

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY last month. 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 heinous crime that occurred November 7, 1999 in Lawrence, KS. Two heterosexual men, one a student at Kansas University, were walking down the street when some men directed anti-gay epithets at them. After responding to the remarks, the two were attacked by five men. One of the victims was knocked backwards on a concrete planter and held down while two attackers struck his face with their fists. The other ran to call the police. This was the third such incident in as many months. One of the victims said that the police initially told him they could not arrest the perpetrators because, "it was their word against ours."

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.

ROLE OF THE FEDERAL OMBUDSMEN IN DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, last week the General Accounting Office, GAO, released a report I requested entitled "Human Capital: The Role of Ombudsmen in Dispute Resolution." The report studies the use of Federal ombudsman offices as an informal alternative to existing and more conventional processes to deal with personnel conflicts inside Federal agencies.

I know that traditional formal dispute resolution processes have long been criticized. To address these concerns, the Federal Government promotes and encourages alternative methods including the use of ombudsmen. This has resulted in the greater use of alternative dispute resolution, ADR, practices, both because of legislation, specifically the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act of 1990, ADRA, and because of a desire to resolve workplaces conflicts quickly to the mutual benefit of both the employee and the agency. I wish to point out that ombudsmen are not themselves an alternative means of dispute resolution, but rather a neutral practitioner of dispute resolution practices, including ADR techniques, to handle complaints.

I support strong workplace protections to protect Federal employees from arbitrary agency actions and prohibited personnel practices. Ombuds-

men provide another way to ensure a more rapid conclusion to workplace problems. These offices may also provide another tool in assisting agencies in attracting, retaining, and motivating their workforces. In fact, this report concludes that "ombudsman offices can offer a useful option for agencies to consider in developing their overall human capital management policies and practices." Another plus is that these offices focus on identifying systemic issues and developing conflict prevention strategies.

The GAO identified 22 workplace ombudsman offices in 10 agencies. Their "best practices" report focuses for illustrative purposes on offices within three agencies: The National Institutes of Health, NIH, the International Broadcasting Bureau, IBB, and the U.S. Secret Service.

NIH has one of the most developed ombudsman offices, which was established in 1997, and now has four full time ombudsmen. The IBB office began as a part-time position in 1988, and now has two full-time officials. The Secret Service's office, started in 1987, employs one full-time staff member and nine collateral-duty people serving the Secret Service's field offices.

These ombudsmen are high-level managers with broad authority to deal with almost any workplace issue, including answering questions about agency policies, cutting through "red tape," counseling employees and coaching them on how to manage situations, handling accusations about employment discrimination, and workplace safety issues. Ombudsmen are a resource for Federal workers with workplace issues; an office which they can consult that is independent, neutral, and provides confidentiality.

The 1990 ADRA authorizes the use of ombudsman offices but does not define or set standards for an ombudsman. The Act, as amended in 1996, established the Interagency ADR Working Group. There is also a Coalition of Federal Ombudsmen. The NIH, IBB, and Secret Service ombudsmen who participated in the GAO report are involved with both these and outside organizations. Some of the non-Federal Government organizations have published or drafted standards of practice for ombudsmen. These standards focus on the core principals of independence, neutrality, and confidentiality, which requires a commitment from the highest levels within an agency. This commitment is the guiding force in the success of the three offices studied by the GAO.

In addition to support from senior management, an ombudsman office must work closely with unions representing Federal workers. The General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority has issued guidance concerning the establishment of ADR programs and the Federal Service

Labor-Management Relations Statute. It is essential that ombudsmen do not come in conflict with the role of unions in protecting worker rights. From the case studies examined by the GAO, there appeared to be good relations between ombudsmen and unions in the agencies where employees are represented by unions. As agencies consider this and other alternatives to traditional dispute resolution, there must be assurances that employees' rights are maintained throughout the process of implementing these practices.

I recommend this General Accounting Office report to my colleagues, and I commend Anthony P. Lofaro of the GAO for his contribution to this report, along with Stephen Altman and Katherine Brentzel. It provides excellent background and a best practices blueprint for Federal agencies as they consider employing ombudsman to assist their employees.

AMERICAN INDIAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on American Indian Heritage Month, which is celebrated in Minnesota in May. It is fitting that we take time during this month to recall the contributions, services and heritage of our fellow Native American citizens, and to remember that the enormous contributions and talents of Native American continue to enrich our lives every day.

In our review of these vital contributions, we must acknowledge the courage, talent, determination, leadership and vision of those men, women and children who made an impact on our Nation in the face of incredible obstacles. We should be mindful, as we celebrate the culture, heritage and spiritual contributions of the first Americans, that we must re-dedicate ourselves to preserving the unique relationship between Native Americans tribal governments and the Federal Government.

Many of the basic principles of our Constitution, such as freedom of speech and separation of powers, were embodied in practices already in use by American Indian tribal prior to our Republic. Many of our deepest values, such as respect for the preservation of natural resources, reverence for elders, and adherence to tradition, find root in American Indian traditions.

The relationship between American Indians and the Federal Government is unique and finds no parallel. When the United States was organized as a Nation, government officials continued the practice from the Dutch and British of making treaty agreements with American Indian Nations whenever land boundaries needed to be clarified or negotiated.

All of the land in Minnesota was gained by the United States through a