise that authorizes a State to move to a 24-hour check for nonlicensed dealers at gun shows when the State can prove that a 24-hour check is feasible. A State can prove that by showing that 95 percent of the records that would disqualify people in that State from buying guns are computerized and searchable by the NICS system. And, because of the particular need to keep guns out of the hands of spouse abusers, the bill specifically provides that a State must have computerized 95 percent of its domestic violence misdemeanor and restraining order records dating back 30 years before it is eligible to go to a 24-hour check at gun shows.

One significant difference between the bill Senator MCCAIN and I introduced last Congress and the one we introduce today is that my colleague from Rhode Island, Senator REED, has worked with us to craft a single gun show loophole closing bill. I am truly pleased that we can now all go forward together in a unified effort to bring greater responsibility to our gun laws.

Now I know that there are many, including President Bush, who argue that what we need to solve the gun violence problem are not new laws but the enforcement of existing ones. I agree with part of that statement, and firmly support efforts to crack down on those who violate our gun laws. But I believe we must go farther than that, because we will never be able to enforce existing laws unless we close the loopholes in them that criminals exploit. And we all know that there is a big loophole in the provision saying that felons and spouse abusers aren't supposed to buy guns, and that is that criminals know that if they go to a gun show, they will be able to avoid the background check that was set up to keep them from getting guns.

Gun crime remains a critical public safety problem. For too long, differences over finding a solution to that problem have unnecessarily divided the Congress, and the American people have been left to suffer the violent consequences. But the reality is that most of us agree on most of the critical questions. We agree that the laws on the books should be enforced, that the rights of law-abiding gun owners should be protected, and that convicted

felons and spouse abusers shouldn't be able to get guns. The bill we are introducing today would write those principles into law. I hope all of my colleagues support it.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. LOTT, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. INHOFE, and Mrs. HUTCHISON):

S. 1808. A bill to provide for the preservation and restoration of historic buildings at historically women's public colleges and universities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, today I rise to re-introduce legislation to help preserve the heritage of seven historic women's colleges and universities. The legislation would authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide restoration and preservation grants for historic buildings and structures at seven historically women's public colleges or universities. The bill directs the Secretary to award \$14 million annually from fiscal years 2004 through 2008 to the seven institutions.

The sweeping changes of the industrial revolution prompted Congress in 1862, with further action in 1887 and 1890, to provide Federal support for the establishment of agricultural and mechanical colleges with growing emphasis on industrial and technical education. Unfortunately, these “land-grant” schools were only for men, leaving women untrained as they entered the expanded work force. Women's advocates, such as Miss Julia Tutwiler in Alabama, immediately recognized the need for institutions where women could receive an equal education. Beginning in 1884, seven institutions in seven separate States were established as industrial schools for women. These institutions include the Mississippi University for Women, the University of Montevallo in Alabama, Georgia College and State University, Winthrop University in South Carolina, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Texas Women's University, and the University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma. These seven institutions remain open, providing a liberal arts education for both men and women, but retain significant historical and academic features of those pioneering efforts to educate women. Despite their continued use, many of the structures located on these campuses are facing destruction or closure because preservation funds are not available. My legislation would enable these buildings to be preserved and maintained by providing funding for the historic buildings located at the colleges and universities I have identified. No more than \$14 million would be available and would be distributed in equal amounts to the seven institutions. My bill also requires a 20 percent matching contribution from non-Federal sources and assures that alterations to the properties using the funds

are subject to approval from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and reasonable public access for interpretive and educational purposes.

These historically women's colleges and universities have contributed significantly to the effort to attain equal opportunity through postsecondary education for women, many of whom would not have had the opportunity otherwise. I believe it is our duty to do all we can to preserve these historic institutions, and I ask my colleagues for their support.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 256—OBSERVING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA, AFFIRMING THE DEEP COOPERATION AND FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE PEOPLE OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA, AND THANKING THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA FOR ITS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM AND TO THE STABILIZATION AND RECONSTRUCTION OF AFGHANISTAN AND IRAQ

Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. DODD, and Mr. HAGEL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 256

Whereas October 1, 2003, marked the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, signed at Washington October 1, 1953, and entered into force November 17, 1954 (hereinafter referred to as the "Mutual Defense Treaty");

Whereas the United States and the Republic of Korea have formed a bond through the common struggle against communist aggression;

Whereas more than 34,000 Americans lost their lives fighting in the Korean War, and approximately 37,000 men and women of the United States Armed Forces are still deployed on the Korean peninsula, enduring separation from their families and other hardships in the defense of freedom;

Whereas the Mutual Defense Treaty has been instrumental in securing peace on the Korean peninsula and providing an environment in which the Republic of Korea has become an economically vibrant, free, democratic society;

Whereas the foundation of the Mutual Defense Treaty rests not only on a common adversary, but more importantly on a shared interest in, and commitment to, peace, democracy, and freedom on the Korean peninsula, in Asia, and throughout the world;

Whereas the United States and the Republic of Korea are working closely together to find a diplomatic solution to the threat posed by North Korea's pursuit of nuclear weapons and the export by North Korea of ballistic missiles;

Whereas the Republic of Korea is making valuable contributions to the global war on terrorism, including the contribution of logistics support for international forces operating in Afghanistan;

Whereas the Republic of Korea has pledged \$260,000,000 and has already sent 700 military engineers and medical personnel to assist in the United States-led effort to stabilize and reconstruct Iraq; and

Whereas South Korea President Roh Moo-hyun pledged on October 18, 2003, to dispatch additional troops to work alongside United States and coalition forces in Iraq; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) observes the 50th anniversary of the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, signed at Washington October 1, 1953, and entered into force November 17, 1954;

(2) reaffirms the deep cooperation and friendship between the people of the United States and the people of the Republic of Korea; and

(3) thanks the Republic of Korea for its contributions to the global war on terrorism and to the stabilization and reconstruction of Afghanistan and Iraq.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, this resolution is cosponsored by my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Senator LUGAR, as well as Senators KERRY, BROWNBACK, DODD, and HAGEL. It recognizes the 50th anniversary of the United States-Republic of Korea Mutual Defense Treaty and is thanking the Republic of Korea for its contributions to the global war on terrorism.

The United States has no better friend in Asia than the Republic of Korea. South Koreans have been there for us time and again, just as we have been for them.

Our alliance has paid dividends on and off the Korean Peninsula. Most recently, South Korea has aided the U.S. effort in Afghanistan and Iraq. South Korea has already sent 700 military engineers and medical personal to Iraq, and President Roh pledged on October 18 to dispatch additional troops to work alongside U.S. forces there. South Korea has also pledged \$260 million in grants to help reconstruct Iraq.

The resolution I offer today observes the 50th anniversary of our alliance, thanks South Korea for its contributions to the global war on terrorism, and reaffirms the deep cooperation and friendship that exists between our two countries.

That cooperation and friendship are sorely needed now, given the challenges posed by North Korea. North Korea today is on the verge of becoming a nuclear bomb factory. The United States needs to redouble its diplomatic efforts to persuade North Korea to change its course.

President Bush, I note, has repeatedly called for a "peaceful, diplomatic" solution to this crisis, and has worked with our friends and allies in that region toward that goal. I believe President Bush's instincts are correct on this issue.

Last week President Bush told the leaders of Asia that the United States is prepared to provide security assurances to North Korea if North Korea takes tangible steps to dismantle its nuclear program. I find that very encouraging. But in my view we need to

do more. That is essentially where we left off at the end of the last administration, when we were working within the Agreed Framework.

What we need to do is have more contact with North Korea. There were only 40 minutes of one-on-one dialog with North Korea last August in Beijing. That, with the translation requirements in such an exchange, is barely enough time to clear one's throat.

Second, we should use the combination of carrots and sticks to convince North Korea to change its course. The sticks are in play, including the proliferation security initiative and a coordinated crackdown on the North's illicit activities, including narcotics trafficking and counterfeiting, among others.

We need to identify as well some incentives for the good behavior that would come if, in fact, there is a verifiable North Korean effort along the path toward nuclear disarmament. This is not giving in to blackmail. It is a positive reinforcement, and there is a huge difference between the two.

Third, we need to sustain and consider increasing humanitarian food and medical aid to North Korea. Nothing about this crisis will be improved by having more hungry or sick North Korean children. This year, the United States provided only 40,000 tons of food aid to the North a generous donation, to be sure, but a pittance against the world program appeal of more than 600,000 tons is needed, and far below the food aid levels the United States has provided in previous years.

I note there is some dispute about the access of this food aid to the people of North Korea, people we need to help. The fact is the World Food Program and the director have reported significant progress towards monitoring delivery of food and ensuring that the aid reaches those most in need. Further, the food aid we have provided we seem fairly well assured is in fact getting where it is intended.

Finally, we need to speak with one voice. The administration has yet to fully resolve the deep internal divisions over the direction of the President's policy. Some senior officials in the administration continue to argue against this policy of engagement. As a matter of fact, they seem to occasionally look forward to tweaking the North Koreans. I might add there is very little social redeeming value in the policies of Kim Jong Il in North Korea. I am not arguing he is a particularly reasonable man, but it seems to me there should be one voice and one policy coming out of the administration. Prospects for diplomatic solutions are in direct proportion to one voice.

To state the obvious, as I know the Presiding Officer knows, time is not our ally in this crisis. The United States needs to communicate both the risks of North Korea's current path and the benefits North Korea could enjoy if it chooses to verifiably abandon its