

any progress, and they fall victim to it and watch their state crumble.

On every continent, AIDS is traveling along social fault lines and exploiting the weaknesses, hurting both lives and economies.

HIV/AIDS is a national security issue that is as important to our time as the war on terrorism. It is an economic issue, a health and safety issue, and it is a moral issue. Without comprehensive action, the HIV/AIDS epidemic will worsen, demanding even more attention and funding. That is why I introduce this bill to reset global AIDS as a top priority in this Congress.

The main purpose of the bill is to provide a comprehensive response to the AIDS pandemic and acknowledge the growing need for resources. In the form of specialized initiatives, my bill will focus on the growing number of AIDS orphans, the lack of health professionals in AIDS-ravaged countries, and the lack of access to affordable treatment for the majority of those afflicted with HIV/AIDS.

I have designed the Global CARE Act to achieve four major goals: Better coordination of our own agencies in fighting global AIDS; the provision of programs that address all components necessary to support a comprehensive response to HIV/AIDS, including prevention, treatment, care, and investment in broader health systems and national economies; increased accountability for the health and policy objectives we will seek to achieve with our financial and human investment; and the ability to mobilize the most effective human capacity-building tools to address the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

Last year, I introduced a version of this bill which authorized \$2.5 billion in global AIDS spending for fiscal year 2003. For fiscal year 2004, I have proposed authorization levels of \$3.35 billion. The United States, unfortunately, only contributed \$1 billion to fighting this epidemic in 2002. With the passage of the Durbin-DeWine amendment, the Senate allocated \$1.525 billion in its fiscal year 2003 appropriations bills. This is a breakthrough—a 50-percent increase by the United States in its commitment.

But these funding levels are still far short of the goal. To meet the need, our target for fiscal year 2004 should be in the \$3.35 billion range. Frankly, when you look at the world this year, the global need just to fight HIV/AIDS stands at \$8.2 billion. Despite these good efforts by the United States, we can do more. But other countries in the world can do more as well. Let them join the President and the Congress in our commitment to this fight. We have been shortchanging this epidemic for too long. We take tiny steps in pursuit of a challenge that is racing away from us.

Because the spread of this disease remains in its infancy, we have to look at it in more serious terms. We must do more for the 42 million people worldwide who are living with HIV/

AIDS, and we have to understand that the disease is not going to wait for our political determination.

A 15-year-old boy in Botswana faces an 80-percent chance of dying from AIDS. We have to change his future. To do that, the Global CARE Act addresses this epidemic aggressively and honestly. I hope this bill will provide a basic blueprint for the United States, and I hope we can join on a bipartisan basis in passing it. I hope my colleagues who read my remarks and follow this debate will believe, as I do, that the President has given us a great opportunity on a bipartisan basis to stand together and tell the world that this caring Nation is committed to dealing honestly and effectively with the global AIDS crisis.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. REID, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. KYL, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. WARNER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. BURNS, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DAYTON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. INHOFE, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 253. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code to exempt qualified current and former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act of 2003. I am also especially pleased to have Senators PATRICK LEAHY and ORRIN HATCH joining me today as lead original cosponsors.

The Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act would permit qualified current and former law enforcement officers to carry concealed firearms across jurisdictions. This legislation has several important benefits. First, the American public will be safer as off-duty and retired law enforcement officers are allowed to carry concealed weapons as they travel across jurisdictions. If enacted into law, the basic net effect of this legislation will be thousands of additional police officers on the streets, at zero taxpayer expense. There are many examples of off-duty officers coming to the rescue of American citizens facing dire situations. Hopefully, with this bill's passage, we will hear about even more of these stories in the future.

Terrorists and violent criminals certainly will not be happy when this bill is passed. They will have additional worries, and hopefully may be deterred, because they will not be sure whether or not seemingly average citizens are actually off-duty or retired law en-

forcement officers who are armed, trained and ready to deal with whatever situation may arise.

This legislation will also help off-duty and retired law enforcement officers protect themselves and their families. All too often, after they are released from prison, violent criminals seek revenge against the law enforcement officers who helped lock them away. While at a minimum this legislation will even the playing field for off-duty and retired law enforcement officers, I hope that it will go further and actually give them an advantage.

This important law enforcement legislation is especially meaningful to me for a number of reasons. First of all, through six years of service as a Deputy Sheriff with Sacramento County, California, I was able to get first-hand experience with the challenges facing our nation's law enforcement officers. As a Deputy Sheriff, I have personally patrolled the streets and encountered plenty of dangerous characters, far too many of which were armed and dangerous. I also clearly learned that a law enforcement officer's job does not necessarily end when he or she is off-duty since you never know when you may come face-to-face with violent criminals.

Finally, now that I serve as a U.S. Senator, I have made passing pro-law enforcement legislation one of my top priorities.

Previous versions of this legislation have enjoyed the support of over one hundred national, state and local law enforcement organizations. The Fraternal Order of Police is a key leader among those organizations. For many years now, the FOP has supported passage of this legislation. I am encouraged that the FOP has made it clear that we will be working together once again in our efforts to get this bill passed and signed into law by President Bush. I want to take a moment to express my appreciation for Chuck Canterbury, National President of the FOP, the rest of the FOP's professional staff and the over 300,000 members of the FOP they represent, for the letter of support for the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act of 2003.

I am pleased that Judiciary Committee Chairman ORRIN HATCH and Ranking Democratic Member PATRICK LEAHY are playing vital roles in advancing this legislation as lead original cosponsors. Over the years, I have championed a number of legislative initiatives aimed at helping our nation's law enforcement officers be better supported and protected as they go about their mission of protecting the American people. These accomplishments include a public law that continues to help state and local law enforcement officers acquire life saving bullet-proof vests and a federal grant-making program that helps our nation's schools acquire the School Resource Officers they need to reduce the threat of violence in our public schools. Senators LEAHY and HATCH have played

important roles in getting each of these legislative initiatives accomplished.

The key goal of the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act I am introducing today has been one of my law enforcement legislative priorities since I first introduced similar legislation back in 1997 during the 105th Congress. Since that time, I have introduced the legislation twice more, in 1999 and 2001. Fortunately, the Judiciary Committee made good progress on conceal carry legislation late last year before the 107th Congress completed its work for the year. As we begin anew in the 108th Congress, I hope we will be able to recapture the momentum and finally get this legislation passed and enacted. Just as we worked together in past years to get things done, I look forward to working with Senators LEAHY and HATCH to do what it takes to successfully turn this worthy legislation into the law of the land. Many years of work and persistence may finally be paying off for all of us, especially our nation's law enforcement officers.

It is worth noting that the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act of 2003 legislation being introduced here today enjoys the strong bipartisan support of thirty-one of my fellow Senators as original cosponsors. I urge the rest of my colleagues to join us in supporting the successful passage of this important Campbell-Leahy-Hatch legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the legislation I am introducing today, the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act of 2003, and the Fraternal Order of Police's letter of support, be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, AS FOLLOWS:

GRAND LODGE,  
FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,  
Washington, DC, January 24, 2003.

Hon. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: On behalf of the more than 300,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I am writing to advise you or our strong support for legislation you intend to introduce to exempt qualified active and retired law enforcement officers from State and local prohibitions with respect to the carrying of firearms. The passage of this legislation has been designated the top legislative priority of the Fraternal Order of Police and we are proud to have a former law enforcement officer as the sponsor of this bill.

Having served six years as a Deputy Sheriff in Sacramento County, you know firsthand the challenges faced by our nation's law enforcement officers. Police officers put their lives on the line every day and are trained throughout their careers to carry and, in worst-case scenarios use, firearms to defend themselves and the public they are sworn to protect. However, the bewildering patchwork of laws in the States often results in a paradox for law enforcement officers, sometimes placing them in legal and physical jeopardy. Criminals and terrorists do not disarm themselves when they travel from jurisdiction to

jurisdiction, and neither should America's police officers.

This is not about firearms—it is about officer safety. After 11 September 2001, it became an important public safety and homeland security issue as well.

The danger inherent to police work and the possibility that an officer will need to respond to an emergency situation does not end with the shift. Criminals and terrorists are never off-duty, making law enforcement officers targets in uniform and out, on duty and off, active or retired. The legislation you intend to offer will give us the ability to defend ourselves at all times by providing qualified active and retired law enforcement officers with the authority to carry their firearms in all U.S. jurisdictions, so long as they have photographic identification issued by the agency for which they are or were employed.

I applaud you for your leadership and you continuing efforts on behalf of our nation's law enforcement officers. It is our hope that we will finally be able to get a bill to the President's desk in this Congress, and we look forward to working with you on this issue. Please do not hesitate to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco through my Washington office if we can be of any assistance on this or any other matter.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,  
National President.

S. 253

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act of 2003".

#### SEC. 2. EXEMPTION OF QUALIFIED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS FROM STATE LAWS PROHIBITING THE CARRYING OF CONCEALED FIREARMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 926A the following:

##### "§ 926B. Carrying of concealed firearms by qualified law enforcement officers

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of the law of any State or any political subdivision thereof, an individual who is a qualified law enforcement officer and who is carrying the identification required by subsection (d) may carry a concealed firearm that has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce, subject to subsection (b).

"(b) This section shall not be construed to supersede or limit the laws of any State that—

"(1) permit private persons or entities to prohibit or restrict the possession of concealed firearms on their property; or

"(2) prohibit or restrict the possession of firearms on any State or local government property, installation, building, base, or park.

"(c) As used in this section, the term 'qualified law enforcement officer' means an employee of a governmental agency who—

"(1) is authorized by law to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of, or the incarceration of any person for, any violation of law, and has statutory powers of arrest;

"(2) is authorized by the agency to carry a firearm;

"(3) is not the subject of any disciplinary action by the agency;

"(4) meets standards, if any, established by the agency which require the employee to regularly qualify in the use of a firearm; and

"(5) is not prohibited by Federal law from receiving a firearm.

"(d) The identification required by this subsection is the photographic identification

issued by the governmental agency for which the individual is, or was, employed as a law enforcement officer.

"(e) DEFINED TERM.—As used in this section, the term 'firearm' does not include—

"(1) any machinegun (as defined in section 5845 of title 26);

"(2) any firearm silencer (as defined in section 921); and

"(3) any destructive device (as defined in section 921)."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 926A the following:

"926B. Carrying of concealed firearms by qualified law enforcement officers."

#### SEC. 3. EXEMPTION OF QUALIFIED RETIRED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS FROM STATE LAWS PROHIBITING THE CARRYING OF CONCEALED FIREARMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is further amended by inserting after section 926B the following:

##### "§ 926C. Carrying of concealed firearms by qualified retired law enforcement officers

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of the law of any State or any political subdivision thereof, an individual who is a qualified retired law enforcement officer and who is carrying the identification required by subsection (d) may carry a concealed firearm that has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce, subject to subsection (b).

"(b) This section shall not be construed to supersede or limit the laws of any State that—

"(1) permit private persons or entities to prohibit or restrict the possession of concealed firearms on their property; or

"(2) prohibit or restrict the possession of firearms on any State or local government property, installation, building, base, or park.

"(c) As used in this section, the term 'qualified retired law enforcement officer' means an individual who—

"(1) retired in good standing from service with a public agency as a law enforcement officer, other than for reasons of mental instability;

"(2) before such retirement, was authorized by law to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of, or the incarceration of any person for, any violation of law, and had statutory powers of arrest;

"(3)(A) before such retirement, was regularly employed as a law enforcement officer for an aggregate of 15 years or more; or

"(B) retired from service with such agency, after completing any applicable probationary period of such service, due to a service-connected disability, as determined by such agency;

"(4) has a nonforfeitable right to benefits under the retirement plan of the agency;

"(5) during the most recent 12-month period, has met, at the expense of the individual, the State's standards for training and qualification for active law enforcement officers to carry firearms; and

"(6) is not prohibited by Federal law from receiving a firearm.

"(d) The identification required by this subsection is photographic identification issued by the agency for which the individual was employed as a law enforcement officer.

"(e) DEFINED TERM.—As used in this section, the term 'firearm' does not include—

"(1) any machinegun (as defined in section 5845 of title 26);

"(2) any firearm silencer (as defined in section 921); and

"(3) a destructive device (as defined in section 921)."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such chapter is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 926B the following:

“926C. Carrying of concealed firearms by qualified retired law enforcement officers.”.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am proud to join Senator CAMPBELL to introduce the “Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act of 2003,” which permits current and retired law enforcement officers to carry a firearm and be prepared to assist in dangerous situations. During his time in the Senate, Senator CAMPBELL has been a leader in the area of law enforcement. As a former deputy sheriff, he knows the difficulties law enforcement officers face due to the patchwork of conceal-carry laws in State and local jurisdictions. He and I have worked together on several pieces of law enforcement legislation, such as the Bulletproof Vests Partnership Grant Acts of 1998 and 2000. I look forward to working with him on our bipartisan bill.

I am pleased that 30 Senators, including Judiciary Committee Chairman HATCH and Committee Members SCHUMER, EDWARDS, FEINSTEIN, GRASSLEY, KYL, SESSIONS, DEWINE, CRAIG, GRAHAM, and CORNYN, as well as Assistant Democratic Leader REID and Assistant Republican Leader MCCONNELL—have joined Senator CAMPBELL and me as original cosponsors of this bill in an effort to make our communities safer and better to protect law enforcement officers and their families. In the last Congress, Senator HATCH and I worked together to reach consensus and have the Judiciary Committee approve this legislation by an 18-1 vote. I thank Senator HATCH for his past support and look forward to working with him again on our bipartisan bill.

We introduce this measure in the Senate at the request of the Fraternal Order of Police, which strongly supports this legislation to protect officers and their families from vindictive criminals and to permit officers to respond immediately to a crime when off duty. Last year, when I chaired the Judiciary Committee, I was honored to work closely with FOP’s National President, Lt. Steve Young, whose death earlier this month was a sad loss for all of us. Steve was dedicated to this legislation because he understood the importance of having law enforcement officers across the nation armed and prepared whenever and wherever threats to our peace or to our public safety arise. I will continue my close work with the FOP and its new National President, Major Chuck Canterbury, to pass this legislation into law.

There are approximately 740,000 sworn law enforcement officers currently serving in the United States. Since the first recorded police death in 1792, there have been more than 16,400 law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty. A total of 1,694 law enforcement officers died in the line of duty over the last decade, an average of 170 deaths per year. Roughly 5 per-

cent of officers who die are killed taking law enforcement action while in an off-duty capacity. On average, more than 62,000 law enforcement officers are assaulted each year, resulting in some 21,000 injuries.

Until 2001, violent crime in this country had declined each of the preceding 8 years. Indeed, it had declined by 40 percent since it peaked at 4 million violent crimes in 1993. Community policing and the outstanding work of so many law enforcement officers played a vital key in our crime control efforts. Unfortunately, during the past two years the downward trend in violent crime ended and violent crime turned upward. Last month, the FBI reported that crime rose slightly in the first half of 2002, including a 2.3 percent increase in murders. The preliminary numbers for 2002 follow an increase in crime in 2001 that was the first in a decade, coinciding with a struggling economy that many experts say could be a contributing factor. Crime rose in 2001 by 2.1 percent, compared with the year before.

The Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act of 2003 is designed to protect officers and their families from vindictive criminals and to allow thousands of equipped, trained and certified law enforcement officers, whether on or off duty or retired, to carry concealed firearms in most situations, thus enabling them to respond immediately to a crime. Our bipartisan bill will allow thousands of equipped, trained and certified law enforcement officers continually to serve and protect our communities, regardless of jurisdiction, and at no cost to taxpayers.

To qualify for the bill’s uniform standards a law enforcement officer must be authorized to use a firearm by the law enforcement agency where he or she works, meet the standards of the agency to regularly use a firearm, not be prohibited by Federal law from receiving a firearm, and be carrying a photo identification issued by the agency.

A qualified retired law enforcement officer under the bill must have retired in good standing, have been qualified by the agency to carry or use a firearm, have been employed at least 15 years as a law enforcement officer unless forced to retire due to a service-connected disability, have a nonforfeitable right to retirement plan benefits of the law enforcement agency, annually meet State firearms training and qualifications that are the same as active law enforcement officers, not be prohibited by Federal law from receiving a firearm, and be carrying a photo identification issued by the agency.

I have heard from many representatives of the law enforcement community, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Officers, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, and the California Correctional Peace Officers Association, CCPOA,

that national legislation is necessary because of the current patchwork of state and local conceal-carry laws. I have also received letters of support for the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act from a variety of Vermont law enforcement officials, including Chief Osburn Glidden of Williston, Officer Wade Johnson of Hinesburg, Chief Trevor Whipple of Barre, Officer Bonnie Hotchkiss of Barre, Sergeant Mike Manning and Sergeant David Yustin of the Vermont State Police, and nine Field Supervision Correctional Officers assigned to the Vermont Department of Corrections Barre Community Correctional Service Center.

As a former State prosecutor, I know that law enforcement Officers are never “off-duty.” They are dedicated public servants trained to uphold the law and keep the peace. When there is a threat to our public safety, law enforcement officers are sown to answer that call. The Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act will enable law enforcement officers in Vermont and across the nation to be armed and prepared when they answer that call, no matter where, when, or in what form it comes.

I urge my colleagues to support the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act to make our communities safer and to protect law enforcement officers and their families.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I rise along with senators CAMPBELL, LEAHY, and others to introduce the “Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act of 2003.” This bill, which permits qualified current and retired law enforcement officers to carry a concealed firearm in any jurisdiction, will help protect the American public, our Nation’s officers, and their families. I would note that this bill has the overwhelming support of the Fraternal Order of Police and other law enforcement associations.

This legislation allows qualified law enforcement officers and retired officers to carry, with appropriate identification, a concealed firearm that has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce regardless of State or local laws. Importantly, this legislation does not supersede any State law that permits private persons to prohibit or restrict the possession of firearms on any State or local government properties, installations, buildings, bases or parks. Additionally, this bill clearly defines what is meant by “qualified law enforcement officer” and “qualified retired, or former, law enforcement officer” to ensure that those individuals permitted to carry concealed firearms are highly trained professionals.

Such legislation not only will provide law enforcement officers with a legal means to protect themselves and their families when they travel interstate, it will also enhance the security of the American public. By enabling qualified active duty and retired law enforcement officers to carry firearms, even if

off-duty, more trained law enforcement officers will be on the street to enforce the law and to respond to crises.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the passage of this important piece of legislation to provide that extra layer of protection to current and retired law enforcement officers, their families, and the public.

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 254. A bill to revise the boundary of the Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park Addition Act of 2003. This bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent in the 107th Congress, and I hope that it will receive quick approval again in the 108th Congress. The legislation provides for a small adjustment of the Park's boundaries to permit the purchase of permanent facilities for Park administrative purposes and to provide visitors with a modest interpretive center that will help them understand the cultural and historical treasures of the Park.

Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park is located along the beautiful Kona coast on the island of Hawaii. It was designated as a National Historic Landmark in 1962 and was established as a National Historical Park in 1978. The Park was created to preserve, interpret, and perpetuate traditional Native Hawaiian culture. The ocean makes up over half of this 1,160-acre Park, and the boundaries include the culturally significant Kaloko and 'Aimakapa fishponds and 'Ai'opio fish trap. There are also several *heiau*, or Native Hawaiian religious sites, found in the Park.

In 2001, 54,000 people visited Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park, and the number of visitors continues to increase. In 2002, 70,000 people visited the Park, an increase of 16,000 visitors. We need a facility there that offers administrative personnel the space and the resources they need to carry out their management functions, and provides visitors with the opportunity to learn about this important part of Hawaii. Rather than erecting a new building and disturbing the resources within Park boundaries, the better option is to locate the facilities nearby on an already-developed parcel. The bill provides a simple, cost-effective solution to the important problems of growing visitorship and the need to provide adequate stewardship of cultural resources. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate and in Hawaii to make this possible.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 254

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park Addition Act of 2003."

**SEC. 2. ADDITIONS TO KALOKO-HONOKŌHAU NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.**

Section 505(a) of P.L. 95-625 (16 U.S.C. 396d(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(a) In order" and inserting "(a)(1) In order";

(2) by striking "1978," and all that follows and inserting "1978."; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(2) The boundaries of the park are modified to include lands and interests therein comprised of Parcels 1 and 2 totaling 2.14 acres, identified as 'Tract A' on the map entitled 'Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park Proposed Boundary Adjustment', numbered PWR (PISO) 466/82,043 and dated April 2002.

"(3) The maps referred to in this subsection shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service."

**SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. DODD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. CLINTON):

S. 255. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require phased increases in the fuel efficiency standards applicable to light trucks; to require fuel economy standards for automobiles up to 10,000 pounds gross vehicle weight; to increase the fuel economy of the Federal fleet of vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senators SNOWE, COLLINS, CANTWELL, CORZINE, DODD, DURBIN, JEFFORDS, LEAHY, MURRAY, REED, CLINTON, and SCHUMER in introducing legislation to increase Corporate Average Fuel Efficiency, CAFE, Standards for SUVs and other light duty trucks.

This bill will close the "SUV Loophole," and require that SUVs meet the same fuel efficiency standards as passenger cars by 2011.

Simply put, this legislation is the single most important step the United States can take to limit dependence on foreign oil and better protect our environment.

If implemented, closing the SUV Loophole would: Save the U.S. 1 million barrels of oil a day and reduce our dependence on foreign oil imports by 10 percent. Prevent about 240 million tons of carbon dioxide—the top greenhouse gas and biggest single cause of global warming from entering the atmosphere each year. Save SUV and light duty truck owners hundreds of dollars each year in gasoline costs.

CAFE standards were first established in 1975. At that time, light

trucks made up only a small percentage of the vehicles on the road, they were used mostly for agriculture and commerce, not as passenger cars.

Today, our roads look much different, SUVs and light duty trucks comprise more than half of the new car sales in the United States.

As a result, the overall fuel economy of our Nation's fleet is the lowest it has been in two decades, because fuel economy standards for these vehicles are so much lower than they are for other passenger vehicles.

The bill we are introducing today would change that, SUVs and other light duty trucks would have to meet the same fuel economy requirements by 2011 that passenger cars meet today.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, NHTSA, has proposed phasing in an increase in fuel economy standards for SUVs and light trucks under the following schedule: by 2005, SUVs and light trucks would have to average 21.0 miles per gallon; by 2006, SUVs and light trucks would have to average 21.6 miles per gallon; and by 2007, SUVs and light trucks would have to average 22.2 miles per gallon.

Last year, the National Academy of Sciences, NAS, released a report stating that adequate lead time can bring about substantive increases in fuel economy standards. Automakers can meet higher CAFE standards if existing technologies are utilized and included in new models of SUVs and light trucks.

And earlier this month, the head of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration said he favored an increase in vehicle fuel economy standards beyond the 1.5-mile-per-gallon hike slated to go into effect by 2007. "We can do better," said Jeffrey Runge in an interview with Congressional Green Sheets. "The overriding goal here is better fuel economy to decrease our reliance on foreign oil without compromising safety or American jobs," he said.

With this in mind, we have developed the following phase-in schedule which would follow up on what NHTSA has proposed for the short term and remain consistent with what the NAS report said is technologically feasible over the next decade or so: by 2008, SUVs and light duty vehicles would have to average 23.5 miles per gallon; by 2009, SUVs and light duty vehicles would have to average 24.8 miles per gallon; by 2010, SUVs and light duty vehicles would have to average 26.1 miles per gallon, by 2011, SUVs and light duty vehicles would have to average 27.5 miles per gallon.

This legislation would do two other things: 1. It would mandate that by 2007 the average fuel economy of the new vehicles comprising the Federal fleet must be 3 miles per gallon higher than the baseline average fuel economy for that class. And by 2010, the average fuel economy of the new federal vehicles must be 6 miles per gallon higher than the baseline average fuel economy for that class.