

still meet all of the substantive requirements of United States trademark law in order to gain protection in the United States based on an international application filed under the Madrid Protocol. In short, it is a win-win situation for American trademark owners.

As my colleagues here know, United States adherence to the Madrid Protocol was stalled for years over administrative provisions—unrelated to the substance of the Protocol itself—relating to voting rights. Since 1994, the Administration voiced objections to these provisions, which would allow an inter-governmental organization, e.g., the European Union, a vote in certain treaty matters taken before the Assembly, separate and apart from the votes of its member states. Although matters before the Assembly would largely be limited to administrative matters, e.g., those involving formalities and fee changes, the concern expressed has been that these provisions, which appear to violate the democratic principle of one vote for each state, would create an undesirable precedent in future international agreements.

While this stumbling block to United States accession to the Protocol has been the subject of much negotiation between the United States and the European Union, I am pleased that a successful resolution on this issue of voting rights has been reached, and I was pleased that the Senate finally received the Administration's request for its advice and consent last year. By passing The Madrid Protocol Implementation Act, we will take an important step in making sure that American trademark owners will be able to take full advantage of the benefits of the Protocol as soon as it comes into force with respect to the United States. This is a particularly important measure for American competitiveness, and for the individual businesses in each of our states. I want to thank Senator LEAHY for his leadership with respect to this legislation, and I look forward to my colleagues' support for it.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 408. A bill to provide emergency relief to small businesses affected by significant increases in the price of electricity; to the Committee on Small Business.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the Small Business Electricity Emergency Relief Act. As the electricity crisis in California continues, small businesses are being hit hard by the increase in electricity prices.

Across California, small business owners are opening their electricity bills only to be in a state of shock. In some cases they find that their bills have doubled, and sometimes even tripled. This has resulted in many small

businesses having to close their doors and many more facing severe economic hardship.

Under the Small Business Electricity Emergency Relief Act of 2001, the Small Business Administration could make loans to small businesses that have suffered economic injury due to a "sharp and significant increase" in their electricity bills.

This legislation will provide California's small businesses with some much needed financial relief. This will greatly assist small businesses in the San Diego region that suffered dramatic increases in their electricity bills last summer.

Small businesses represent the heart of our great state's thriving economy. This legislation will ensure that these small businesses are provided assistance to help keep their lights on.

STATEMENTS ON SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 28—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY AND LEGAL REPRESENTATION IN STATE OF IDAHO V. FREDRICK LEROY LEAS, SR.

Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.

S. RES. 28

Whereas, in the case of State of Idaho v. Fredrick Leroy Leas, Sr., C. No. CR-00-01326, pending in the District Court Of The Second Judicial District Of The State Of Idaho, in and for the County of Latah, testimony has been subpoenaed from Cindy Agidius, an employee in the office of Senator Mike Crapo;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Cindy Agidius is authorized to testify in the case of State of Idaho v. Fredrick Leroy Leas, Sr., except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Cindy Agidius in connection with the testimony authorized in section one of this resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 29—HONORING DALE EARNHARDT AND EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE TO HIS FAMILY ON HIS DEATH

Mr. EDWARDS (for himself and Mr. HELMS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

S. RES. 29

Whereas the Senate has heard with great sadness of the death of Dale Earnhardt in a tragic accident;

Whereas Dale Earnhardt, a native of Kannapolis, North Carolina, represents a genuine American success story, rising from poverty to become a racing legend and accomplished businessman;

Whereas Dale Earnhardt became the first driver to follow Rookie of the Year honors in 1979 with the Winston Cup championship the next year;

Whereas Dale Earnhardt is tied only with Richard Petty in winning seven Winston Cup Series titles during his 26 years in racing;

Whereas Dale Earnhardt followed in his father's footsteps as a stock car driver, and earned the nickname "The Intimidator" for his aggressive racing style with which he went on to win 76 career races, including the 1998 Daytona 500;

Whereas Dale Earnhardt was not only devoted to the sport of racing, but to his family as the loving husband of Teresa, and loving father of Taylor Nicole, Dale Jr., Kelley, and Kerry;

Whereas Dale Earnhardt's love for life and countless contributions to family and the State of North Carolina serve as an inspiration to millions;

Whereas Dale Earnhardt contributed significantly to the growth and popularity of NASCAR in America through his support of and dedication to racing;

Whereas fans across the nation mourn the untimely loss of one of NASCAR's greatest champions;

Whereas in days following the passing of Dale Earnhardt, fellow drivers and NASCAR officials repeatedly referred to him as "the greatest driver in the history of the sport";

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) Recognizes that the world has too soon lost one of its most beloved sports heroes and one of the greatest drivers in racing history; and honors him in his devotion to life, family, and motor sports; and

(2) expresses its deep and heartfelt condolences to the family of Dale Earnhardt on their tragic loss.

SENATE RESOLUTION 30—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. DOMENICI submitted the following original resolution; from the Committee on the Budget; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. RES. 30

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting

such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget (referred to in this resolution as the "committee") is authorized from March 1, 2001, through February 28, 2003, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2001.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2001, through September 30, 2001, under this section shall not exceed \$2,880,615, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$20,000, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$4,000, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2001, through September 30, 2002, under this section shall not exceed \$5,112,126, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$20,000, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$4,000, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2003.—For the period October 1, 2002, through February 28, 2003, expenses of the committee under this section shall not exceed \$2,187,120, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$20,000, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946); and

(2) not to exceed \$4,000, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 2. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2003.

SEC. 3. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), any expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees of the committee who are paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications expenses provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee for the period March 1, 2001, through September 30, 2001, for the period October 1, 2001, through September 30, 2002, and for the period October 1, 2002, through February 28, 2003, to be paid from the appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations" of the Senate.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THERE SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE PARITY BETWEEN THE ADJUSTMENTS IN THE COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES AND THE ADJUSTMENTS IN THE COMPENSATION OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. AKAKA) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

S. CON. RES. 17

Whereas members of the uniformed services of the United States and civilian employees of the United States make significant contributions to the general welfare of the United States;

Whereas increases in the levels of pay of members of the uniformed services and of civilian employees of the United States have not kept pace with increases in the overall levels of pay of workers in the private sector;

Whereas there is a 32 percent gap between the compensation levels of Federal civilian employees and the compensation levels of private sector workers, and an estimated 10 percent gap between the compensation levels of members of the uniformed services and the compensation levels of private sector workers; and

Whereas in almost every year of the past 2 decades, members of the uniformed services and civilian employees of the United States have received equal adjustments in compensation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that there should continue to be parity between the adjustments in the compensation of members of the uniformed services and the adjustments in the compensation of civilian employees of the United States.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senators WARNER, MIKULSKI, BINGAMAN, and KENNEDY in introducing a resolution which would express the sense of the Congress that parity between Federal civilian pay and military pay should be maintained. A comparison of military and civilian pay increases by the Congressional Research Service finds that in 17 of these

last 20 years military and civilian pay increases have been identical. Disparate treatment of civilian and military pay goes against longstanding policy of parity for all those who have chosen to serve our Nation—whether that service be in the civilian workforce or in the armed services.

In the 106th Congress, an overwhelming majority of the United States Senate agreed, and approved a bipartisan pay parity amendment on February 24, 1999 by a vote of 94 to 6 during consideration of S. 4, the Soldiers', Sailors', Airmen's, and Marines Bill of Rights Act. In many instances, Federal civilian and military employees work side-by-side doing the important work of the Nation, and the Senate has recognized that we should not undermine the morale of these very dedicated public servants by failing to bring them in line with military personnel.

The rationales for an increase in military and civilian pay are the same. Both the armed services and the Federal civilian workforce need to address critical retention and recruitment problems. This year, the General Accounting Office, GAO, has added "human capital" as one of the areas of high risk for the Federal government. A wave of potential retirements threaten institutional experience and knowledge at every level. An estimated 53 percent of the Federal workforce will be eligible to retire by 2004. By that same time, approximately 60 percent of the Senior Executive Service, our top civilian managers, will be eligible for retirement.

These vacancies will occur in an era in which those entering the workforce are less likely to join public service. As the GAO has noted, the "Federal government has often acted as if its people were costs to be cut rather than assets to be valued." Congress has continually asked Federal employees to make significant sacrifices for the sake of our Nation's fiscal health. FEPCA, legislation passed in 1990 to bring the pay of Federal employees in line with that offered in the private sector, has never been fully implemented. Between 1993 and 1999, the executive branch has cut 17 percent of its workforce, totaling 377,000 full time positions. In 1996, Federal employees were forced to make higher contributions to their retirement plans in order to help pay down the national debt. But through it all, Federal employees have continued to provide high quality service to the American public, usually with fewer resources and personnel.

One way to ensure the Federal government is able to attract and retain qualified public servants is to ensure parity between civil service employees and members of the armed forces. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important resolution.