

Of the 16 million men and women who served in World War II, only 5 million are alive today. We are now losing veterans of the greatest generation at the rate of 1,100 veterans a day. I questioned that, but we checked it; 1,100 veterans of World War II are passing away each day. By the year 2004, there will be less than 4 million of us.

In my home State of Alaska, in the last 10 years, we lost one-third of the veterans whom I had known and worked with so long.

The site design of our memorial has been endorsed by the Historic Preservation Officer of the District of Columbia, it has received four endorsements of the District of Columbia's Preservation Review Board, and five approvals each from the Committee on Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission.

The memorial is governed by the Commemorative Works Act of 1986. That act gave the final site and design approval to the Commission on Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission and the Secretary of the Interior.

Eight sites were considered for the memorial. In 1998, the design was approved by the Commission on Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission and the site selection was reaffirmed. In 1998, the National Park Service, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, completed an environmental assessment and issued a finding of no significant impact. In the year 2000, the final design was approved by the Commission on Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission, and on November 11 of last year, the year 2000, a ceremonial groundbreaking took place for this memorial.

More than 500,000 Americans have sent donations to the fundraising campaign, 48 State legislatures have done the same thing, 1,100 schools and more than 450 veterans groups, who represent 11 million veterans.

Even though all the procedural steps have been taken, the memorial has now been delayed because of a procedural issue involving the National Capital Planning Commission. The National Capital Planning Commission decision of 2 years ago of including a World War II memorial has been placed in question because the former National Capital Planning Commission chairman continued to serve after the expiration of his term. The legislation that would originally establish this commission permitted members to serve until replaced, but when that law was amended, inadvertently the language allowing continuous service fell out with no explanation. That created a technicality that has forced a review now, again, by the National Capital Planning Commission.

This memorial has been through 22 public hearings, it has complied with

every applicable law, and this technicality regarding the National Capital Planning Commission Board should not penalize the millions of veterans who served our country honorably when asked to do so. They want to see this memorial.

I congratulate the House of Representatives, particularly Congressman Stump, for sending this legislation to the Senate. I thank all who have been very considerate in trying to work out the problems relating to it. I believe I am joined by all the veterans of World War II who serve in this body in urging that the House bill be enacted and sent to the President for his signature immediately.

For many of us, this year marks the 55th year since we left the military service. We were in World War II and returned home.

We want to see this memorial finished while a significant number of our comrades are still alive. We want to be there when this memorial is opened.

Memorial Day for 2001 is just 1 week from next Monday. The veterans of this Nation intended to celebrate the initiation of this memorial on that day. They will not be able to do so unless the bill gets to the President in time to sign it. This is more than a dream of our veterans; it is a demand on our country. I urge no Senator stand in the way of the prompt enactment of this bill.

REQUEST FOR ABSENCE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be excused from the voting in the Senate until 6:30 p.m. next Tuesday, commencing at the adjournment today.

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

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I come to the Senate to report on the progress the Judiciary Committee is making with respect to a number of administration nominations to the Department of Justice.

Over the last several weeks, I have been working to reach an understanding on how this committee will handle nominations. A number of procedural and substantive issues have been raised in these regards for both Executive and Judicial Branch nominations. The Democratic members have sought to work out arrangements and understandings so that all members of the committee would know what our rules are, know what our practices and procedures will be, and understand how this committee will approach our important responsibilities with respect to nominations.

Over the last 2 weeks the chairman's insistence that the committee proceed

with nominations before those practices and procedures had been agreed upon has led to public reference to outstanding issues that we should have resolved first. I always regret when we are not able to work out matters through reason and cooperation. I do not believe it was appropriate for Republican members of this committee to deride Democratic members as acting "irresponsibly" or "despicably" or "in breach of their constitutional duties." I know that it was not helpful.

Nonetheless, I was proud of the Democratic members of this committee when we jointly sent our May 4 letter to the chairman and provided a way out of the impasse in spite of the name calling. A few days later the chairman responded with language that reflected our respectful tone and for which I thank him.

While I disagree with much of what the chairman argues and asserts in his letter, I appreciate that he has now indicated that with respect to judicial nominations, he "intends to be fully respectful of [Democratic Senators'] views and will assist in any way to ensure that you and our other Senate colleagues receive real, meaningful consultation by the White House on judicial nominees." I appreciate that in his letter he writes that he "respect[s our] views and efforts in ensuring [we] will be appropriately consulted in a meaningful manner on nominees to vacancies in [our] home states."

For the last several weeks, we have also been seeking to resolve concerns about how this committee handles certain confidential information about nominations, information that may reflect on their fitness for office, and may be relevant to how Senators in this committee vote on reporting nominations to the Senate, as well as how Senators vote on confirmations. Those concerns have also been pending for several weeks now without resolution. Those concerns are what prompted our request for an executive session in accordance with Rule 26.5 of the Standing Rules of the Senate so that we could fully discuss these very important matters in accordance with the confidentiality rules that bind us.

Those concerns made it inappropriate to proceed on certain matters over the last few weeks. Although our Republican colleagues knew about our concerns, they nonetheless berated us without any acknowledgment that those open issues, which affect executive as well as judicial nominations, were still unresolved. That, too, was most unfortunate.

Over the last several days I have also reached out to the Bush administration to work with us on ways to resolve these concerns. Those outreach efforts may provide the opportunity to reach a mutually acceptable resolution of these matters. I hope so.

In light of the cooperation we began receiving from the administration last

week, we were able to proceed to report and confirm Larry Thompson to be the Deputy Attorney General at the Department of Justice and Dan Bryant to be the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legislative Affairs. I understand that they were sworn in last Friday and, again, congratulate them and their families.

I have spoken to Attorney General Ashcroft about the staffing needs of the Department of Justice and assured him that I will do my part. For those with short memories, I note that Attorney General Ashcroft was confirmed 6 weeks before Attorney General Reno's confirmation in the last administration and the Deputy Attorney General was confirmed 3 weeks before his counterpart in the last administration. Assistant Attorney General Bryant was confirmed 7 weeks before his counterpart in the previous administration.

The committee is moving expeditiously on the administration's nominations to the Department of Justice. Indeed, we are ahead of the confirmations schedule of the Clinton administration for each and every nominee confirmed to date.

The Clinton administration's Assistant Attorney General to head the Criminal Division was not confirmed until November. The committee proceeded to consider the Chertoff nomination this week, after a hearing last week. That is extremely expeditious. Indeed, in spite of Mr. Chertoff's role as the lead counsel to the Republicans in the Whitewater investigation, an extremely partisan effort, we are moving ahead. Mr. Chertoff explained at his hearing that he understands the role of the head of the Criminal Division and will carry out those functions without regard to politics or partisanship. I believe him and look forward to working with him.

The Assistant Attorney General to head the Office for Policy Development in the last administration was not confirmed until August, 95 days after her nomination. Professor Dinh did not return his responses to written questions until this Tuesday. He was precipitously placed on the committee agenda last week. Once his responses were in, he was considered and reported out this week, months ahead of his counterpart in the last administration.

While we consider the current nominations, the many dedicated employees at the Department of Justice continue to work, do their jobs, and serve the public. Many of the comments made over the last several weeks disparage their fine work and commitment. I see no evidence that the Department is "floundering" or that the dedicated public servants who staff the Department and the United States Attorneys' offices around the country have stopped doing their jobs.

The chairman has noticed another hearing for Department of Justice

nominees next week, although he has yet to specify who will be included at that hearing, which is less than a week away. Democrats on the committee are continuing to work expeditiously and cooperatively to consider, report and confirm the vast majority of the President's nominations to the Department of Justice.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT COMPLIANCE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, pursuant to section 313(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I submit for the RECORD a list of material in S. 896 considered to be extraneous under subsections (b)(1)(A), (b)(1)(B), and (b)(1)(E) of section 313. The inclusion or exclusion of material on the following list does not constitute a determination of extraneousness by the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

To the best of my knowledge, S. 896, the Restoring Earnings to Lift Individuals and Empower Families (RELIEF) Reconciliation Act of 2001, contains no material considered to be extraneous under subsections (b)(1)(A), (b)(1)(B), and (b)(1)(E) of section 313 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

PROJECT SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, in a speech in Philadelphia on Monday, President Bush spoke out about gun violence in this country. Citing alarming statistics about the number of Americans killed and injured by handguns each year, he stated that "this is unacceptable in America. It's just unacceptable, and we're going to do something about it." The President emphasized that "we're going to reduce gun violence in America, and those who commit crimes with guns will find a determined adversary in my administration." I commend the President for his commitment to helping eliminate gun violence.

In his speech, the President introduced "Project Safe Neighborhoods," an initiative to combat gun violence. The main focus of this initiative is on the increased enforcement of existing gun laws and more vigorous prosecution of crimes committed with handguns. The President plans to devote \$550 million in funding to this initiative over the next 2 years. The majority of the funding will be dedicated to hiring new Federal and State prosecutors to focus on gun crimes, updating State criminal record systems, improving Federal ballistics testing that trace illegal guns and developing regional task forces of Federal, State and local law enforcement agencies to catch and prosecute criminals in gun cases.

Although there is often disagreement about the best approach to ending gun violence, we can all agree that enforcement of our gun laws and prosecution

of people who use guns illegally are essential elements to any successful approach. Since 1993, increased law enforcement and prosecution efforts have resulted in a 16 percent increase in the number of gun cases filed and a 41 percent increase in the number of offenders sentenced to more than 5 years in prison. These increases in enforcement efforts enjoy broad bipartisan support. I commend the President for building upon this consensus by taking another step toward ensuring that gun criminals are prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

While I agree with the aims of the President's initiative, I believe that it is not enough. We must also make it harder for criminals to get guns in the first place, by closing the gun show loophole that allows the purchase of handguns without a background check. Although he stated during the presidential campaign that he supported closing the gun show loophole, President Bush did not mention it in his speech on Monday. The President expressed that "Project Safe Neighborhoods is one step, an important step" toward making domestic tranquility a reality. I hope that the President will take the next, necessary step toward protecting the citizens of this country by supporting efforts to close the gun show loophole.

SUBMITTING CHANGES TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, FUNCTIONAL LEVELS, AND BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, section 310(c)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, provides the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee with authority to revise committee allocations, functional levels, and budgetary aggregates for a reconciliation bill which fulfills an instruction with respect to both outlays and revenues. The Chairman's authority under 310(c) may be exercised if the following conditions have been satisfied:

1. The Committee on Finance reports a bill which changes the mix of the instructed revenue and outlay changes by not more than 20 percent of the sum of the components of the instruction, and

2. The Committee on Finance still complies with the overall reconciliation instruction.

I find that S. 896, as reported, satisfies the two conditions above and, pursuant to my authority under section 310(c), I hereby submit revisions to H. Con. Res. 83, the 2002 Budget Resolution. The attached tables show the current 2002 Budget Resolution figures as well as the revised committee allocations, functional levels, and budgetary aggregates, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.