

of the memorial (including payment of the amount for maintenance and preservation required under section 8906(b) of title 40, United States Code); or

(B) any funds that remain on expiration of the authority for the memorial under section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. SMITH):

S. 269. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to further the conservation of certain wildlife species; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, a firm commitment to protect public safety and the welfare of wild cats that are increasingly being kept as pets. I am joined by Senator ENSIGN of Nevada, Senator WYDEN of Oregon and Senator LEVIN of Michigan as original co-sponsors of this legislation.

This bill amends the Lacey Act Amendment of 1981 to bar the interstate and foreign commerce of carnivorous wild cats, including lions, tigers, leopards, cheetahs, and cougars. The legislation would not ban all private ownership of these prohibited species, but would outlaw the commerce of these animals for use as pets.

Current figures estimate that there are more than 5,000 tigers in captivity in the United States. In fact, there are more tigers in captivity in the United States than there are in native habitats throughout the range in Asia. While some tigers are kept in zoos, most of these animals are kept as pets, living in cages behind someone's house, in a State that does not restrict private ownership of dangerous animals.

Tigers are not the only animals sought as exotic pets. Today there are more than 1,000 web sites that specialize in the trade of lions, cougars, and leopards to promote them as domestic pets.

Untrained owners are not capable of meeting the needs of these animals. Local veterinarians, animal shelters, and local governments are ill equipped to meet the challenge of providing for their proper care. If they are to be kept in captivity, these animals must be cared for by trained professionals who can meet their behavioral, nutrition, and physical needs.

People who live near these animals are also in real danger. These cats are large and powerful animals, capable of injuring or killing innocent people. There are countless stories of many unfortunate and unnecessary incidents where dangerous exotic cats have endangered public safety. Last year in Lexington, TX, a three-year-old boy was killed by his stepfather's pet tiger. In Loxahatchee, FL, a 58 year-old woman was bitten on the head by a 750 pound Siberian-Bengal Tiger being kept as a pet, and in Quitman, AR, four 600 to 800 pound tigers escaped from a "private safari". Parents living nearby sat in their front yards with high-pow-

ered rifles, guarding their children at play, frightened that the wild tigers might attack them.

This is a balanced approach that preserves the rights of those already regulated by the Department of Agriculture under the Animal Welfare Act such as circuses, zoos, and research facilities. This Act specifically targets unregulated and untrained individuals who are maintaining these wild cats as exotic pets.

The Captive Wildlife Safety Act represents an emerging consensus on the need for comprehensive federal legislation to regulate what animals can be kept as pets. The United States Department of Agriculture states, "Large wild and exotic cats such as lions, tigers, cougars, and leopards are dangerous animals . . . Because of these animals' potential to kill or severely injure both people and other animals, an untrained person should not keep them as pets. Doing so poses serious risks to family, friends, neighbors, and the general public. Even an animal that can be friendly and lovable can be very dangerous."

The American Veterinary Medical Association also "strongly opposes the keeping of wild carnivore species of animals as pets and believes that all commercial traffic of these animals for such purpose should be prohibited."

This bill preserves those local regulations already in existence. Full bans are already in place in 12 States and partial bans have been enacted in 7 States. I sincerely hope that grass roots organizations continue to encourage State and local governments to ban the private ownership of exotic cats.

The Captive Wildlife Safety Act is supported by the Association of Zoos and Aquariums, the Humane Society of the United States, the Funds for Animals, and the International Fund for Animal Welfare.

No one should be endangered by those who cannot properly keep these animals. Exotic cats in captivity should be able to live humanely and healthfully.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation and look forward to working with our partners in the House to enact the Captive Wildlife Safety Act.

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. 269

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 "Captive Wildlife Safety Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF PROHIBITED WILDLIFE SPECIES.

Section 2 of the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (g) through (j) as subsections (h) through (k), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

"(k) PROHIBITED WILDLIFE SPECIES.—The term 'prohibited wildlife species' means any live lion, tiger, leopard, cheetah, jaguar, or cougar."

SEC. 3. PROHIBITED ACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3 of the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3372) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking "or" at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting "or" after the semicolon at the end; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) any prohibited wildlife species (subject to subsection (e));";

(B) in paragraph (3)(B), by inserting "or" after the semicolon at the end; and

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking "paragraphs (1) through (4)" and inserting "paragraphs (1) through (3)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(e) NONAPPLICABILITY OF PROHIBITED WILDLIFE SPECIES OFFENSE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a)(2)(C) does not apply to—

"(A) any zoo, circus, research facility licensed or registered and inspected by a Federal agency, or aquarium;

"(B) any person accredited by the Association of Sanctuaries or the American Sanctuary Association;

"(C) any State college, university, or agency, State-licensed wildlife rehabilitator, or State-licensed veterinarian;

"(D) any incorporated humane society, animal shelter, or society for the prevention of cruelty to animals;

"(E) any federally-licensed and inspected breeder or dealer that is conducting any breeding or dealing activity with a person referred to in this paragraph; or

"(F) any person having custody of a wild animal solely for the purpose of transporting the animal to a person referred to in this paragraph.

"(2) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall promulgate regulations describing the persons or entities to which paragraph (1) applies.

"(3) STATE AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this subsection preempts or supersedes the authority of a State to regulate wildlife species within that State."

(b) APPLICATION.—Section 3(a)(2)(C) of the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (as added by subsection (a)(1)(A)(iii)) shall apply beginning on the effective date of regulations promulgated under section 3(e)(2) of that Act (as added by subsection (a)(2)).

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to be joined by my distinguished colleagues in introducing legislation that addresses the welfare of exotic animals throughout the country. Specifically, this bill prohibits the interstate shipment of exotic animals; namely lions, cheetahs, tigers, jaguars, and leopards. Only zoos, circuses, sanctuaries, universities, licensed breeders and other Federal and State licensed facilities are exempted from this prohibition.

During my days as a practicing veterinarian, I saw firsthand exotic animals mistreated by owners who were ill-prepared to care for them. All too often, large cats are put in cages that are too small to accommodate their growing needs. Owners often buy a young tiger or cat, paying more attention to their cuddly exterior rather

than the overwhelming responsibility that comes along with raising an animal that will grow into a large, wild, predator.

In my home State of Nevada, there is a burgeoning population of exotic animals being kept as pets. I have been contacted by animal control centers throughout the State that are called to aid in situations where a wild tiger or lion has escaped and run amok. In these situations, not only are the owners and the animal control professionals in danger, so too are children and other neighbors who may be in the wrong place at the wrong time. These animals' instinct is to attack, and they will do so, if given the opportunity. That is why only highly trained individuals who have the know-how and the resources should be able to own exotic animals.

In fact, I am informed that officials in Nye County in my home State, are working to pass a county ordinance that would ban the ownership of exotic animals because of the threat these animals pose to public safety. We have the support and backing of the Humane Society of the United States, the American Veterinary Medical Association, and the American Zoo and Aquarium Association.

This legislation protects the public, but also ensures that the animals receive the best care possible from certified and trained owners. I look forward to having the overwhelming support of my colleagues in the Senate.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. CLINTON, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 270. A bill to provide for additional weeks of temporary extended unemployment compensation, to provide for a program of temporary enhanced unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, Congress took an important step forward for working families earlier this month by providing unemployment benefits for nearly 3 million jobless Americans. These benefits are a lifeline for the millions of workers who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, but as we all know, there is much more work to be done on this basic issue. One million workers have run out of their State and Federal benefits and remain without jobs. Clearly, these workers deserve our help too.

In fact, there is an additional category of workers who have not even received a dime of unemployment benefits. They paid into the unemployment insurance fund, and they lost their jobs due to the failing economy, but they have been left behind by the outdated eligibility rules in our unemployment laws.

Today, I am introducing the Economic Security Act of 2003 to cover the 1 million who have exhausted their

benefits, as well as the nearly 1 million low-wage and part-time workers currently not eligible for unemployment benefits, and to increase benefit levels to help keep families out of poverty during periods of unemployment.

Nationally, only about half of unemployed workers received unemployment benefits last year. This number has dropped precipitously since 1975 when 75 percent of unemployed workers received benefits. This increasingly serious problem is a result of laws implemented in the 1980s to restrict eligibility for the unemployment insurance program. Because of these restrictions, many of the unemployed workers who do not receive benefits today are excluded because they are part-time or low-wage workers.

In all but 12 States, low-wage workers are ineligible for benefits because their most recent earnings are not counted. As a result, many former welfare recipients—success stories who have recently entered the workforce, have now lost their jobs because of the economic down-turn, but they are being denied the unemployment benefits they deserve. Many minimum wage workers, who work hard and play by the rules and have not seen a raise in 6 years, are also left behind. Those low-income workers are now left without a safety net.

In addition, the majority of States do not provide benefits to part-time workers, despite the fact that part-time workers are an essential part of the labor force. They now comprise nearly 20 percent of the workforce. Part-time workers also represent a large share of the unemployed, one in five unemployed workers today were working part-time before they lost their jobs. Women now represent 70 percent of the part-time workforce, compared with 44 percent of full-time workers, and 17.5 percent of part-time workers earn less than \$15,000 a year. Despite their significant labor force role, part-time working adults are half as likely as full-time workers to receive unemployment insurance benefits. Nationally, only 12 percent of unemployed part-time workers receive unemployment benefits.

Under the Economic Security Act, the Federal Government will reimburse States for 1 year for the cost of providing unemployment benefits to two categories of workers: 1. Those who would be eligible for regular unemployment compensation if their last completed quarter of earnings is included in their wage record, and 2. those seeking part-time employment.

The bill will also provide Federal funds to states to increase the level of unemployment benefits. Sadly, these benefits today are often not sufficient to meet basic needs such as paying the rent or putting food on the table. In 2000, the average unemployment benefit replaced only 33 percent of workers' lost income, a steep drop from the 46 percent of wages replaced by benefits during the recessions of the 1970's and

1980's. During an economic crisis, unemployed workers have few opportunities to rejoin a declining workforce. They depend on unemployment benefits to live.

Raising benefits will enable these workers to support their families and invest more in the economy. They immediately spend their unemployment insurance benefits in their communities, and that spending will provide a needed, immediate stimulus to the economy. In fact, every dollar spent on unemployment benefits boosts the economy by \$2.15.

The Economic Security Act of 2003 will provide Federal reimbursements for states which increase their weekly unemployment checks by the greater of 15 percent or \$25 for 1 year. Under this provision, the average recipient will have an extra \$135 a month. Unemployed households will use this amount to help pay the rent, buy groceries, keep the family car running, or hire a babysitter during job interview. This boost in unemployment benefits will stimulate the economy and help these laid-off workers support their families while they look for a new job.

State unemployment insurance administrators often fall short of the funds they need to administer benefits efficiently and promptly, and to see that all who are eligible receive their benefits. The Act provides \$500 million to State Unemployment offices to offset the administrative expenses associated with implementing the new coverage and benefit changes, and to provide better employment services to workers receiving unemployment compensation.

Congress cannot continue to ignore the plight of millions of Americans hurt by economic forces beyond their control. As we work together to get the economy moving again, we must also work together to see that no one is left behind. We have a responsibility to give help and hope to these deserving Americans by strengthening unemployment insurance to cover all unemployed workers, and I urge my colleagues to give high priority to this needed reform.

By Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. SCHUMER, and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 271. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an additional advance refunding of bonds originally issued to finance governmental facilities used for essential governmental functions; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce, with my friend and colleague, Senator CORZINE, the "Municipal Debt Refinancing Act of 2003." We are pleased to be joined by Senator SCHUMER and Senator SNOWE in this bipartisan effort. This important legislation will allow States and localities access to low cost capital during this current period of fiscal crisis, allowing cities to take advantage of low interest