

to a job at a tortilla shop. Most days she hits the road looking for work, leaving applications everywhere from a factory for stamping T-shirts to a plant making refrigerator parts.

To cope, some people are resorting to uncomfortable measures. After losing her job, Gladys Barraza, her husband and two children moved into her parent's two-bedroom home, also in Lennox. Rosa Saldivar is facing starker options. Her husband, Martin, who lost his job at a bakery that served airport restaurants, is pressuring her to take their three kids back to the family home in Durango, in northern Mexico.

They wouldn't be the only ones to go. Ms. Van Deventer, the assistant principal, says that 50 to 60 children, out of a student body of about 1,100, have dropped out of Jefferson Elementary since Sept. 11. Some, she says, have gone back to Mexico and El Salvador, where it's cheaper to be unemployed and where extended families can provide support. Others have left to look for work in other American cities, including Las Vegas, where it is rumored there might be jobs.

For those who are staying, the stress is growing. Health workers and parent-group coordinators at the schools are detecting more alcohol abuse and depression. A few days ago, Carmen Torres, a parent counselor at Jefferson Elementary, saw a couple bickering. The wife was dragging in her recently laid-off husband to register for English-language lessons. The husband, crying in despair, complained that the classes were beyond him.

But many are confident that the community will prove its resilience. Yvonne Moreno, a counselor at a health program run by the school district, notes that most of those in Lennox have been working since they were six or seven years old. Many crossed the desert on foot, eluding border patrolmen, to get here. "They are survivors," she says.

#### CIVILIAN FEDERAL AGENCY USE OF REMOTE SENSING

Mr. AKAKA. Madam President, I commend to your attention a report entitled "Assessment of Remote Sensing Data Use By Civilian Federal Agencies," which was prepared by Dr. Sherri Stephan of the Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services and the Congressional Research Service. The report will be available on the Subcommittee's website.

In January 2001, I asked the CRS to conduct a survey of remote sensing data and technology use by Federal non-military agencies. Subcommittee staff used the CRS survey results, included in the report as an appendix, and collected agency responses to analyze how Federal agencies use remote sensing. It is my hope that this report will enable Congress to better understand the issues that arise in obtaining and applying the technology.

The widespread availability of detailed and accurate satellite imaging data has made the world increasingly transparent. Observational capabilities that only a few decades ago were classified and strictly limited are now owned and operated by both govern-

ment and private-sector organizations. For example, Space Imaging, a private satellite data company's web site contains satellite photos of the attack on Kandahar.

Satellite images have also revolutionized the study of the natural environment and global hazards, agriculture, transportation and urban planning, law enforcement, education, energy use, public health trends, and international policy. Researchers in my State of Hawaii, in partnership with NASA, NOAA and others, use remote sensing data for many purposes, such as to monitor water temperature and climate variability for tsunami early warning and evacuation planning, environmental impacts on fisheries, and volcanic activity monitoring.

There is now a national capability to provide remote-sensing data products and value-added information services directly to end users, such as farmers, foresters, fishermen, natural resource managers, and the public. Just this fall, researchers demonstrated on the island of Kauai how remote sensing data from unmanned aerial vehicles could be used to help determine precisely when a coffee crop is ready for harvesting.

New imaging technology and new data systems provide a rich opportunity for federal agencies to improve their services. The nineteen agencies included in this study span the roles of the federal government from basic research centers to law enforcement. All but four report some use of remote sensing data and technology. These agencies use data for environmental and conservation purposes, early warning and mitigation of natural disasters; basic and applied research, mapping activities, monitoring and verifying compliance with laws and treaties, agricultural activities, and transportation and shipping.

We also asked the agencies to share their concerns with remote sensing data. These concerns expressed their desire to use the data and technology more fully and efficiently. Many agencies had difficulties due to cost and licensing of commercial data and value-added products and analysis, as well as other access concerns. Several agencies were concerned about their capacity to exploit fully remote sensing data and technology, mostly due to a shortage of trained personnel within the agencies to analyze and interpret data.

This report offers several options to alleviate these concerns, but these are not the only possible solutions. Nor are they suggestions for action. The Federal Government uses remote sensing data in many ways, and it is unlikely that a single solution will solve all the problems associated with this use.

Since the first photographs of enemy troop positions from a hot air balloon in 1860, there have been military and

intelligence applications of remote sensing data. Today, in this new age of terrorism and homeland security concerns, users now include local first responders, city planners, and State officials. This creates a new challenge for commercial and government data providers to translate our impressive imagery technology into a capability that can be exploited by users quickly and easily.

I would like to thank the staff of the Congressional Research Service, especially Marcia Smith, for her able assistance in preparing this report.

#### LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred November 5, 1994 in Laguna Beach, CA. A gay man was attacked by two men yelling anti-gay slurs. The assailants, Donald Nichols, 18, and an unnamed 16-year-old boy, were charged with robbery and assault with a deadly weapon in connection with the incident.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

#### LIFT THE HOLD ON S. 1499

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter to our majority leader, Senator DASCHLE, regarding my request to hold all non-judicial nominations that come before the Senate until all holds are lifted on S. 1499, the American Small Business Emergency Relief and Recovery Act of 2001. I want to make sure that my colleagues are aware of what I am doing and why.

As I just mentioned, my actions have everything to do with emergency assistance for small businesses. They are literally dying in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on September 11. They badly need access to affordable financing and management counseling until business returns to normal, and the administration's approach is not adequately helping those who need it.

Senator BOND and I introduced S. 1499 on October 4 to address the needs of small businesses trying to hold on in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks. For almost 2 months, emergency legislation with 63 sponsors has been

blocked from being considered because the administration and two Republican Senators have chosen to put holds on legislation rather than debate the bill and cast a vote.

Today there is an article in the Miami Herald that says, “. . . [there aren't] any objections to having the Kerry-Bond bill come to the floor for a debate as long as the Administration's and the Small Business Administration's concerns were aired.” That implies that we haven't given them a chance to express their concerns and to work with us to pass this bill, when we have.

We went to great efforts to work with SBA, Senator KYL and his staff, and the administration. This has gone on long enough. I have not placed a hold on non-judicial nominees in haste. I do it because I have no alternative. Small businesses need assistance, the administration's approach isn't adequate to meet the needs of those businesses, and Senator BOND and I have a sensible approach to reach them. I ask my colleagues to lift their holds on the bill, let us debate the bill, and let us vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to Senator DASCHLE be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,  
Washington, DC, December 12, 2001.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,  
Majority Leader, United States Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: As you know, Senator Bond and I have introduced and are trying to gain Senate passage of S. 1499, the “American Small Business Emergency Relief and Recovery Act of 2001.” This legislation, supported by 63 Senators, would provide emergency and immediate financial assistance to small businesses around the country who are suffering tremendous financial loss following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. More specifically, the bill would leverage \$860 million in federal dollars to make available \$25 billion in loans and venture capital to ailing small businesses. The bill has widespread support in the business community, and is endorsed by 36 groups concerned with the financial health of small businesses including the US Chamber of Commerce, the National League of Cities, the US Conference of Mayors and the National Restaurant Association.

Despite the widespread and bipartisan support for this legislation, Senator Kyl continues to block its consideration by the Senate. Yesterday, Senator Kyl noted his concerns are based in large part on objections raised by the Administration. Senator Bond and I have attempted to negotiate with Senator Kyl and the Administration so that an agreement could be reached to move this legislation. However, it has become increasingly clear that Senator Kyl and the Administration are not interested in negotiating our differences. Rather, they are interested in delaying consideration of this important relief interminably—“running out the legislative clock” at the expense of the thousands of small businesses who are finding it more and more difficult to keep their doors open

without the relief they so desperately need in these difficult economic times.

For this reason, and regrettably, I have come to the conclusion that, having tried to negotiate in good faith, my only remaining option is to demonstrate, conclusively, that under no circumstances will we back away from our commitment to small businesses. To bring Sen. Kyl and the Administration back to the negotiating table in earnest, I would like to place a hold on all non-judicial executive nominations that may come before the Senate. It is my hope that this hold will be short-lived, as it will lead to more serious negotiations and ultimately Senate consideration of S. 1499. However, I am prepared to keep this hold in place until the Senate considers our bill. A simple yes or no vote on this important relief for small businesses is not too much to ask, and I hope that our Republican colleagues in the Senate will at long last allow us the opportunity to make good on our promise to help struggling businesses nationwide.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KERRY.

#### THE USA PATRIOT ACT OF 2001

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I rise to offer some guidance to the Secretary of the Treasury on the regulatory authority assigned to him by the Congress with the recent enactment of H.R. 3162, “The Patriot Act of 2001.”

As a member of the Senate Banking Committee, I authored an amendment to that legislation's anti-money laundering title, title III, the “International Money Laundering Abatement and Financial Anti-Terrorism Act of 2001,” which was included in the final legislation as signed by the President at Sec. 311. My amendment directs the Secretary of the Treasury to promulgate regulations defining “beneficial ownership of an account” for purposes of Section 5318A and subsections (i) and (j) of Section 5318 of the Bank Secrecy Act. I would like to offer some guidance to the Secretary of the Treasury concerning the Secretary's determination of “reasonable” and “practicable” steps for domestic financial institutions to ascertain the “beneficial ownership” of certain accounts as provided in Section 311 of the bill.

Section 311 of this legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to require domestic financial institutions and agencies to take one or more of five “special measures” if the Secretary of the Treasury finds that reasonable grounds exist to conclude that a foreign jurisdiction, a financial institution operating outside the United States, a class of international transactions, and/or types of accounts is of “primary money laundering concern.”

The second measure would require domestic financial institutions to take such steps as the Secretary determines to be “reasonable” and “practicable” to ascertain beneficial ownership of accounts opened or maintained in the

United States by a foreign person, excluding publicly traded foreign corporations, associated with what has been determined to be a primary money laundering concern.

In both Section 5318A(b)(1)(B)(iii) and (b)(2), the Secretary is given the authority to require steps the Secretary determines to be “reasonable and practicable” to identify the “beneficial ownership” of funds or accounts. Neither the phrase “beneficial ownership” nor the phrase “reasonable and practicable steps” is defined in the legislation, and there is no single accepted statutory or common-law meaning of either phrase that the legislation is meant to incorporate.

During the 106th Congress, the issue was dealt with by the House Banking Committee, which favorably reported H.R. 3886, which contained provisions nearly identical to those contained in Section 311 of H.R. 3162, but without the mandatory rulemaking requirement which my amendment added this year. Both in the 106th Congress and again this year, the concern has been expressed that this lack of statutory definition conceivably could result in a rule or order under either Section 5318A(b)(1)(B)(iii) or (b)(2) that requires financial institutions to identify all beneficial owners of funds or of an account, which in turn might result in some circumstances in clearly excessive and unjustifiable burdens. As the author of the amendment requiring the Secretary to undertake rulemaking in this area, I am sensitive to this concern, and I would expect the Secretary to address it when implementing this act, including when making determinations under the following provisions: (1) Section 5318A(a)(3)(B)(ii), which requires the Secretary to consider, in selecting which special measure to take, “whether the imposition of any particular special measure would create a significant competitive disadvantage, including any undue cost or burden associated with compliance, for financial institutions organized or licensed in the United States;” and (2) those above-referenced provisions that permit only those steps that the Secretary determines to be “reasonable and practicable” to identify the beneficial ownership of accounts or funds, which provisions impose an enforceable constraint on the substance of any rule or order under either Section 5318A(b)(1)(B)(iii) or (b)(2).

In addition, Section 5318A(e)(3) requires the Secretary to “promulgate regulations defining beneficial ownership of an account” for purposes of Section 5318A and subsections (i) and (j) of Section 5318. This is the Bennett amendment. Section 5318A(e)(4) gives the Secretary the authority, *inter alia*, to “define . . . terms for the purposes of” Section 5318A “by regulation.” I would strongly encourage the Secretary to define the meaning of the