



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 16, 2007

No. 81

Senate

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, a Senator from the State of Maryland.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, we come to You in our weakness and seek Your strength. Our knowledge is insufficient; we seek Your guidance. Our doubts assail us; we seek Your faith. Our fears taunt us; we seek Your courage. Our energy is often depleted; we seek Your power. Our emotions betray us; we seek Your discipline. Our temptations conquer us; we seek Your grace. Our burdens weaken us; we seek Your help. Our lives are often too empty; we seek Your joy.

Lord, give our lawmakers this day Your guidance, power, courage, faith, discipline, grace, help, and joy.

Lord, we ask, too, that You would comfort the King and Falwell families during their time of grief. We pray in Your comforting Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2007.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, a Senator from the State of Maryland, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CARDIN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this morning the Senate will immediately resume consideration of H.R. 1495. The debate will continue until 10:30 on the four pending Iraq-related amendments.

The debate time until 10:30 is equally divided and controlled between the two leaders, with the final 20 minutes shared by the two leaders. I will have the last 10 minutes of that 20-minute period.

There will be 2 minutes of debate prior to each vote. After the first vote, the remaining votes in sequence will be limited to 10 minutes. I hope Members would not leave the Chamber area during the votes as time for the votes will have to be strictly enforced. Since these amendments are first-degree amendments, except for the Feingold amendment, Members have until 9:30 this morning to file any germane second-degree amendments.

Once these Iraq-related amendments are disposed of, then the managers of the water resources legislation hope to shortly conclude the entire legislation. I hope that can be the case.

With the cooperation of the Senate last night, we have moved the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to the immigration legislation until Monday, May 21. This will allow negotiations to continue for a few more days.

I mentioned that a lot of work is needed to be done this week, including

the supplemental appropriations bill and the budget resolution. We have other things we are working on to get teed up for next week. We have so much to do, Mr. President.

Also, last night, with the cooperation of the Republican leader and the rest of the Senate, we forged a path for the consideration of these two items, these two items tomorrow, the budget and the WRDA matter. So I, again, thank the Members for their cooperation.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my sitting down, Senator BIDEN have 4 minutes of our time; Senator BOXER, 3 minutes; Senator FEINGOLD, 3 minutes; Senator KENNEDY, 4 minutes; Senator LEAHY, 4 minutes; Senator LEVIN, 4 minutes; Senator MURRAY, 3 minutes; Senator REED, 3 minutes—that is REED of Rhode Island—Senator TESTER, 3 minutes; and Senator WHITEHOUSE, 3 minutes. We should have enough time to cover all that. If not, I will yield a minute or so of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I also ask that the quorum calls be equally divided.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2007

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1495, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6157

A bill (H.R. 1495) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Boxer-Inhofe amendment No. 1065, in the nature of a substitute.

Reid (for Levin-Reid) amendment No. 1097 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1065), to provide for military readiness and benchmarks relative to Iraq.

Reid (for Feingold-Reid) amendment No. 1098 (to amendment No. 1097), to provide for a transition of the Iraq mission.

Warner-Collins amendment No. 1134 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1065), relative to the President's strategy in Iraq.

McConnell (for Cochran) amendment No. 1135 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1065), to express the sense of the Senate that Congress must send to the President acceptable legislation to continue funds for Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom by not later than May 28, 2007.

AMENDMENT NOS. 1098, 1097, 1134, AND 1135

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 10:30 a.m. shall be equally divided between the majority and the Republican leaders or their designees for debate prior to the votes on the motions to invoke cloture on the following amendments: amendment No. 1098, offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD; amendment No. 1097, offered by the Senator from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN; amendment No. 1134, offered by the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER; and amendment No. 1135, offered by the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. COCHRAN.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the desk should get their clocks out because I am going to suggest the absence of a quorum and that time will have to run equally from both sides. So each time that I have allotted will be reduced by whatever time the people don't show up here to get in their remarks.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll of the Senate.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 2 minutes that remain allocated to Senators WHITEHOUSE and LEAHY be allocated to me for my presentation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAQ AMENDMENTS TO WRDA

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, as we speak, more than 150,000 brave American troops are in the middle of a violent civil war in Iraq, with more troops on the way. Meanwhile, the President has repeatedly made it clear that noth-

ing—not the wishes of the American people, not the advice of military and foreign policy experts, not the concerns of members of both parties—will discourage him from pursuing a war that has no end in sight.

Congress cannot wait for the President to change course—we must change the course ourselves. Iraq's problems will not be solved by an open-ended, massive U.S. military engagement. And our own national security will be weakened until we bring this war to a close.

That is why I am pleased to join the majority leader and Senators DODD, WHITEHOUSE, SANDERS, LEAHY, KERRY, KENNEDY, BOXER, WYDEN and HARKIN in introducing an amendment to bring this war to a close. Our amendment, which is the same as the Feingold-Reid bill, would require the President to begin safely redeploying U.S. troops from Iraq within 120 days of enactment, and would require redeployment to be completed by March 31, 2008. At that point, with our troops safely out of Iraq, funding for the war would be ended, with three specific and limited exceptions: protecting U.S. infrastructure and personnel; training and equipping Iraqi security forces; and, perhaps most important, conducting "targeted operations, limited in duration and scope, against members of al-Qaida and other international terrorist organizations." By enacting Feingold-Reid, we can finally focus on what should be our top national security priority—defeating al-Qaida.

Some have suggested that cutting off funds for the war could mean cutting off funds for the troops. They would have people believe that, under my approach, our brave troops will be left to fend for themselves in Iraq, without training, equipment, or resources.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Using our power of the purse to end our involvement in the war would in no way endanger our brave servicemembers. By setting a date after which funding for the war will be terminated—as this amendment proposes—Congress can ensure that our troops are safely redeployed without harming our troops, as we did in Somalia in 1993.

While Feingold-Reid is not the only amendment we are considering, it is the only amendment that would bring this war to a close. I regret to say that the Levin-Reid amendment accomplishes very little, once the President gets through certifying and waiving whatever he needs to certify and waive to keep his policies in place.

Levin-Reid and the Warner amendment would ensure that Congress receives more reports on Iraqi progress in meeting benchmarks. We don't need reports to tell us that the President's policy isn't working. And we don't need reports to show us that our continued military presence in Iraq is a mistake, one that the American people overwhelmingly oppose. It is long past time for benchmarks, let alone benchmarks

that aren't tied to meaningful consequences. Feingold-Reid will move us toward ending the war. Levin-Reid will move us backward.

As long as the President's Iraq policy goes unchecked, our courageous troops will continue to put their lives on the line unnecessarily, our constituents will continue to pour billions of their dollars into this war, our military readiness will continue to erode, and our ability to confront and defeat al-Qaida will be jeopardized. I urge my colleagues to support Feingold-Reid and oppose Levin-Reid.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO POLICE CORPORAL BRUCE MCKAY

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to express the sorrow of the people of New Hampshire and myself and Kathy, on the passing of Corporal Bruce McKay, who died in the line of duty as a police officer in Franconia, New Hampshire, last Friday, May 11.

This is a traumatic event for us as a State and as this is the second time within a year a police officer has been shot in New Hampshire and died. To lose two of these gentlemen who were so extraordinary in the span of a year is truly a sad and difficult event for us as a State.

Corporal McKay was, like so many police officers, just an exceptional individual who did his job of protecting us, of being out there on patrol, making sure that we are safe in our homes and going about our business on a daily basis. Corporal McKay worked in a very small town, the idyllic and pastoral town of Franconia, NH, a place where people go to get away from the hustle and bustle and threat and difficulty of the urban American lifestyle. It's right up in the mountains of New Hampshire, just past Franconia Notch, one of our most famous and beautiful spots. It is a place where many people have come to write and to live and movie stars and Supreme Court justices have retired there.

It is not a place where you'd expect a violent act like this to occur. But doing his job on patrol, making what appeared to be a routine stop, he was attacked and shot to death by the individual he pulled over. This is a trauma not only for our State and for the Town of Franconia, especially, but even more

overwhelmingly for his daughter, Courtney, and his parents, Bruce and Catherine, and our sympathies and prayers go out to them.

We thank him for his service. We thank all officers of the law who put their lives on the line every day and serve us and give us the protection and safety which is so important to our lives.

On behalf of Kathy and me, and to the extent I can, the people of New Hampshire, we express our condolences and our sympathies to his family during this extraordinarily difficult time. His service will be tomorrow. I had hoped to attend it, but unfortunately, the budget will be here on the floor tomorrow and as the ranking Republican on the budget, I feel it is my responsibility to be here to represent the Republican position on that bill. Our hearts and prayers go out to him and his family, and we send his family all our support during this very difficult time.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 3 minutes under a previous consent order.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, American troops must come home from Iraq. Because more than 3,000 of our men and women have lost their lives, and tens of thousands more have returned home wounded, American troops must come home from Iraq.

Because hundreds of billions of America's tax dollars have been sunk into the sands and marshes of Iraq, with much of that funding lost to waste, fraud, or abuse by those who have neither Iraq's nor America's best interests at heart, America's troops must come home from Iraq.

Because the public records of this conflict—reflected in the many retired generals who have spoken out against the conduct of the war, and the many books and articles chronicling its planning and execution—reveal catastrophic mistakes and misjudgments that have raised serious questions about this administration's very capacity for leadership, American troops must come home from Iraq.

Because that same administration misused and distorted intelligence, arguing that America should go to war on the basis of information that proved to be untrue or highly misleading, American troops must come home from Iraq.

Because despite the millions of Americans who joined together to call for a new direction in Iraq, this President chose instead to escalate the con-

flict, American troops must come home from Iraq.

Because the President and Vice President and their political allies would rather pick a political fight with this Congress, using false rhetoric, such as "micromanaging" and "precipitous withdrawal," than answer tough questions from the American people, American troops must come home from Iraq.

Because the prospect of our troops' redeployment is the single most powerful force at our disposal to galvanize unity and cooperation among the Iraqi factions and effect real change, American troops must come home from Iraq.

And because even after all this, this President still refuses to listen to the American people and stubbornly fails to give this country the change of course it demands, it is up to this Congress to act to bring American troops home from Iraq.

Some claim this strategy is risky, but the greater risk by far would be to fail to seize the opportunity a redeployment of our troops presents us. To announce clearly to the world that American troops will soon leave Iraq will change the dynamic there in a positive way. It may be the only way we can change the dynamic there in a positive way. It will give us the chance to renew and rebuild diplomatic ties in the region and around the world that have been so badly damaged by this President and this President's war, and restore America's prestige and standing among our friends. It will send a signal to the insurgents who foment violence in Iraq that they will no longer be able to use the United States military presence as a recruiting tool for extremists, and it will motivate efforts by the Iraqis to secure and stabilize their Nation.

It will give the Iraqis the impetus to step forward and do the things our military leaders say they must do for the surge to succeed—things they have been disgracefully slow in doing, such as passing a hydrocarbon law to allow equal sharing of oil revenues among all Iraqis, and measures to facilitate elections, as an example.

It will give our country the time and resources to restore our extraordinary military to the strength and level of readiness our troops deserve. And it will give us the freedom and the resources to look to the many challenges that still confront us here at home, from soaring gas prices to a broken health care system.

To achieve all these things, we must take the first step. We must make it clear we will bring our troops home from Iraq. The measure offered by Senator FEINGOLD, with the support of the distinguished majority leader, is a smart strategy. It has a responsible schedule and it will be an effective step to repair what the President has left broken.

It would require the President to redeploy our troops from Iraq by March 31, 2008. After that date, funds would

only be available for three specific limited purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 15 seconds.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The limited purposes for funding would be: targeted counterterrorism operations, protecting United States infrastructure and personnel, and training and equipping Iraqi security forces.

This plan gives our troops in the field the resources they need today and a strategy that is worthy of their service as they look to tomorrow. I urge my colleagues to support the Feingold-Reid amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator is recognized for 3 minutes under a previous unanimous consent order.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, last November, the American people voted to end the President's one-man show in Iraq. I think the Chair understands that very well, given that he was victorious in November, and a lot of the questions surrounded what are we going to do about Iraq, this terrible failed policy.

Today, we have an amazing opportunity, and I thank Senator REID for giving us that opportunity, to vote to end this war now, and to do it in a way that is responsible, to do it in a way that is gradual, to do it in a way that makes a lot of sense.

The Feingold amendment essentially shifts the mission away from a combat mission to a support mission. It is very clear the President will get the funding he needs for the following things. Our troops will be funded to go after al-Qaida. After all, that was the primary purpose we declared after 9/11, and I voted to go to war to get al-Qaida, and to get bin Laden. Then the administration took a U-turn and got us off course into Iraq.

Our military has been superb. They have done everything they have been asked to do, from searching for those weapons of mass destruction, ascertaining there were none; and then, apparently, the mission wasn't done. The President said, get Saddam. They got Saddam. Oops, the mission still wasn't done. After that, he said, get his family members and show them on television and show the people we mean business. But the mission still wasn't done.

Then there were three elections in Iraq, to give the Iraqis a chance to choose their own leaders. We train and train and train Iraqi soldiers and police, where there are now about 300,000. If they can't defend and protect their own country, if they do not love the chance to have freedom as much as we love it for them, then I say it is time to change this mission. Keep on going after al-Qaida. Yes, you can keep training those troops if they need our help in that, and force protection. Those would be the missions. The Feingold amendment gives us this chance.

The President has derided any attempt Congress has made to end this war. He says, why should politicians get involved with this? Well, let me say why I think the Senate should get involved. Because it is our constituents, just as it is the President's constituents, who are dying in Iraq. In front of my office door I have these large boards that list the names of the dead, and 21 percent of the dead were either born in California or they were based in California—21 percent. So I will not allow this President to tell me I have no right to try to end this war. I have every right to try to end this war, and I will stand shoulder to shoulder with my colleagues, as I did from day one when 23 of us said this war was a bad idea.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an additional 1 minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, our Nation is grieving over this war. Every day when we wake up and turn on the TV or the radio, we don't know what other horror is befalling our troops. We have a country in Iraq where 70 percent of the people want us out of there, where a broad majority says it is OK to kill or wound an American soldier, where maybe 50-plus percent of the Iraqi Parliament says we should get out on a timetable.

It is pretty simple. When I was a kid, my mother said, don't go where you are not wanted. Enough is enough. We have given and given and given, in blood and in treasury. So I proudly stand before the Senate urging my colleagues to do the right thing, to vote for responsible redeployment, a responsible end to this war, and join me in voting for the Feingold amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 4 minutes under a previous consent order.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly support the Feingold-Reid amendment on Iraq. This is a defining moment in our debate on this misguided war. We in Congress have a choice. We can continue the administration's failed policy and guarantee that even more American troops will die in Iraq's bloody civil war. Or we can finally exercise our "power of the purse" and begin to bring this disas-

trous war to an end by linking the requirement to withdraw our combat troops from Iraq by next March to a prohibition on spending.

We all must face up to the fact that Congress must use the power of the purse to force an end to the war, and the sooner we do so, the better.

It is wrong for the Congress to continue to defer to Presidential decisions that we know are fatally flawed.

The American people know this war is wrong, and it is wrong to abdicate our responsibility by allowing this war to drag on longer while our casualties mount higher and higher.

For more than 4 long years, the President's assertion of unprecedented power has gone unchecked. This amendment reclaims our responsibility under the Constitution as a co-equal branch of Government, with specific powers of our own on issues of war and peace.

Congress can exercise its authority to redirect or terminate an ongoing conflict in two ways. It can enact specific limits on the scope of the conflict, and it can use the power of the purse to deny funding for all or parts of a conflict.

Congress has followed that path in prior wars, and we must follow it today. During the Vietnam war, Congress repealed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution of 1964, which many of us felt had been misused to justify the escalation of America's involvement in Vietnam. Congress also prohibited the reintroduction of troops into Cambodia after President Nixon's escalation of the war. We went on to cap the number of American troops in Vietnam, and we eventually cut off funding for the war when the President left us no alternative.

Exasperated by the actions of successive Presidents Johnson and Nixon on the Vietnam war, Congress enacted the War Powers Act in 1973 over President Nixon's veto. The act requires Presidents to consult with Congress before placing troops in harm's way, seek authorization to keep them there, and continue consultation as the conflict goes on.

This congressional assertion of power in matters of war and peace resonates loudly today.

Opponents of our efforts to bring the Iraq war to an end have mischaracterized any use of this congressional power as an abandonment of our soldiers on the battlefield. Nothing could be further from the truth.

No responsible legislator would take any action that endangers our troops. In fact, using congressional authority to force a change of course in Iraq and begin to bring our troops out of Iraq's civil war is the best way to protect our troops.

Requiring a change of course by using the "power of the purse" or taking other action will not mean taking equipment and supplies away from our troops. We will avoid the mistake the President made in sending our troops

into Iraq without adequate armor and without a plan to win the peace. There is no reason for Congress now to shy away from exercising the full range of its constitutional powers.

President Bush should not be permitted to continue his disastrous policy of sending more and more American troops to die in the quagmire of Iraq's civil war.

Because the President refuses to bring this war to an end, we in Congress must put on the brakes ourselves and stop the madness. We must require the administration to begin to bring our troops home to the hero's welcome they have earned.

The failure of our policy is abundantly clear to anyone who honestly looks at the facts.

Despite the addition of tens of thousands of American troops, and the ongoing presence of more than 150,000 American soldiers in Iraq, political reconciliation remains as difficult as ever to achieve.

Our troops continue to be vulnerable targets for the insurgents in what has been the longest period of high casualty rates since the war began. Sectarian violence in Baghdad continues. Attacks within the international zone in Baghdad are increasing. Violence is spreading out of Baghdad and increasing elsewhere in Iraq. Iraqis are demonstrating in the streets against America's occupation. Legislation pending in the Iraqi Parliament would require a timetable for the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq.

The Iraqi people want a timetable for the withdrawal of our military. The American people want a timetable. Only the President continues to stubbornly refuse to adopt one.

It is time for President Bush to listen to the Iraq Study Group, the Iraqi people, Congress, and the American people, and work with us to bring our troops home.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, among the four amendments this morning will be one submitted by me, together with my principal cosponsor, Senator COLLINS. The purpose of this amendment is to require the administration to keep the Congress well informed. The situation in Iraq changes almost daily. Our losses continue. In my judgment, it is the responsibility of every Member of the Congress to keep well versed on this situation, keep in mind the perspectives with regard to the strategy as enunciated by the administration, and maintain their own individual opinions about that strategy and how this operation is going. Daily, each of us must consult with our constituents. Regrettably, almost weekly many of us have to speak with families of the loved ones they have lost or those who have been seriously injured.

There are several parts to the amendment I put forward. I thank many Senators who worked with me—indeed,

both sides of the aisle, together with their professional staffs. The first part of the amendment goes through extensive findings, principally acknowledging the extraordinary heroism and bravery of the men and women wearing the uniform of our country, together with our coalition partners and the families who stand behind them. They unquestionably have performed in a manner consistent with the finest traditions of the professionalism of the U.S. military.

The findings also address the historical progress of the Iraqi Government in its formation, but also raises questions of the several benchmarks, benchmarks which were selected and composed by the Iraqi Government, announced by that government, and their commitments to trying to meet those benchmarks.

Taken together, I think it is very important that our strategy in Iraq be put in a position where it reflects in many respects the degree of success in meeting these benchmarks and, if these benchmarks are not met, then such changes as our President desires to make from his strategy as announced on January 10 of this year.

We, in this amendment, recite as the benchmarks that are most serious his forming a constitutional review committee and then completing the constitutional review; enacting and implementing legislation on deBaathification; enacting and implementing legislation to ensure the equitable distribution of hydrocarbon resources of the people of Iraq without regard to sect or ethnicity of recipients; and enacting and implementing legislation to ensure that the energy resources of Iraq benefit Sunni Arabs, Shia Arabs, Kurds, and other Iraqi citizens in an equitable manner.

That is sort of a description of the basic category of these benchmarks. Then we go on to require the President of the United States to report on how this sovereign Government of Iraq is or is not achieving progress toward accomplishing the aforementioned benchmarks, and shall advise the Congress on how that assessment requires or does not require changes to the strategy announced on January 10, 2007.

Among the reports required, the President shall submit an initial report in classified and unclassified form to the Congress not later than June 15, 2007.

I purposely selected that date because our schedule reflects that this body will go into a recess for much of August. I think it is absolutely imperative every Member have the benefit of the latest possible assessment of the performance or nonperformance by the Iraqi Government of these benchmarks, as well as the situation in Iraq. So the President will do that on July 15, assessing the status of each of the benchmarks.

Next, the President, having consulted with the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, the commander of the mul-

tinational forces, General Petraeus, and Admiral Fallon, will prepare a report and submit to the Congress his findings. If the President's assessment of any of the specific benchmarks established above is unsatisfactory, the President shall include in that report a description of such revisions to the political—not just the military but the political, the economic, regional, and military components of the strategy as announced by the President on January 10, 2007.

In addition, the President shall include in the report the advisability of implementing such aspects of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group report as he deems appropriate. That was a very valuable report. I think it has provided a considerable number of guideposts that have been embraced by Members of this body.

Then the President shall submit a second report not later than September 15, 2007, following the same procedures and criteria enunciated above. The reporting requirement of the Armed Services Committee bill of last year will be waived through September 15 so as not to have duplication. Then testimony before the Congress. Prior to the submission of the President's second report on September 15, 2007, and at a time to be agreed upon by the leadership of the Congress and the administration, the U.S. Ambassador to Iraq and the commander of multinational forces, General Petraeus, will be made available to testify in open and closed sessions before the relevant committees of our Congress. There again, we get their independent report followed by that of the President.

We also place some limitations on the availability of the nonmilitary funding in this appropriations bill, such that the President can restrict that funding in those instances where he believes, first, there is more than adequate funding in the pipeline already and therefore it doesn't require the additional expenditure of funds; or, second, the Iraqi Government has substantial cash in their reserve accounts that could be applied to the nonmilitary aspects. Further, the President is given waiver authority with regard to the benchmarks so the flow of these funds is tied in some respects, again, to the performance of the benchmarks.

We also put a section in this report requiring the redeployment of our forces in such circumstances as the sovereign Iraqi Government, having taken actions consistent with their Constitution, should call upon the United States and other partners of the coalition forces to withdraw certain elements of their troops—respecting, once again, and placing upon them the obligation to fulfill the responsibilities of sovereignty.

Also, we put in this amendment requirements for independent analysis of much of the same material that is being reviewed by the administration. While we have over the years, for ex-

ample, trained for now 2½ to 3 years, some 325,000 Iraqi armed forces and police, what is the ability of that trained group, such as it is, to take up more and more of the responsibility in the fighting, and particularly that fighting that relates to sectarian violence?

For that purpose, we have two parts. The first addresses the Comptroller General. He is being requested to make an assessment of all of the benchmarks as to whether they have been met or not met. Second, we appropriate a sum of money to fund an independent organization and a very senior, well-respected, retired, four-star officer to head up a military, professional assessment by the retired community, of the Iraqi forces. I think that is a pivotal part of this amendment. I just hesitate to think why any Member could vote against a provision saying that we need a fresh, new, independent assessment of the capabilities or lack of capabilities of the Iraqi security forces. That is in here.

Mr. President, I urge colleagues to carefully consider this amendment.

It is for their benefit to keep them informed, both requiring the administration to come forward with timely reports and testimony and, secondly, two independent organizations, one the Comptroller General to give an assessment of benchmarks and, second, that we have an organization well known to all of us here, a private sector organization to give support to a senior, highly respected uniform retired four-star general to make an assessment of the military capabilities of the Iraqi forces.

Again, I thank my colleagues. I particularly thank my principal cosponsor, the Senator from Maine, for her diligent effort throughout the preparation of this amendment as well as the previous initiatives we have taken on this floor over the past 2 months with respect to the President's policy, particularly the surge policy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief, not only because the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia has done a superb job of describing the initiative we have brought before the Senate but also because I have a commitment to testify very shortly before another committee on yet another important issue. But I do wish to comment briefly on one of the provisions that is included in Senator WARNER's proposal, a provision I consulted with many of our colleagues on and brought forth to the senior Senator from Virginia and suggested be included. He agreed and has placed it within his amendment.

This provision conditions the release of reconstruction funds to progress on the benchmarks that are included in the Warner-Collins amendment. These benchmarks include making progress on deBaathification, making progress in passing and implementing an oil revenues distribution bill, making

progress and producing trained and equipped Iraqi security forces, and overall for the Iraqi Government to make more progress toward the political reconciliation that is absolutely essential to quelling the sectarian violence that now engulfs Baghdad. It includes, therefore, provisions and benchmarks not only on deBaathification but also on holding provincial elections, something that would help lead to the integration of more Sunnis into the Government power structures.

It is important that there be consequences for the Iraqi Government if those benchmarks are not met, and the best way is to condition the release of billions of dollars of reconstruction assistance—assistance for which the American taxpayers are footing the bill—on whether the Iraqi leaders are making progress in meeting the benchmarks. If they are not making progress in meeting the benchmarks, then I think we should not release the reconstruction funds. This would have definite consequences, and I believe it is appropriate that we link it to reconstruction funds.

None of us wants to—or very few of us want to cut off the essential training and equipping funds for Iraqi troops, much less American troops. So I do not support an alternative amendment which will be offered today which would simply cut off funds. I don't think that is responsible. That is a disservice to the brave men and women who are fighting so hard in Iraq. I want to make sure our troops have everything they need—the training, the equipment, and the support to carry out their dangerous mission.

I also want to make sure the Iraqi troops have the training and the equipment they need, but I share the frustration of the former chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee that we have been training Iraqi troops and equipping them for years, some 300,000 troops, and yet we still find that the Iraqi security forces are not able to take the lead in very many operations, and that is very disturbing to me. It is one of the reasons I strongly support Senator WARNER's proposal for an outside review by a distinguished non-partisan group led by retired GEN Jim Jones to assess the capabilities and the readiness of the Iraqi forces. That is a very important provision as well.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, on that point, will the Senator yield?

Ms. COLLINS. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. WARNER. We worked together on this provision for some time. It has been 2 months in the making. I supplied it to several colleagues in the House, notably JIM MORAN, who is on the Appropriations Committee. They seized it and, verbatim, this provision with regard to establishing an ability to have, independent of the Pentagon, an assessment of the Armed Forces and security forces in Iraq is in the House appropriations bill now going into conference. So I believe it is imperative

that we, this body, likewise put that provision in our Senate bill.

I thank my colleague.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia for his clarification and that good news about the reception on the House side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority time has expired.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds more.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, my support for our operations in Iraq is neither open-ended nor unconditional. I believe the Warner-Collins amendment takes important steps toward accountability, and I hope it will have the support of the majority of Members in this body.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President. I want to take a few brief moments to explain why I supported the Feingold-Reid-Dodd amendment this morning, and why I opposed the other two amendments offered before this body.

While I would have preferred a stand-alone vote on the Feingold-Reid-Dodd bill, as I think we owe the American people and our brave men and women in uniform unequivocal support for changing our mission in Iraq, I am nonetheless still pleased that we at least had a cloture vote on this amendment.

As my colleagues know, the language in this amendment was almost identical to the language in the stand-alone Feingold-Reid-Dodd bill, which I strongly endorsed. This amendment would have mandated that the phased redeployment of U.S. combat forces from Iraq begin within 120 days, and set a deadline of March 31, 2008 for the completion of that redeployment. It allowed for continued counter-terrorism operations, force protection, and training and equipping of Iraqi security forces. Reid-Feingold represented the only responsible way to force the President to change his flawed policy in Iraq.

I deeply respect Senator WARNER and the leadership that he has demonstrated for many decades in the Senate, but I could not in good conscience vote for his amendment. The Warner amendment would have done nothing to force a change in mission, it would not have held the Bush administration or the Iraqi Government accountable, and it would not have started the process of redeploying our forces from Iraq. Instead, it would have allowed the President to waive any restrictions, just as he has waived the advice from the Baker-Hamilton Commission, and just as he has ignored the will of the American and Iraqi people.

I had absolutely no objection to the resolved clauses of Senator COCHRAN's amendment, which stated that "It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should send legislation to the President providing appropriations for Oper-

ation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom in a manner that the President can sign into law by not later than May 28, 2007." In fact, Congress already sent President Bush a robust supplemental funding bill and the President chose to veto it. Moreover, the Feingold-Reid-Dodd amendment provided funding for these critical missions and was wholly "in a manner that the President can sign it into law by not later than May 28, 2007."

But, in Senator COCHRAN's amendment, this language was preceded by inaccurate statements. These statements claim that "funds previously appropriated to continue military operations in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom are depleted." This is simply not true. The Congressional Budget Office estimates, and the Pentagon confirms, that there is enough funding to last through midsummer.

It is my hope that in the coming days, the Senate will continue to seek meaningful ways to bring about a responsible and urgent change in the President's failed policy in Iraq. I look forward to working with my colleagues to do just that.

I thank the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 minutes in leader time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today we face an awesome vote, a historic vote in the Senate. It is a vote about this war in Iraq. It is an issue which consumes this Senate and this Nation. We have lost 3,400 soldiers, over 30,000 returned home injured, some with serious, grievous disabilities and injuries they will battle for a lifetime. We have spent over \$500 billion, and there is no end in sight.

This morning, the White House announced that the President has finally found a general who will accept the responsibility for the execution of this war. Why did four generals before him refuse this assignment? Because those four generals know, the American people know, and this Senate knows that the administration's policy in Iraq has failed.

Our soldiers have not failed. They have risen again to the challenge. They have exhibited such courage and bravery. They have shown the kind of sacrifice that wins over the hearts of generation after generation of American people. But the Iraqis failed to lead their own nation, and the situation in that country is in disarray.

Now is the time for the Senate to speak directly, honestly, decisively. This war must end. Our troops must come home. The Iraqis must accept responsibility for their future.

The Feingold-Reid amendment, which will be before us today, may not be adopted, but it will be adopted at

another time on another day. At some future moment, after we have buried more of our fallen heroes, after we have cared for those thousands returning with injuries, after the Iraqis have broken our hearts again with their interminable fighting, their interminable civil war, and their lack of leadership in their nation, then we will act. But today is the day when we should act.

I respect very much my colleague from Virginia, Senator WARNER. He is one of the few on that side of the aisle who have spoken out suggesting that these policies must change. I don't believe his amendment achieves all that we need to achieve today. It sets benchmarks but gives the President the power to waive those benchmarks and the requirements that come with them. Sadly, we know what this President will do. Just as with the sweep of a veto pen he swept away our bipartisan effort to start a timetable to end this war, he will sign a waiver and continue on for the next 18, 19 months with this war with no end in sight.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for 1 minute off the leader's time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my friend for his very articulate statement. I so agree with what he said. I want to make it clear to my colleagues, and I want to make sure my colleague agrees, that of all the options which will be before us, all well-mentioned, all worked on so diligently—some of my colleagues are here who did that—is it not a fact that the only one that will guarantee a change in the status quo is the Feingold amendment because all the others really lead right back to where we are today because the President is given total leeway to decide exactly what to do? Am I correct on that point, that if we want change, you have to vote for the Feingold amendment, if you want to end the war?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in response to my colleague from the State of California—and I thank her for her leadership—there is only one amendment today which will end this war, there is only one amendment today which will start to bring these troops home, there is only one amendment which will make it clear to the Iraqis that this is their country and their responsibility. The Feingold-Reid amendment is the amendment which will finally start bringing this war to an end.

How many more soldiers do we have to bury? How many more do we have to bring into our military and veterans hospitals? How many more thousands of innocent Iraqis have to die before we finally accept our responsibility to bring this war to an end? We can do it today. We should do it today. I urge my colleagues to support the Feingold-

Reid amendment, and I urge all of them to understand the gravity of this decision. This is not about politics. This is about the life and death of great heroes in America who continue to step forward and risk their lives for this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor to the Feingold-Reid amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, a little more than 6 weeks ago, the Senate passed a supplemental appropriations bill relative to the war in Iraq. It contained provisions relating to the readiness of U.S. forces, such as ensuring U.S. military units are fully mission capable, that they are not deployed for combat beyond a year in the case of the Army, 7 months in the case of the Marines; that they are not redeployed for combat if the unit has been deployed within a year for the Army and 7 months for the Marines. The vetoed bill provided for a Presidential waiver of those limitations.

The vetoed bill also contained a very essential provision regarding troop reductions—first, a troop reduction requirement that would commence on October 1. That is the heart of the bill that was vetoed. We will commence finally to reduce the number of troops in Iraq instead of adding to the troops, instead of adding more military, instead of looking to a military solution, finally recognizing that there is no military solution, there is only a political solution in Iraq, and that it is up to the political leaders in Iraq to reach that conclusion.

We must put pressure on them, and the only way I know to put pressure on the Iraqi leaders is to tell them that the future of their country is in their hands, that we cannot save them from themselves, and for us to change the course by beginning to reduce the number of troops in a nonprecipitous way and to do that beginning in 180 days.

What that amendment did on the supplemental was also set a goal for the remainder of the troops who are going to be removed. Except for the limited missions that were set up, it set a goal to do that. It was not set in stone as to the precise moment all the troops would have to leave, and it avoided using the funding mechanism. We did that on purpose. We want to send a message to the troops that troops in Iraq, whatever they are, whatever are left, whatever are going to be removed that have not been removed at the exact moment in the Feingold amendment—troops are going to be supported.

We are going to support these troops. We are not going to use a funding mechanism to cut off funding for our troops. That was the way to go. We got 51 votes in the Senate for that approach. It was vetoed by the President.

Now we have an amendment that is pending. This amendment would provide essentially the same provisions: protecting our troops, funding our troops but also initiating the beginning of the reductions that are so essential to forcing the Iraqis to step to the plate and resolving their political differences.

This amendment that is pending, however, contains a waiver. The waiver provision in this amendment has caused some concern understandably. The only purpose for the waiver provision the President was given in this pending amendment was in order to avoid a veto, to get the funds there.

However, it will not avoid a veto. The security advisor to the President has told me that, as a matter of fact, the President still opposes it, although he has a waiver authority in this amendment. Because of that, it does not serve its purpose of avoiding a veto.

Because there is some confusion as to the waiver provision, as to whether there is any intent to weaken what we did when we passed the supplemental, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to withdraw my amendment. I understand it has been cleared on the other side. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment and that cloture be vitiated.

Mr. REID. After the Feingold vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order will be effective after the first cloture vote.

Under the previous order, the next 10 minutes is reserved for the Republican leader.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I again wish to address the amendment I have put forward together with Senator COLLINS. I realize there is a provision in here with regard to a waiver, and that relates to the President's ability to redirect funds that are nonmilitary. But I say to my colleagues that while that particular section of this bill was amended at the last minute, the other sections absolutely remain strong and essential to keep this body informed; namely, the two independent studies, one to be performed by retired military with respect to the proficiency, capability, professional abilities of the Iraqi security forces; and, secondly, the one that requires the General Accounting Office to give an opinion with regard to the compliance or noncompliance of benchmarks.

So in this amendment, yes, I still think there is a lot of strength and validity to the provisions regarding the restriction of funds to be expended by our Government in terms of the nonmilitary spending. The other portions of this bill remain strong and should earn the support of all colleagues who wish to be kept advised of this ever-changing situation.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is time remaining for the Republican leader. Is that right?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. REID. On my side, how much time do we have?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Five minutes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, is Senator COCHRAN going to use some of the 7½ minutes?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am happy to use whatever time is available to support my amendment.

Mr. REID. There is 7½ minutes. Mr. President, what I would ask—the reason I am asking my friend from Mississippi is, we have had a lot of confusion here today with amendments being withdrawn and a lot of people wanting to speak.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has been waiting to speak. I would be happy, if it is convenient to the Republicans, to give 3 more minutes to the minority and allow Senator BIDEN to speak for 3 minutes. Would that be permissible?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that be the case.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will be able to support my amendment. It is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment. There are certain findings that are made in the amendment. But it all comes down to saying that the Senate should give the President what he has asked for, in terms of supplemental appropriations to fund the activities in Iraq that would protect our soldiers, that would put into the field new equipment and armaments that would help us reduce the level of casualties, make it less likely that American soldiers are going to die on the battlefield.

We don't need to continue to drag this out. This request has been submitted to the Senate, to the House, and it still has not been approved. People want to add everything to it. We have had a lot of suggestions about amendments that should be put on the supplemental.

What this sense of the Senate says, basically, is the Congress should approve the funding requested by the President at the earliest possible date. We know that that may take a few days, but it should not take any longer than that. So I am hopeful that Senators, after expressing their views on the war, expressing their views on whatever else they want to put in this legislation, keep focused on what the real need is and what the request is; it is supplemental funding to replace funds that have been exhausted in the regular fiscal year appropriations to add what the military needs.

I have a letter from Secretary Gates which specifically says:

The situation increases the readiness risk of our military with each passing day. Should the Nation require the use of these forces prior to the equipment becoming available, the funding delay negatively impacts our forces in the field by needlessly delaying the accelerated fielding of new force protection capabilities, such as the mine-resistant ambush-protected vehicle, and counter-IED technologies.

So my hope is the Senate will approve my amendment and let's get on with supporting the President's initiative to bring this war to a successful conclusion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, we are about to vote on a bunch of amendments. The two amendments on the Democratic side, one having been withdrawn, are designed to do one thing that is straight forward: Instead of focusing our military on the much more—on being engaged in this civil war, they are intended to focus on a limited mission, a much more limited mission that is in our national interest that we can achieve with far fewer troops: Combatting al-Qaida and like-minded terrorist groups and continuing to train Iraqi troops.

I am not crazy about the language in the Feingold amendment. But I am crazy about the fact that we have got to keep the pressure on. The fact is, with every passing day, the situation in Iraq gets worse, and the President refuses to change course, continuing to dig us deeper and deeper and deeper in a hole.

The most important thing we can do, and I compliment the Democratic leaders for this, is keep pressure, keep pressure on the President. Now, why pressure on the President? Quite frankly, he is not going to change. The only way, with all due respect to my Republican friends, is to put pressure on them so they start voting for the troops and not for the President.

The fact is, as a number of my colleagues have mentioned in the news on the Republican side—I will not name any of them—they basically told the President: Mr. President, you have got until September. Well, between now and September, a lot more people are going to die in the midst of a civil war that don't have to die in the midst of a civil war if we change the mission.

So this is all about keeping pressure. So every single day the public picks up the paper and sees that we are trying to change the President's course of action in Iraq. In turn, hopefully, they will speak to their Democratic and Republican Senators and Representatives and say: Make him change.

Because until we get 67 votes, we are not going to be able to change his God-awful war. This war is a disaster. So what my friend, Senator FEINGOLD, is doing is making a very valuable contribution. I am going to vote for cloture so we can continue to debate this issue and continue to put pressure on.

Starting to get our troops out of Iraq and getting most of them out by early next year is what we have in the original legislation the President vetoed, which is the preferable way to go, in my view.

But obviously we do not have the votes to overcome that veto, so we are trying to put something else on the table. But as important as beginning to bring our troops home, with a reasonable prospect of ending their presence in Iraq, it is equally important to have a plan for what we are going to leave behind, so we do not trade a dictator for chaos in a region that will undermine our interests for decades.

So we have to have a plan to bring stability to Iraq when we leave, and that requires a political solution. In the interests of time, I will not attempt to discuss that, I will do it at a later date. But I compliment my friend from Wisconsin for continuing to keep the pressure on. This is all about, in my view, getting the 67 votes to be able to override the President's veto and ending this God-awful mess that he has us in and continues to dig us deeper and deeper and deeper and deeper into.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There remains now a little over 8 minutes of the Republican time.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I think the Republican leader wants to take 1 minute. No? If you would yield that back.

Mr. WARNER. I yield back the time on this side.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to ask unanimous consent to yield that back.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time being yielded back, there remains now 5 minutes on the majority side.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I exceed the 5 minutes, I will use my leader time.

The Congress and the President are on the eve of a very important negotiation about the administration's failed policy in Iraq. Does anyone dispute that it has been a failed policy? Does anyone dispute that it has been a failed policy? I don't think so.

But there is one simple question that negotiators will be wrestling with: After more than 4 years of a war in Iraq, costing Americans more than 3,400 lives, tens of thousands wounded, a third of them grievously wounded, we have more than 2,000 double amputees in this war, head injuries like we have never seen before, approaching a trillion dollars in taxpayers' expenditure for this war.

Sadly, there is no end in sight. Isn't it time for the administration to change course? Now, Nevada is struck and struck very hard with the fact that one of our brave soldiers from Nevada may be a hostage or some say a prisoner of war. This is new experience even in Iraq.

The votes we are about to cast this morning will give every Member the

opportunity to tell the American people, the White House, and the Congressional negotiators where they stand on critical issues.

House and Senate Democrats stand with General Petraeus. General Petraeus says the war cannot be won militarily. There can only be a political solution, which my friend from Michigan, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has been saying for almost 2 years. The administration and the leaders in Iraq have not listened to CARL LEVIN.

We stand united, we Democrats and a couple of stalwart Republicans, in our belief that our troops are enmeshed in an intractable civil war, that we are pursuing a failed strategy that is making us less secure, not more secure, and that it is time to begin a responsible, phased redeployment.

We stand united in our efforts to get the administration to change course but do so now, immediately. The President's policy is not working, and it is not working for so many reasons.

The present path is not sustainable. The facts on the ground are certainly not encouraging. Everyone, today, look at USA Today. The attacks are up. The deaths are up, both of Iraqis and Americans; the injuries are up of both Iraqis and Americans.

Despite the fourth surge in U.S. forces since the start of the war, attacks on our troops have not decreased. The monthly casualty rate since the onset of the surge is close to the highest level we have seen since the start of this war. About three American soldiers are killed every day on average. Since the beginning of the surge, 300 Americans have been killed. I don't know how many have been injured but thousands. Meanwhile, the Iraqi Government remains in a dangerous stalemate—no oil law; no law on de-Baathification; no constitutional amendments. This paralysis has further fueled the sectarian violence, and our troops are caught in the middle. They protect the Sunnis. Our troops protect the Shia, protect the Kurds. In the process, they are all shooting at our troops.

The U.S. mission grows further and further disconnected from our strategic national interest. Instead of focusing on training, counterterrorism, and our regional interests, U.S. forces are patrolling Baghdad's streets, still kicking down doors, increasingly vulnerable to snipers, kidnappers, improvised explosive devices, and other acts of terror. American forces have done everything we have asked of them, and more. They toppled a dictator and helped pave the way for a new government. It is now up to the Iraqi political leaders, after 4 years, to step up to the plate and fight for their own nation. Again, as our leader on the Armed Services Committee, Senator LEVIN, has said on many occasions: Take off the training wheels. The Iraqi Government has to do that.

Our troops, their families, and the American people deserve an exit strat-

egy, instead of extending tours from 12 to 15 months, putting further strain upon our men and women in uniform. It is long past time to transition the United States mission in Iraq and begin a responsible, phased redeployment.

The Feingold-Reid amendment does just that. It achieves that goal. The amendment calls for the phased redeployment of our troops to begin within 120 days. It doesn't call for withdrawal—phased redeployment. After April 1, 2008, the sixth year of the war in Iraq—think about that—it would still permit U.S. forces to remain in Iraq conducting force protection, training, and targeted counterterrorism missions. As Senator BIDEN said: Go after the real bad guys.

I appreciate the efforts of my friend, the senior Senator from Virginia, former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, but I say after more than 4 years of a failed policy he has watched, as I have, his amendment is very tepid, very weak, a cup of tea that has been sitting on the counter for a few weeks. You wouldn't want to drink that tea. You wouldn't want to vote for this amendment. If you look in the dictionary under "weak," the Warner amendment would be listed right under it. I have the greatest respect for Senator WARNER. I know he is trying to stick up for his President. Senator WARNER has served this country honorably for more than 40 years. But the situation in Iraq is grave and deteriorating. It requires actions, certainly not more reports, especially those without consequences. I will vote against the Warner amendment and I hope everyone votes against it. It is nothing.

The Cochran amendment, offered by my friend with whom I have had the good pleasure of serving in Congress for 25 years—he is a fine man and a real patriot; he has served this country so well for so long—I don't necessarily agree with every word and assertion the Senator included in his amendment, but I do agree with its thrust; namely, the White House and the Congress have an obligation to our troops to move quickly and complete action on the supplemental spending bill. But I do say to my friend from Mississippi: The President has asked for money. But for the first time in more than 4 years of this war, he has to deal with this constitutional body that was provided to our country by our Founding Fathers, called the Congress. It is another branch of Government. He has to deal with us. That is why there are negotiations prior to getting the President a conference report.

Had I drafted this amendment, I would have asked more of the White House than simply the Congress write a blank check to this administration. Too many blank checks have been given to this President, and look what we have as a result. It is important we deliver our troops a strategy that is worthy of their sacrifice. I would also

have made improving their readiness a priority. What do people who have the military experience in this body focus on? Senator WEBB of Virginia, Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island, they focus on readiness; that is, how are the troops being taken care of, how are they being rotated? JIM WEBB, as we know, served gallantly in battle. He knows what it is to send troops into battle without proper readiness. He is concerned about that. We don't have enough about readiness, certainly, in the Cochran amendment.

We were going to have another vote on the Levin amendment. Basically, as I said to the Presiding Officer late last night, it was the amendment that went to the President and he vetoed it. The Levin amendment is the same thing except we gave the President waivers. You would think that would be a step in the right direction. But we have heard from all types of administration officials as late as last night: We will veto that. So we will make it easier for them. We are not going to go ahead and offer that. We will stand on the merits of what we sent to the President before.

Regardless of the outcome of today's votes, I want everyone listening to know that if my Republican friends choose to stick with a failed policy, congressional Democrats will take this fight up at the first available opportunity. We know we have to get a bill to the President, a conference report. We are going to do that. But there are other measures that are going to be moving through this body quite quickly—defense authorization, for example. We are going to continue focusing, as Senator BIDEN said, on the President's failed strategy. Our troops and their families deserve no less.

Look what is going on now. Is the Commander in Chief fulfilling his obligations? We were told with this most recent surge that General Petraeus would be the guy who would take care of things over there. But he has told us we can't win militarily. Now today we read in the paper that General Lute is going to be the czar. The czar? What about that? Whose job is he taking? Is he taking General Petraeus's job? Is he taking President Bush's job? What is next in the continual march of the President's failed policy?

We must change course. That is why I am going to proudly vote for the Feingold-Reid amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PRYOR). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we retrieve 4 minutes of the time.

Mr. REID. I object.

Mr. WARNER. I wish to address the very harsh criticism of my distinguished friend and leader.

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Virginia. I will then use 2 minutes to respond.

Mr. WARNER. I say to my friend, I have worked on this amendment. I spent a good deal of time in the office

of colleagues on the other side of the aisle yesterday, incorporated several provisions in this amendment at their request. I say it was a good-faith effort to do my very best to point out the need for this Senate and the Congress as a whole to get the most timely flow of information available to us, both from the President and from two independent groups. I say when you get a man of the stature of General Jones, who is willing to go out and work with private sector organizations to make a professional assessment of the military of Iraq, that, I say to my friend, the distinguished leader of the Democratic side, is not weak tea. That is a commitment by a very brave, credible American to try to help this institution, the Congress, have a better understanding about the viability and the professional capabilities of the Iraqi armed forces.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, let me be very clear: I in no way suggested my friend from Virginia didn't act in good faith. That is the story of his life. I just say, another study? Look at the one in the newspapers today. They studied what is going on in Iraq today with the explosive devices—the people getting killed and maimed and injured. How many more studies do we need? The study that has already been completed in the minds of the American people is to change course in this civil war. We have too many people being killed and injured in that war. The course needs to change. I care a great deal about my friend from Virginia, but that doesn't take away from the fact that I have to call his amendment what I think it is. It is my opinion it is weak.

AMENDMENT NO. 1098

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is 2 minutes evenly divided on the Feingold amendment.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the Feingold-Reid amendment would finally bring this disastrous war to a close by safely redeploying our troops from Iraq by March 31, 2008.

We can't afford to keep ignoring the rest of the world while we focus solely on Iraq. By redeploying our troops from Iraq, we can create a more effective, integrated strategy to defeat expanding terrorist networks whether they be in Afghanistan, Somalia, Algeria, Morocco, or even here at home.

It is time to end a war that is draining our resources, straining our military and undermining our national security, and the way to do that is by using our power of the purse to safely bring our brave troops out of Iraq. That is what the Feingold-Reid amendment does.

Over 6 months ago, the American people voted to bring this war to a close. Today, by passing the Feingold-Reid amendment, the Senate can finally do the same thing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we feel the matters directed in the Feingold amendment have been addressed repeatedly by the Senate, and the Senate has spoken its will and rejected those concepts.

I yield the floor and urge my colleagues to vote against the Feingold amendment.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order and pursuant to rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Feingold amendment No. 1098 to amendment No. 1097 to H.R. 1495, the Water Resources Development Act.

Russell D. Feingold, Harry Reid, Barbara Boxer, Amy Klobuchar, Sheldon Whitehouse, Ted Kennedy, Patty Murray, Richard Durbin, Bernard Sanders, Daniel K. Inouye, Christopher Dodd, Ron Wyden, John Kerry, Debbie Stabenow, Ben Cardin, Jim Webb, Charles E. Schumer, Tom Harkin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 1098, offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHN-SON) are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. DOLE) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 29, nays 67, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 167 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Inouye	Obama
Byrd	Kennedy	Reid
Cantwell	Kerry	Sanders
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Clinton	Kohl	Stabenow
Dodd	Lautenberg	Whitehouse
Durbin	Leahy	Wyden
Feingold	Menendez	

NAYS—67

Alexander	Bingaman	Carper
Allard	Bond	Casey
Baucus	Brownback	Chambliss
Bayh	Bunning	Coburn
Bennett	Burr	Cochran

Coleman	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Collins	Isakson	Salazar
Conrad	Kyl	Sessions
Corker	Landrieu	Shelby
Cornyn	Levin	Smith
Craig	Lieberman	Snowe
Crapo	Lincoln	Specter
DeMint	Lott	Stevens
Domenici	Lugar	Sununu
Dorgan	Martinez	Tester
Ensign	McCaskill	Thomas
Enzi	McConnell	Thune
Graham	Murkowski	Vitter
Grassley	Nelson (FL)	Voinovich
Gregg	Nelson (NE)	Warner
Hagel	Pryor	Webb
Hatch	Reed	
Hutchison	Roberts	

NOT VOTING—4

Brown	Johnson
Dole	McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 29, the nays are 67. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1098 WITHDRAWN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, cloture not having been invoked on the Feingold amendment, it is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 1097 WITHDRAWN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Levin amendment No. 1097 is withdrawn, and the cloture motion thereon is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 1134

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes equally divided prior to the cloture vote on amendment No. 1134 offered by the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER.

Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield such time as the distinguished Republican leader requires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate on a bipartisan basis overwhelmingly rejected the notion of a surrender date. We now have an opportunity to vote for a proposal by Senator WARNER which I will allow him to describe that strikes me to make a lot of sense. I am going to allow him to describe the provisions of it, but I would urge a vote for the Warner amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the amendment embraces provisions which provide the ability for the Senate—indeed, the Congress as a whole—to become better advised with regard to the President's position on the compliance or noncompliance with the benchmarks, as well as an independent group headed by the former commandant of the Marine Corps, General Jones, as to the proficiency and the professional ability of the Iraqi security forces.

Secondly, another provision allows the GAO to give an independent analysis to the Congress on the Iraqi Government's achievement or nonachievement of the benchmarks. This is an amendment to help keep us informed. So when we proceed—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WARNER. To go on the August recess, we will be better equipped to deal with this question on the public's behalf and to tell our constituents our own individual feelings about this controversial issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say at the outset how much I respect the gentleman from Virginia. I thank him for his leadership time and again thank him for all he has given to this county.

I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment and I want my colleagues to know why. Within this amendment which establishes benchmarks is a provision giving the President of the United States the power to waive. What does it mean? The same pen the President used to veto our bipartisan timetable to start bringing the troops home will be used to make this proposal a nullity. It will not achieve the goals we want to achieve.

Unless and until the Congress convinces this President to change his policy and does it in forceful terms, this war will continue with no end in sight.

I urge my colleagues not to support this amendment that is before us, cloture on this amendment, because, frankly, giving the President a waiver is a guarantee nothing will change.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order and pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the pending Warner amendment No. 1134 to H.R. 1495, the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

Mitch McConnell, Judd Gregg, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, Lisa Murkowski, Susan M. Collins, John Warner, Orrin G. Hatch, Craig Thomas, Larry E. Craig, John E. Sununu, Pete V. Domenici, James M. Inhofe, Trent Lott, John Thune, Christopher S. Bond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 1134, offered by the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHN-SON) are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. DOLE) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 168 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Domenici	Nelson (FL)
Allard	Ensign	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Enzi	Pryor
Bond	Graham	Roberts
Brownback	Grassley	Salazar
Bunning	Gregg	Sessions
Burr	Hagel	Shelby
Byrd	Hatch	Smith
Chambliss	Hutchison	Snowe
Coburn	Isakson	Specter
Cochran	Landrieu	Stevens
Coleman	Lieberman	Sununu
Collins	Lincoln	Thomas
Corker	Lott	Thune
Cornyn	Lugar	Voinovich
Craig	Martinez	Warner
Crapo	McConnell	
DeMint	Murkowski	

NAYS—44

Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Feinstein	Murray
Bayh	Harkin	Obama
Biden	Inhofe	Reed
Bingaman	Inouye	Reid
Boxer	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kerry	Sanders
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Kohl	Stabenow
Casey	Kyl	Tester
Clinton	Lautenberg	Vitter
Conrad	Leahy	Webb
Dodd	Levin	Whitehouse
Dorgan	McCaskill	Wyden
Durbin	Menendez	

NOT VOTING—4

Brown	Johnson
Dole	McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 44. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. WARNER. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. COLEMAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1134 WITHDRAWN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, cloture not having been invoked on the Warner amendment, the amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 1135

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes equally divided prior to the cloture vote on amendment No. 1135 offered by the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. COCHRAN.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, this amendment expresses the sense of the Senate that the President should receive from the Congress acceptable legislation to continue funding the operations—Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom—by not later than May 28 of this year. The funds previously appropriated by the Congress for operations in this region are depleted, according to a letter and testimony before our committee from the Secretary of Defense and other military leaders and the service chiefs who have appeared before our committee as well.

The President requested supplemental funding over 3 months ago, and no supplemental funding has been approved by the Congress. We are putting troops at risk. We are keeping the military from deploying equipment and armaments that will protect the lives and save lives of American troops in this region. I think it is the responsible thing to do, Mr. President, for us to approve this supplemental funding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have been told by Pentagon officials that there is money there to the end of June. We have been told by the Congressional Budget Office that there is money there until July. But in spite of all that, we sent the President a bill. He vetoed that bill.

We recognize the need to get money to the troops. We are going to do that. I stated on the floor yesterday that we will take whatever time it takes to complete this funding prior to the recess we have scheduled for Memorial Day, and we are going to do that. We will work with the minority to do that.

I also suggest that we are all going to vote for cloture on this amendment, so maybe we don't need to vote on it. If Senators are all going to vote for it, let's accept it by voice vote.

Mr. BYRD. No, no, let's vote.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are mandatory on a cloture motion.

CLOTURE MOTION

Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the pending Cochran amendment No. 1135 to H.R. 1495, the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Pete V. Domenici, Johnny Isakson, James M. Inhofe, Craig Thomas, Trent Lott, John E. Sununu, John Thune, Thad Cochran, Christopher S. Bond, Norm Coleman, John Warner, Richard G. Lugar, Jeff Sessions, Orrin Hatch, Gordon H. Smith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 1135, offered by the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. COCHRAN, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHN-SON) are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. DOLE) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 169 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Akaka	Domenici	Mikulski
Alexander	Dorgan	Murkowski
Allard	Durbin	Murray
Baucus	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Feinstein	Obama
Biden	Graham	Pryor
Bingaman	Grassley	Reed
Bond	Gregg	Reid
Brownback	Hagel	Roberts
Bunning	Hatch	Rockefeller
Burr	Hutchison	Salazar
Byrd	Inhofe	Schumer
Cantwell	Inouye	Sessions
Cardin	Isakson	Shelby
Carper	Kerry	Smith
Casey	Klobuchar	Snowe
Chambliss	Kohl	Specter
Clinton	Kyl	Stabenow
Coburn	Landrieu	Stevens
Cochran	Lautenberg	Sununu
Coleman	Levin	Tester
Collins	Lieberman	Thomas
Conrad	Lincoln	Thune
Corker	Lott	Vitter
Cornyn	Lugar	Voinovich
Craig	Martinez	Warner
Crapo	McCaskill	Webb
DeMint	McConnell	Wyden

NAYS—9

Boxer	Harkin	Menendez
Dodd	Kennedy	Sanders
Feingold	Leahy	Whitehouse

NOT VOTING—4

Brown	Johnson
Dole	McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 9. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I know of no Senators who have expressed a desire to speak on the amendment. Therefore, given the fact that cloture has been invoked, I suggest the Chair put the question on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1135) was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wanted to give Senators and staff an update on where we are with the WRDA bill now that we have voted on these various Iraq resolutions.

Where we are now is that our work is almost done on this bill. We are down to the final amendments that are in the managers' package. One of our colleagues, Senator COBURN, is looking at about three or four of these amendments that he has some problems with. We are very hopeful we can work with him to resolve those questions because we have many items in the managers' package. We think about 10 or 12, or more, actually. So he is looking at four, and we are working with him to resolve them.

If we can resolve that, it would be a wonderful thing because we could get done with this bill. Senator DEMINT has two amendments which we are looking at on our side, and we think we can work with those amendments. We think we can reach agreement on those amendments.

So here is where we are. This bill is being slowed down because of four particular items in the managers' package that Senator COBURN is looking at right now and we are working with him. If we can resolve those questions, and we can certainly resolve Senator DEMINT's amendments, we will be done with this bill, and we can roll them all into a managers' package, either do them by voice vote or have a recorded vote and then a final passage vote, which, believe me, would be welcome news for the workers and the businesses of our great country.

If we cannot resolve these remaining matters, we are very willing to have votes on those questions and we would like to start that this afternoon. We will just work our way through the six votes and see how it all comes out, but we are hopeful. We are going to give it another hour, hour and a half to talk to colleagues. I didn't want colleagues to think that Senator INHOFE and I weren't continuing to focus on this bill. We are. We are working our caucuses in an effort to get this done.

I am going to relinquish the floor, and we will be back as soon as we have some agreement on these remaining amendments.

I see the distinguished ranking member on the floor now, so we will have a chance to collaborate on where we stand, and I yield the floor for my colleague to speak at this time.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we have come a long way. I am sorry I wasn't here to hear Senator BOXER's remarks, but I am sure I agree with the remarks of the chairman of the committee.

We are down now to a manageable number of amendments. We are working very diligently, and I understand there are two Republican amendments and four Democratic amendments. The time is here for us to do everything we can to try to make this happen. I think

almost everyone in here, Democrat and Republican, is for this bill. It has been 7 years since we have had this reauthorization bill. It is overdue, so we need to have it now.

We debated this for 2½ hours yesterday, so I would encourage any one of the authors of these six amendments to come and work with us and get this thing done. It would be a shame if we came this far and didn't get it done. So I join my chairman, Senator BOXER, in encouraging everyone to work together.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. MENENDEZ pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 203 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MENENDEZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, over the last couple of months, we have been debating the policy in Iraq, and over the first 4 months of the 110th Congress, the Senate has spent many days debating this policy. I and many other Senators believe we should move in a new direction and change the policy by transitioning the mission to training Iraqi forces, fighting terrorists, and protecting our troops and civilian personnel in Iraq.

As part of this new policy, we should have a phased redeployment strategy to begin the process of winding down the war to get our brave combat forces home. Our troops have accomplished every mission in Iraq. They have done their job. It is well past time that the President, his administration, and this Congress do our job as they have done their job in Iraq.

The war has diverted our attention and resources from the broader war against al-Qaida and its allies which continues unabated 5 years following the horrific events of September 11. Despite this administration's exaggerated rhetoric in the months leading up to our invasion, Saddam Hussein's regime

did not have any direct ties to al-Qaida, and our decision to topple his regime without international support drained resources from our ongoing efforts in Afghanistan. The Bush administration's inexcusable lack of planning for a postwar environment and the stunning incompetence in managing the occupation gave birth to a large, mostly Sunni-based insurgency in Iraq. This insurgency, aided by a steady flow of foreign fighters, is now giving birth to a new generation of al-Qaida terrorists providing ideological inspiration for extremists around the world.

The Presiding Officer knows, as well as so many others, that contrary to the administration's rosy rhetoric in 2002 and 2003, the decision to invade Iraq has served as a major setback in our overall struggle against Islamic extremism and the terrorism that movement inspires. Dr. Bruce Hoffman, one of the world's leading experts on terrorism, who recently briefed me, has declared:

The United States' entanglement in Iraq has consumed the attention and resources of our country's military and intelligence communities at precisely the time that Osama bin Laden and other senior al-Qaida commanders were in their most desperate straits and stood to benefit most from this distraction.

For that reason, it is essential that we get our Iraq policy on the right path by beginning to redeploy our U.S. combat forces, emphasizing training of Iraqi security forces, protecting our forces, and engaging in targeted counterterrorism missions.

The war against al-Qaida and its extremist allies continues on multiple fronts around the world. This is a generational battle, so our Nation must respond accordingly. Vice President CHENEY, seeking to validate the administration's counterterror efforts, declared last fall:

I don't know how much better you can do than no attacks in the last 5 years.

Every American is grateful that the Vice President's statement continues to hold true. We must salute those men and women in our Armed Forces, our intelligence community, and our law enforcement networks, from State and local police forces to the FBI, who have helped protect our Nation against further attacks. To take one example, it was skillful surveillance and old-fashioned gumshoe work on the part of the CIA and FBI agents, closely cooperating with their British counterparts, which allowed us to stop in its tracks a chilling plot to blow up as many as 10 airplanes crossing the Atlantic in August of 2006.

Unfortunately, the absence of terrorist attacks in the United States does not signify any reduction in the overall threat posed by al-Qaida and its allies waging battle on behalf of Islamic extremism. The dangers our Nation still face today were brought home by two developments in recent days.

The Presiding Officer knows this well because of the State he represents.

First, six men were arrested last week for conspiring to launch an attack on Fort Dix in New Jersey and "kill as many soldiers as possible." This home-grown cell of Islamic extremists was broken up when two of the defendants sought to purchase assault weapons from an undercover FBI agent. They had engaged in small arms training at a shooting range in the Pocono Mountains in my home State of Pennsylvania.

Second, another development. Late last week the U.S. Embassy in Berlin issued a general threat warning indicating that a terrorist attack against U.S. military or diplomatic facilities in Germany may be in the final stages of planning. This plot may be linked to the upcoming G8 summit to be held in Germany later this summer.

We have all seen the press reports indicating fresh evidence that al-Qaida is once again establishing training camps in southwest Asia, only this time in Pakistan, not Afghanistan. Although we achieved successes in late 2001 and 2002 in cutting off al-Qaida's hierarchy from its foot soldiers around the world and severing operational links inside the organization, these gains are slowly disappearing. Instead, we see the chain of command within al-Qaida re-emerging with fresh evidence of plans of potential terrorist strikes in western Europe and perhaps even our own homeland.

Just listen to what the Director of National Intelligence, Mr. McConnell, declared in recent testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee:

We also have seen that al-Qaida's core elements are resilient. They continue to plot attacks against our homeland and other targets with the objective of inflicting mass casualties. And they continue to maintain active connections and relationships that radiate outward from their leaders' hideout in Pakistan to affiliates throughout the Middle East, northern Africa, and Europe.

The deadly reach of al-Qaida was reaffirmed with April's coordinated explosions in and around the capital of Algeria, killing 24 and wounding more than 200. A group calling itself al-Qaida in Islamic North Africa claimed responsibility for the blasts, a severe blow to a nation that was finally coming out of the ashes of the horrific civil war in the 1990s.

Mr. President, we know in order to neutralize this reconstituted and possibly more dangerous version of al-Qaida, the U.S. must embark on a global counterinsurgency campaign which recognizes that military force is an essential, but not sufficient, response to this threat. The U.S. must draw on all elements of our national power—military, political, and economic—in a coordinated campaign that seeks to deny refuge and sanctuary to al-Qaida forces wherever they reside.

The Third Way National Security Project recently released an insightful report that calls for a global constriction strategy against al-Qaida—an effort to suffocate the al-Qaida movement and pressure its physical re-

sources, its people, and its vehicles of propaganda—all in a unified effort to shut down al-Qaida's ability to wage war through large-scale acts of terror. We can accomplish this strategy through multiple methods: doubling the size and increasing the skill sets of our Special Forces troops, working with other nations to more effectively crack down on terror financing flows, and, finally, getting serious on public diplomacy so that we can counter and refute the hate-filled messages from extremists at every turn.

Recently, former Senator Gary Hart suggested that we should create a fifth military service branch which would unify all Special Forces under one command, an idea worthy of consideration and further study.

We also need to send a firm message to Pakistan that the United States cannot tolerate the return of al-Qaida training facilities anywhere in the world. If such camps are on sovereign Pakistani territory, then it is the responsibility of the government in Islamabad to ensure that those camps are shut down. General Musharraf has been a partner of the United States, and his government has played a valued role in some of our most notable counterterrorism successes. But we cannot abide any backsliding when it comes to this issue.

Al-Qaida is not only reconstituting its networks and operational capabilities, but it is also making gains in the broader battle of ideas—the clash between modernity and reason and extremism and jihadism. These are two very different worldviews fiercely competing every day for the hearts and minds of the Muslim world. America will win the war against extremism when we persuade the citizens of Egypt, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and other nations of the strength of our ideas and values and offer a path away from militancy and irrational hatred.

But we have been going in the wrong direction on this front. We only need to recall the immediate aftermath of the 9/11 attacks when the world united with us in grief and sympathy. Who can forget that grand headline, in France of all places, on September 12, 2001: "We are all Americans." The United States had a historical opportunity to unite the world in a common cause against the forces of terrorism and extremism and destroy the al-Qaida network and the twisted beliefs that serve as its cornerstone. Instead, by pursuing a black-and-white, our-way-or-the-highway approach, this administration helped transform our Nation's greatest asset—the appeal of the American spirit around the world—into a liability.

America today evokes feelings of resentment and distrust, negativity and hostility. Instead of building a grand international coalition on behalf of the values that unite us, the White House settled for temporary and weak "coalitions of the willing" that have left us far too isolated.

Since 2001, the Pew Global Attitudes Project has tracked on a regular basis

how America is perceived overseas and global attitudes toward the U.S.-led war on terrorism. Across the board, we have seen a dramatic decline in positive views toward the United States and, even more troubling, the American people. This decline has been especially marked in the Islamic world, where Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida enjoy far stronger favorability ratings than our Nation. In both Morocco and Jordan, both relatively moderate Muslim nations, a 2005 poll found that approximately half of respondents in both nations believe suicide attacks against Americans in Iraq are justifiable. In Indonesia, positive views of the United States plunged from 61 percent to 15 percent in 1 year alone—from 2002 to 2003. Unfortunately, those numbers have barely edged upward in recent years.

Something has gone terribly wrong when a vile terrorist organization is in a more positive light than our great Nation. That is, apparently, what some surveys show across the world. I understand that the United States is the biggest guy on the block and a certain level of resentment will always exist. Yet, we cannot succeed in this global struggle against terrorism and extremism if our own ideas and our own image are viewed in such distorted, negative terms. We must recommit ourselves to a global public diplomacy campaign that conveys our Nation as it truly is—a beacon for liberty and hope. Our efforts will succeed when we inspire those currently sitting on the fence in the Muslim world to reject the false ideals that al-Qaida and its brethren promote. In waging an offensive against al-Qaida, our ideas will be as important as the might of our military forces.

While we must wage a strong offensive against al-Qaida and its extremist allies, we cannot neglect a strong defense here at home. Combating terrorism requires a strong homeland security effort, to ensure that our Nation can effectively defend and deter against attacks that can kill or injure tens of thousands of Americans in one strike. Unfortunately, homeland security has long been an afterthought for this administration, instead used primarily as a rhetorical weapon against its political opponents. The Department of Homeland Security's ineffectual record and poor performance bear witness to this neglect.

It is easy to forget that this administration fiercely opposed the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, instead arguing that a small office in the White House could adequately do the job. The administration long resisted the full implementation of the 9/11 Commission recommendations—a serious oversight that the 110th Congress has sought to rectify, with both the House and the Senate passing comprehensive legislation to help ensure that all of the commission's recommendations are finally put in place. When it came time to replace Tom

Ridge as Secretary of Homeland Security, the White House put forward as its first choice Bernard Kerik—a political hack with a checkered past—only to withdraw the nomination days later after a series of embarrassing disclosures on his personal background.

The Department of Homeland Security has lacked the necessary budgets, leadership, and political support required from the White House to do its job properly. Although the administration created a brand new department to coordinate homeland security policy, overall funding for homeland security programs barely grew after DHS opened its doors in early 2003. The upper echelons of the Department have constituted a revolving door with industry, as senior political appointees spend only a year or two in their positions before cashing in on their contacts and joining lobbying firms and technology firms with interests before the Department. We saw the culmination of this neglect and indifference in the Department's shameful response to Hurricane Katrina in the fall of 2005.

Although I do not sit on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, I take a strong interest in these issues, as they are vital to my constituents in Pennsylvania. And so I believe there are three key areas where this Congress can take further action to help ensure that our Nation is better prepared to protect itself against a future attack. First of all, we must ensure that our limited homeland security dollars are spent wisely. Although I respect the general principle that Federal spending must be allocated in a manner fair and proportionate for all 50 States represented in this Chamber, we cannot treat homeland security funding as just another Government program. It is an undeniable fact, one emphasized by the 9/11 Commission, that some States, some cities, and some targets are at significantly greater risk to attack than others. And so we must allocate our homeland security funding on a risk-focused basis.

During the Senate's debate on the 9/11 Commission bill, I was proud to stand with the distinguished Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and others in fighting for an amendment that would revise our funding formulas to ensure that homeland security dollars flow, first and foremost, to those cities and States with the greatest at-risk targets. Although this effort failed, I was pleased to see that we have made progress since the last Congress and encourage the House-Senate conference to ensure that risk-based funding provisions be included in the final bill.

A second area of strong concern to me is the prospect of terrorists transforming our chemical plants and hazardous material rail shipments into lethal chemical weapons. A Congressional Research Service report indicates that there are at least 16 chemical plants in Pennsylvania where a re-

lease of toxic chemicals could cause over 100,000 deaths, and two plants where such a release could result in over a million deaths. This threat has been brought home in recent weeks as we see insurgents in Iraq engineering large explosions of chlorine tankers to spread noxious fumes in populated areas. These attacks are growing in sophistication and lethality and I worry that they may provide a blueprint for similar attacks in the United States. Therefore, I am encouraged that the Department of Homeland Security released its final regulations on chemical plant security earlier this month. These regulations are a good start, but we need to do much more. In particular, we need to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security's Chemical Security Office receives far more than the paltry \$10 million it was appropriated for the current fiscal year.

It is also essential to permit those state and local governments which wish to adopt even more stringent protective measures to do so. The regulations issued by the Department are somewhat ambiguous on this point, and so both Houses of Congress have endorsed language that preserves the right of State and local governments to "preempt" Federal regulations so long as they are not in direct contradiction. This language would permit the Department of Homeland Security to establish a minimum floor for chemical security regulations, but, yielding to the best principles of federalism, allow individual State and local governments to go beyond those minimum regulations where appropriate.

Finally, it is incumbent that our Nation takes steps to once and for all ensure that our first responders have reliable access to secure interoperable communications. After 343 firefighters and paramedics gave their lives on 9/11, and countless victims died during Hurricane Katrina, because emergency personnel were unable to communicate with each other, it is unacceptable that we have still failed to establish a nationwide interoperable communications system that will allow local, State, and Federal first responders to communicate with each other in a seamless and uniform fashion. For this reason, I am proud to join my distinguished colleague from Arizona in cosponsoring S. 744, the SAVE LIVES Act, a bill ensuring that an additional 30 MHz in the 700 MHz spectrum band be dedicated to public safety.

The SAVE LIVES Act would require the Federal Communications Commission to auction 30 MHz of the spectrum, which is otherwise scheduled to be made available in January 2008 for general commercial purposes, under a conditional license requiring any winning bidder to meet detailed requirements to operate a national, interoperable public safety broadband network. A commercial provider can use this broadband spectrum for commercial purposes, but must make available the

spectrum for public safety purposes whenever it is needed.

I am proud to be the first cosponsor on this important legislation. I strongly urge the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee to take up this bill immediately, because we don't have time to lose. Pursuant to a previous congressional mandate, the FCC must auction spectrum in the 700 MHz band by January 28, 2008. Unless this bill passes in some form beforehand, all of that spectrum, with a small exception, will be auctioned off to commercial providers, with no requirement that any of it be made available to first responders for public safety purposes.

Secure, interoperable communications is an issue of particular interest to my constituents in the city of Philadelphia. Currently, first responders are unable to use their radios in the tunnels of the city's subway and commuter rail system, SEPTA. The city has applied for DHS grants in past years to wire the tunnels to facilitate communications, but those applications have been rejected. I intend to work with the city and other members of the Pennsylvania Congressional delegation to ensure that the fifth largest city in the Nation is prepared for any potential emergency in its transit system.

There are a number of other strong policy proposals that I urge this Congress to consider to further strengthen our Nation's homeland security. I do not have the time today to discuss them in further detail, but at a minimum, we should take a serious look at the following areas:

Ensuring that we inspect the air cargo transported by passenger airlines to prevent terrorists from planting a bomb in a plane's underbelly; strengthening our border security with better technology and additional Customs and Border Patrol agents; working with the private sector to develop real incentives for both large corporations and small businesses to adopt commonsense solutions that mitigate the risks of an attack and thus make them less attractive targets to terrorists; undertaking a serious and comprehensive approach to locking up sources of nuclear missile material around the world to prevent our worst nightmare—an improvised nuclear bomb destroying an American city.

All of us remember where we were and what we were doing on September 11, 2001. The memories of that terrible day will remain with all of us so long as we are alive. Our Nation has been blessed that we have not had to endure another attack during the intervening 5 years, but we recognize that our friends in Western Europe, Southeast Asia, and the Middle East have suffered ghastly attacks that have taken the lives of innocent civilians and spread terror. The war in Iraq is at the center of our national discussion today, but we cannot allow it to distract us from the objectives the American people set

out to achieve in the fall of 2001: destroying al-Qaida and denying legitimacy to the ideas of jihadist extremism.

It is time to refocus our attention and resources. Al-Qaida may not have mounted another attack against our citizens, but they have tried and are once again on the march. We must rededicate ourselves to a comprehensive strategy that seeks to constrict Al-Qaida's bases of support and undercuts their popular legitimacy in the Muslim world. On the home front, we must ensure that we are adequately prepared to deter and defend against likely attacks that seek to exploit our open society and sow panic and economic damage.

If America truly is engaged in a generational battle against the forces of extremism, our Nation must adopt a serious and comprehensive approach to counterterrorism, both overseas and at home. We owe the victims of 9/11 and their families no less—indeed, we owe the American people no less.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I ask to speak for 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, this is a very difficult time for those of us who have long known that the war in Iraq was a strategic error of monumental proportions but who also understand the practical realities of disengagement. The majority of this country believes we need to readjust our Iraq policy and get our combat forces off the streets of Iraq's cities. A majority of our military believes this administration's approach is not working. A majority of the Congress believes we need a new approach.

There are sound, realistic alternatives that could be pursued toward the eventual goal of removing our troops from Iraq, increasing the political stability of that war-torn region, increasing our capability to defeat the forces of international terrorism, and allowing our country to focus on larger strategic priorities that have now gone untended for years. Unfortunately, few of these alternatives seem to make it to the House or Senate floor in a form that would truly impact policy.

With respect to the approaches that have been taken recently, let me first say I am somewhat cynical about the stack of benchmarks that have appeared in recent bills laying down a series of requirements to the Iraqi Government. The reality is that the Iraqi Government is a weak government. Like the Lebanese Government 20

years ago, it has very little power, and it is surrounded by a multiplicity of armed factions which have overwhelming power in their own concentrated areas of activity.

Too often, the benchmarks that we, in our splendid isolation, decide to impose are little more than feel-good measures, giving us the illusion that we are doing something meaningful. Just to make them more illusory, the language we send over on benchmarks and other policies, such as unit readiness and length of deployment, are usually couched with waivers, so the President can simply ignore the language, anyway. What does this do? How can we continue these actions and then claim to the American people that we are really solving the most troubling issue of our era? Some of these discussions remind me of what Mark Twain once wrote, saying that the Government in Washington is like 2,000 ants floating down the river on a log, each one thinking they are driving it.

Secondly, let me say that I admire the intentions of the bill my colleague, Senator FEINGOLD, introduced today. However, I could not vote for that bill because an arbitrary cutoff date for funding military operations in Iraq might actually work against the country's best interests in an environment where we have finally seen some diplomatic efforts from this administration. Recent initiatives from Secretary of State Rice, Ambassador Crocker, and Admiral Fallon, the new commander of Central Command, hold out the hope, if not the promise, that we might actually start to turn this thing around.

Admiral Fallon has publicly stated that we must deal with Iran and Syria. Ambassador Crocker, at this moment, is arranging a diplomatic exchange with Iran. Secretary of State Rice has cooperated at the ministerial level in an environment where her Iranian counterpart was also at the table. Importantly, Admiral Fallon mentioned during his recent confirmation hearing that it is not the number of troops in Iraq that is important but the uses to which they are being put.

So there is some room for movement here, as long as the movement occurs in a timely fashion. An arbitrary cutoff date would, at this point, take away an important negotiating tool. Let us just hope they use the tools we are providing them in an effective manner.

There is, however, one issue which demands our immediate attention and which should not be delayed. As we look at our options here in Congress, I continue to firmly believe we have a duty in an area which is not being properly addressed by this administration and which is in the proper purview of the Congress. When the supplemental appropriations bill is returned to the President, it should contain language prohibiting this administration from deploying Army units for longer than 12 months and from deploying Marine Corps units for longer than 210 days. It should also prohibit sending

any military individual overseas unless he or she has been home from a previous tour for at least as long as they had been deployed. In other words, if you have been gone a year, you should come home for a year before you go back.

This administration has gone to the well again and again, extending the length of military tours and shortening the time our soldiers and marines are allowed to be at home before being sent again and again into Iraq and Afghanistan. Absent the gravest national emergency, there is no strategy in Iraq or elsewhere that justifies what has been happening with the deployment cycles of the men and women we are sending into harm's way. It has reached the point that the good will and dedication of our military people are being abused by policymakers obsessed with various experimental strategies being conducted at their expense. These people have put their lives literally into the hands of our national leadership. There are limits to human endurance, and there are limits to what military families can be expected to tolerate in the name of the national good. For that reason, I urge our conferees to include language which will limit this policy in the bill that will be returned to the President.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, in these dangerous times, we face terrorist threats around the world. The decisions we make here in the Senate must put us in a stronger position to fight and defeat terrorists wherever they hide. Just last week, the United States and German Governments unraveled the reported plot to attack American interests in Germany. This development reminds us that we face dangers all around the globe, and we need to be able to dispatch our resources wherever and whenever they are needed to keep us safe.

Unfortunately, having nearly 150,000 American troops stuck in the middle of a civil war in Iraq does not strengthen our ability to fight terrorists from around the globe. In fact, by forcing our troops to police a civil war and by not giving our troops the equipment and training they need, the President's current policy is impairing our military readiness and our ability to fight and win the broader war on terror. It is time to refocus our efforts back on to the broader war on terror. Yes, we will

still fight and defeat the al-Qaida terrorists who are in Iraq. But we recognize that terror networks exist in many other countries, and we have to fight and defeat terrorists in those places as well.

That is why I supported the Feingold-Reid amendment this morning. That amendment recognizes that leaving our troops in the middle of a civil war in Iraq is not the best use of our military. It doesn't make us safer at home, it diminishes our ability to fight the broader war on terror, and it impairs our military readiness.

It is clear the Iraqi civil war cannot be solved militarily. It must be solved politically. Today we are 5 years into this war. Thousands of American lives have been lost, and billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars have been spent. Yet the Iraqis have not moved forward with meeting key benchmarks and beginning reconciliation. We have to show the Iraqis that we will not police their civil war indefinitely and that they must take responsibility for their own future. The redeployment language of the Feingold-Reid amendment from this morning makes it very clear to the Iraqis that our commitment is not open-ended and that they must make the necessary compromises to bring peace to their country.

In Iraq, our troops have done everything we have asked them to do. Now it is time to begin redeploying our troops, rebuilding our military, and getting back to fighting the war on terror.

As I look at these issues, I see four imperatives: First, we have to fight and defeat terrorists; second, we have to recognize the war in Iraq is impacting our ability to do that; third, we have to rebuild our military readiness, which has been seriously compromised by this war in Iraq. Finally, we have to be there to support our servicemembers, our veterans and their families, every step of the way.

First of all, we all recognize that we are in a war with terrorists around the world and we need to fight and win that war. This is not a war against countries. We are in a war against terrorists wherever they reside. President Bush wants us to believe the war in Iraq is the war on terror. It is not. The war on terror that our country faces is not the same thing as the civil war that is raging in Iraq. What is happening in Iraq is primarily a civil war between factions that have been in conflict for generations. The Feingold-Reid amendment empowers our military to target and destroy any terrorist elements in Iraq, but it would not force the majority of American troops to be stuck indefinitely in the crossfire of a civil war.

As we look at the terrorists our Nation confronts, al-Qaida is the most dangerous, according to the declassified National Intelligence Estimate from last year.

That NIE report said:

Al-Qaida will continue to pose the greatest threat to the homeland and U.S. interests abroad by a single terrorist organization.

The NIE also said the jihadists "are increasing in both number and geographic dispersion. If this trend continues, threats to U.S. interests at home and abroad will become more diverse, leading to increasing attacks worldwide."

Al-Qaida is the threat. We have to get back to fighting al-Qaida, and that is what the Reid-Feingold amendment would allow.

Under that amendment, while most troops would be redeployed, some would remain to conduct targeted operations against al-Qaida and other terrorist groups. They would provide security for American infrastructure and personnel, and they would be allowed to train and equip the Iraqi security forces.

This administration's focus on Iraq has distracted us from the larger war on terror, and it has left us vulnerable. Our country faces possible threats from terrorists around the world, and we need a security strategy that ensures that we can fight those threats wherever they are. But, instead, the Bush administration has become increasingly focused on Iraq, which weakens our ability to fight that broader war on terror just when we must be strong.

Next, let's look at the relationship between the civil war in Iraq and our own security. Does having so much of our military tied up in Iraq's civil war make us safer? Does it help us fight terrorists around the world? The truth is, leaving our troops in Iraq is not making us more secure.

A State Department report from 2 weeks ago found:

International intervention in Iraq has been used by terrorists as a rallying cry for radicalization and extremist activity that has contributed to the instability in neighboring countries.

According to our own State Department, our involvement in Iraq is making the region less stable, not more stable. The war in Iraq has the potential to make it harder for us to respond to other threats around the world. That is because the conflict in Iraq is tying up large parts of our military and is degrading our military readiness, which brings me to my third point.

We must rebuild America's military. We can all be proud that our country is home to the finest fighting forces in the world. But we must also face the truth. The war in Iraq has impaired our military readiness, and that is not just my opinion, it is the opinion of military leaders and experts who say it may take us, now, 5 years to rebuild our military.

The Iraq war has impaired our readiness by forcing a hard-to-maintain tempo on our troops, by destroying our equipment, by reducing the capabilities of our Guard and Reserve, and by limiting the training that our troops receive. Today we are forcing a very tough tempo on our servicemembers. They all want to work, and they all want to work hard. But we have to

make sure the demands placed on them are reasonable. The Pentagon has extended tours of duty for our troops. It has deployed troops sooner than planned. It has sent troops without all the training and equipment they should receive. It has deployed troops without the downtime at home that our servicemembers and their families deserve.

Two Army brigades are on their fourth deployment now to Iraq and Afghanistan. That tremendous pace with little downtime in between is a strain on our troops. Our military is the best in the world. I believe we need to address those strains on our servicemembers so we can remain the best in the world.

The Iraq war is also impairing our readiness by destroying our equipment. The Army, for example, is supposed to have five brigades' worth of equipment prepositioned overseas, but because of the war in Iraq, the Army is depleting those reserves. GEN Peter Schoomaker told the Senate just last month:

It will take us 2 years just to rebuild those stocks.

Our military is the best in the world. I believe we need to address the strains on equipment so we can remain the best in the world.

The Iraq war has especially impacted the readiness of our National Guard. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau, LTG Stephen Blum, testified that the readiness of National Guard forces is at a historic low. He said:

Eighty-eight percent of the forces that are back here in the United States are very poorly equipped today in the Army National Guard.

A national commission looked at the National Guard and Reserve and sent its report to Congress last March, a few months ago. The commission said:

We believe that the current posture and utilization of the National Guard and Reserve as an "operational reserve" is not sustainable over time, and if not corrected with significant changes to law and policy, the reserve component's ability to serve our Nation will diminish.

Our military is the best in the world. I believe we need to address the readiness of our Guard and Reserve so we can remain the best in the world.

We also rely on our Guard members when disaster strikes at home. We need their trained personnel and equipment to respond quickly. After the horrible tornadoes that occurred in Kansas just a few weeks ago, the Governor of Kansas said recovery efforts for those two States were hampered because there were not enough personnel and equipment. Where were those resources? In Iraq, not here at home.

COL Timothy Orr of the U.S. Army National Guard told the Senate that his brigade's homeland security capabilities have been degraded.

He testified to us:

Our ability as a brigade to perform these homeland missions continues to be degraded by continued equipment shortages, substitutions, and the cross-leveling of equipment

between the State and the Nation to support our deploying units.

I have shown now how the Iraq war has impacted the readiness of our troops, of our equipment, and of our National Guard. The pace of deployment to Iraq is also hindering another measure of readiness—the training that our servicemembers receive.

To meet the President's surge, the Pentagon has been sending some troops to Iraq earlier than was planned, and they are keeping other units there in Iraq longer than planned. That means our troops are getting less time at home, less time between deployments, and importantly, less time to train. Commanders are forced to shorten the training their troops receive so they are focusing now only on specific training that they need for Iraq, but not for other potential conflicts.

That makes sense if there is limited training time. We want all that time devoted to their most immediate need. However, many military leaders are now warning us that this fast pace diminishes our ability to respond to other potential conflicts. Here is how the colonel who commands the First Marine Regiment put it:

Our greatest challenge is and will remain available training time, and because that time is limited, our training will continue to focus on the specific mission in Iraq. This has, and will continue to, limit our ability to train for other operations.

Army COL Michael Beech told the Senate in April that he believes our training strategy is broad enough to support a variety of other events. But he added:

However, if deployed in support of other emerging contingencies, I would be concerned with the atrophy of some specific tactical skills unique to higher-density conflicts.

We have military commanders telling us that they are concerned that our ability to train for other missions has been limited and certain tactical skills have atrophied. We don't know what the future of our world brings. We don't know what types of conflicts we will need to be prepared to fight. It is our responsibility, as leaders today, to be preparing for whatever the future brings for the next generation. By allowing our troops to only now be trained for today's mission, we are not meeting our responsibility for the long-term dangers our country must be prepared to defeat.

Our military is the best in the world. I believe we have to address these training shortfalls so we can remain the best in the world.

I am also concerned at the billions of dollars that we are spending in Iraq, coming at the expense of our ability to be strong at home. I am very concerned that the Bush administration has chosen to fund this war in ways that have meant that homeland security priorities at home have not been fully funded. I have worked very hard with my colleagues to try to correct that in areas such as port security grants and

first responder funding. But it is not easy to overcome years of misplaced priorities from this administration.

Let me share with you some of the examples from this President's latest budget proposal. President Bush, in his budget proposal to us, dramatically cut funding for first responders to pay for the war in Iraq. His budget cut critical State homeland security grants by \$348 million, or about 60 percent, to pay for the war in Iraq. He reduced urban area grants by \$185 million—that is a 25-percent reduction—to pay for the war in Iraq. He cut our local law enforcement terrorism prevention grants by \$119 million. That is a cut of 33 percent at home to pay for the war in Iraq.

Mr. President, we know funds are limited, so we have to be smart. Policing a civil war in Iraq should not come at the expense of our security right here at home.

Finally, as we fight and win the war on terrorism and we rebuild our military, we have to be there every step of the way to support our servicemembers, our veterans, and, importantly, their families. We need to meet their needs every step of the way from the day they are recruited, while they are being trained, when they are deployed, and, importantly, when they transition back here at home.

Today, too many of our servicemembers are falling through the cracks and not getting the support they deserve. That is why I have been working on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the Appropriations Committee to identify those needs, to fund them, and to have the appropriate policies so we support those men and women who have so strongly supported us.

At the end of the day, our security comes down to people, people doing a job this country has asked them to do. We have to keep our promise to them. We face terrorist threats around the world. We must and we will defeat them. But to do so, we have to be smart and we have to be tough.

Unfortunately, the civil war in Iraq is not making us more secure; it is making us less secure. We need to refocus our efforts back on the war on terrorism and we need to rebuild our military. I supported the Feingold-Reid amendment this morning because it sets a new direction for our involvement in Iraq so we can refocus on the larger security challenges our Nation faces.

This is what I am fighting for in the Senate. I know we can do it. We can take care of our men and women in uniform, we can improve security right here at home, we can track down and eliminate terrorists around the world. It is a matter of getting our priorities straight.

Redeploying our troops from Iraq so we can focus on those other priorities is a critical first step in the Senate we have to take.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS.) The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the senior Senator from Washington State for her statement. She expressed similar concerns at the time of the original vote on the war in Iraq. She courageously stood up and spoke to why the mistakes were being made.

I have to say, especially seeing the distinguished Presiding Officer from my own State of Vermont, I think it is safe to say, if the same speech had been given in the State of Vermont, way over across the continent to our State, it would have been widely and happily received.

We have a situation where one time people put on the ribbons to support the troops, as we all do, we all do, but then when the budget comes, we find, well, we will support everything but those things needed by our troops when they come home—everything that is needed by our veterans, everything that is needed by a lot of our troops while they are over there, and this will not change until more people speak out as courageously as the Senator from Washington State has.

I commend her. She has been very consistent. They are words that this Vermonter is glad to hear. I am glad she is saying it at a time when both the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Vermont, and I had a chance to be here. I applaud her for it.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, Members of the Senate—at least a certain limited number—are intensely involved in an attempt to draft an immigration bill that will serve the national interest. I say “serve the national interest” because there are quite a number of special interests. There are the interests of poor people all over the world who would like to come here, interests of all kinds. But at one of our hearings, we had several professors and experts on immigration and the economy. They said we ought to ask what is in the national interest and do that. That can also cause us to develop a thought process that could lead to legislation of which we can be proud.

One thing that is not in our national interest is to continue the current policy of immigration. It is not working. It has comprehensively failed us. We

all know that. We have been at this for some time. We know this system is not working effectively. It has not made us proud. Congress deserves a lot of blame. Often unmentioned is that very considerable blame should fall on Presidents over the last 20 years because I am not aware of a single time any of them have come to Congress with a comprehensive request for action that would actually fix this broken system. So both Congress and the President deserve criticism.

These discussions are ongoing. I admire the Senators who are participating. I am aware these discussions are going on. People ask me: Senator, does that offend you? I say: No, you need some people to gather to try to hammer something out and sometimes to make a blocked system begin to work. There are some excellent Senators participating in that activity. But I have to tell my colleagues, I have some concerns. My predictions last week seem to be coming true today; that is, a process has been ongoing that could lead to us having an entirely new bill plopped on the floor of the Senate, that nobody has had a chance to read on one of the most important issues facing our country.

Some say: Oh, it is not so important. We have to get the bill off the floor. The public is going to be mad, so the sooner we can just bring this thing up and vote it out and get it away from here, the less blame is going on fall on us.

That kind of thinking is afoot here, I am afraid. But it is not good thinking. I believe the American people know this is an important issue. They believe we should get it right. They want us to get it right. They know there are going to have to be some tough choices. I know there are people talking, calling in on the radio and fussing and saying unkind things sometimes that they shouldn't say. We have people calling in with Pollyanna-ish ideas that are not worth two cents. People sort of judge the debate by maybe what they hear in those circumstances.

We need to work up a bill that can be effective, that would actually work. It cannot be done quickly. Fortunately, the efforts have been abandoned on the bill that we passed last year, amazingly. It was an absolutely fatally flawed piece of legislation that should never have become law. I think Members of the Senate, many of them who voted for it, had they believed it would become law, probably wouldn't have voted for it. They also didn't know what was in it. It was over 800 pages. They knew the House wasn't going to pass it. That is not responsible leadership.

This year, we have a new framework. When you have a new framework, you are not able to analyze portions of last year's bill and see how the new framework is going to work. So we are told that they are coming close to reaching agreement. People who I affectionately called “the masters of the universe,”

those who are out there plotting all this comprehensive immigration reform and putting it together, they are meeting. What will they produce? I don't know. So we are now going to have a cloture vote on Monday. The Democratic leader insisted on that. He moved it off at least until Monday to give this small group a few more days to discuss it, this small group who are on the inside. As a result, we will have a cloture vote on Monday on the old bill, last year's bill.

Presumably Tuesday or sometime, this new bill will be plopped down. What is going to be in it? We don't know. We were told we may get the language tomorrow or we are going to try to have the language for you tomorrow, Senators, so you can at least begin to read it. We think this year's bill is going to be a thousand pages. That is not a little bitty matter, a thousand pages. As a former Federal prosecutor for 15 years, I know that if you don't get every single aspect of the bill right, it can't be made enforceable. If you make errors in the language and the drafting and the appellate process and the enforcement ideas, the whole thing can be a joke and not effective. It takes time to do write a bill this size correctly.

We are going to have this comprehensive immigration reform bill bouncing back up next week. They are going to want to vote on it by Friday of next week. I submit that Senators will not be given enough time to really analyze it, much less the American people. If we are to avoid cynicism, we ought to make sure the American people are engaged in the process. Those are large concerns of mine.

As I said, they say we may have the language tomorrow. But the best we can ascertain is, it is probably not going to be bill language, language we would actually vote on and amend. This is serious. It is some sort of outline or word statement of what the bill provisions are going to be, not having had it written out so we can examine it carefully before we vote on it.

A group of Senators—I was one of them—has written a letter to the Republican leader and to the majority leader, I believe, to say that with an issue as important and complex as immigration reform, it is critical that the process for floor consideration be open to full and informed debate and amendment. Who could dispute that? It goes on to say:

There are reports that the cloture vote on the motion to proceed will be held on Monday. We would ask you to seek the following assurances from Senator REID.

This would be the letter to Senator MCCONNELL asking him to approach the majority leader, Senator REID, and ask for these assurances: that a new, compromise proposal should be brought to the floor of the Senate as a separate, clean bill, not as an amendment to S. 1348, last year's bill. Therefore, we can proceed in a clean fashion to amend it and act on it in the appropriate fashion. No. 2, it was asked that full and

final bill text must be available online in a searchable format by midnight tonight. They have been talking about having that available in this fashion, but will we get it? I doubt it. All germane Republican amendments must be allowed to be called up and voted on. That is germane amendments, amendments that go right to the bill, not amendments unrelated to the bill. We need a CBO score, that is the Congressional Budget Office score. We had the CBO finally come through with a score on last year's bill that found that not counting the enforcement expenditures, the cost of that bill, as written, would be \$127 billion. I thank my excellent staff member for her assistance. Real money, I submit, it would cost, because the people who would be legalized and given permanent status and put on the road to citizenship in last year's bill would have been available for huge amounts of money from the Government in terms of earned-income tax credit and other welfare programs. So we don't have a score on it.

Before we pass a bill, we should look at the CBO score. The CBO has made clear that the real surge in cost to the U.S. Treasury will be in the next 10 years, not in the first 10 years. In fact, the Heritage Foundation's Mr. Robert Rector, who was one of the architect of welfare reform a number of years ago, has done immense calculations on the cost of the bill. He estimates that a substantial percentage of the people who would be legalized under this legislation will have less than a high school education and that on average would cost the U.S. Treasury \$30,000 a year or as much as \$1 million over a lifetime per household headed by a person without a high school education. He carefully worked those numbers up. Are they accurate? I don't know. But he spent a lot of time working on that. The point Mr. Rector and the Heritage Foundation have made with crystal clarity is that those wise people in the big suites in Manhattan who think we are going to solve our financial difficulties with Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security by adding large amounts of low-skilled immigration are in a dream world because it is going to cost us, not help us, financially. He called it a fiscal disaster. We haven't even seen the language of the new comprehensive immigration reform bill, so we don't know what the CBO score and the cost to the U.S. taxpayers would be.

Those are some fairly minimal issues that I believe should be dealt with before we rush into legislation.

Let me mention a few quick questions that I have about the new bill. The bill purports to have an enforcement guarantee. That is important. The enforcement provisions contained in Title I and Title II of the new bill will be meaningless unless they are funded, meaning that we actually put the money up for enforcement, and unless the enforcement measures are required to be implemented before other

parts of the bill kick in. That was the "trigger" debate we had last year.

Senator ISAKSON from Georgia offered a commonsensical approach that we should not give benefits to individuals until we are sure that the immigration system is not continuing to be broken and not working. It would simply require the borders to be secured before the new immigration programs are implemented. But it was rejected on the floor after debate last year 40 to 55 because the leaders who so-called put together that bill last year agreed they would vote against any amendments that had any significant impact on the legislation. So they all got together and voted against a commonsensical trigger. We need such a trigger in this year's legislation.

Without an enforcement trigger, we are unable to assure the American people that immigration reform in 2007 will be any different from 1986, when the promises of future enforcement, made in exchange for the amnesty given in 1986, never materialized.

That is what happened. In 1986, they said there were about 2 million people here illegally. We set up a system to grant them amnesty. We changed some laws to supposedly make the immigration system more lawful in the future. When amnesty was handed out, turned out to be 3 million people were here illegally. We had a big percentage of those who claimed amnesty, and who got it—got it on fraudulent claims—when they really were not entitled to it. That is the history of immigration reform in 1986—20 years ago. So we need to make sure, this time, when legislation passes, it will actually work. Isn't that what the American people want of us?

Another question we need to ask: How much will this bill increase legal immigration? Last year, the bill would have increased the number of green cards—that is, permanent resident status—the United States would issue over the next 20 years to 53 million. That would be 34 million more than the current 18.9 million scheduled to be issued under current law. That was last year's bill. It was just about three times the current rate of immigration.

Now, I have to tell you, Professor Borjas, at Harvard, has written a book, "Heaven's Door." He is at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, himself a Cuban immigrant as a young man. Professor Borjas has indicated he thinks that 500,000 per year would be the right number for America, economically and otherwise. That would be 10 million over 20 years, not 53 million over 20 years.

When it came out of committee, it was even worse. It would have increased the immigration levels by elevenfold—up to 217 million over 20 years. It actually could have gone that high under the bill as written. My staff—Cindy Hayden and her team—ran these numbers, and they were later confirmed by the Heritage Foundation. We had amendments that brought it down to 53 million.

So we do not know what the green card increases will be in the bill being talked about now. It is a critical question. So we need time to study that issue and make sure the numbers of people coming into our country are assimilatable, and also do not plummet the wages of American workers, particularly middle-class and lower middle-class workers.

I am telling you, the numbers indicate that low-skilled workers in the industries where there are large amounts of illegal immigration have not shown wage increases. In fact, in many instances, adjusted for inflation, wages have gone down. We had expert testimony on that. From 2000 to 2005, wages in categories of workers, where immigration is heavy, showed a net decrease in income.

So that only makes sense. If you bring in large amounts of low-skilled labor, you can expect the value of low-skilled labor in the United States to go down. I do not think the average American believes and expects that immigration reform will result in a large increase in immigration. I am pretty sure they think we are working on a comprehensive plan to create a legal system that works, and they probably expect immigration will be reduced, not tripled. So we have to look at that question.

Another question would be: Will the temporary program be temporary? Last year's bill contained a "temporary" worker program that was, in reality, a low-skilled permanent migration program for 200,000 workers, plus their families, annually. This is the bill that is on the floor today that we will vote cloture on next week. Workers and their families were given 3-year renewable visas. They could bring their families into the United States. They could be sponsored by their employer, the first year they are here, for a green card, to become permanent residents in the United States. They could continue to renew those temporary worker 3-year visas indefinitely, as long as they were working and did not have a felony conviction. So in last year's bill it was not a temporary worker program. It was a plan to bring in workers who were put on a virtual automatic path to permanent residence and citizenship.

What will this new bill contain? We hear different things. One is that it contains a 3-year visa, where workers are allowed to bring in their families—I am not sure we can look our voters in the eye back home and say we are going to sponsor such a program again this year.

Additionally, if we set aside 10,000 green cards a year for these new "temporary" workers to apply for—as I am hearing the bill may do—I am sure we cannot claim our intention is to create a temporary plan. So I am worried about that.

All I would say to my colleagues is, let's be sure we have enough time. There is no reason for us to have to

vote a week from this Friday on final passage of a 1,000-page bill that we have never even seen the language of yet. The only bill that is out there is last year's fatally flawed bill. Why can't we have this opportunity to review the new bill?

I have argued we should move dramatically in the way that Canada moved to create a merit-based system for immigration, based on skills and abilities, which countries such as Canada or the United States would deem helpful to their nation.

If we have 100 people who want to come to our country, and we cannot accept 100, we can only accept 50, why wouldn't we set up a system that asks them what skills and attributes they have that might be beneficial to our country—which would allow them to most flourish and benefit from the American experience? Why wouldn't we ask that and give preference to those who would come here?

I say to my colleague, to show the bankruptcy of any idea that we could have open borders, in the year 2000, we had 11 million people apply for 50,000 diversity lottery slots. We have an amazing situation, if you want to come to America, and you do not qualify in any number of ways, you can put your name in a pot, and each year we draw out 50,000 names. We had 11 million people in 1 year apply for those slots. So why wouldn't a merit-based system work?

Today, only 20 percent of the immigrants coming into the United States are admitted based on their skills. Canada went through a long period of discussion about this issue. They had a national discussion over some years, and the Parliament in Canada directed their government to establish a point-based system. Canada wanted that point-based system to ensure that 60 percent of the people who come into Canada come on a merit basis. Canada still takes those for humanitarian relief, Canada still takes other immigrants such as those with family connections, but in Canada that is much more limited than in the United States.

That was their plan. They are very happy with it. I have met with the person who actually runs that program. They are happy with what they did. They think it is something we should consider. They think we would be happy with it. We are hearing discussions that would be a part of this package. What a great step that would be if we would move in that direction. It is critical to me that more immigrants be selected on a point-based system as part of comprehensive immigration reform. It is something for which I have advocated for some time now and think we could actually get there. I am hearing some good feedback about it. But, once again, we need to read the language of the new bill.

I would point out a couple things. One, what I am hearing is the best they would expect to get to would be 40 per-

cent of the immigrants would be coming into our country based on merit, not 60 percent like Canada. Australia also does that, with 60 percent of their immigrants coming into their country on a merit-based, on a point-based system.

I am concerned that we will end up with a system that will not be effective to move us to a more merit-based system, which would serve our long-term national interests and would ensure the people who do come to America come with every prospect and every ability to flourish in our country and to do well, and not only not be a drain on our medical system or our welfare system, but actually be prosperous taxpayers contributing to the health and vitality of our Nation.

I think I saw Senator BOXER in the Chamber a few moments ago. I will wrap up, if she is available, but I do not see her on the floor at this moment. I will share a couple more thoughts I do think are important.

Last year, we did not get a final CBO score until 3 months after the passage of the bill. The August 18th CBO score estimated the bill would cost \$126.9 billion for the first 10 years, and that "beyond 10 years, definitely the costs would escalate."

That is a major factor in what we are doing, and we have not even, to my knowledge, asked for a score from CBO, and I do not think we can ask for a score. We cannot ask for a score because we do not have bill language to say what is going to happen. We do not even know what is in the bill that will be dropped on us.

Another issue that was quite contentious last year, and I believe is very important: Will illegal aliens who worked here under a fictitious name and fraudulent Social Security number be able to get Social Security benefits?

Last year's bill would have allowed current illegal aliens to get Social Security benefits for the time they worked illegally in the United States.

In addition to the predictable fraud on the Social Security system that would result from this provision—there would be no way you could identify with certainty who paid with what Social Security number if you are using false numbers—this concept is fundamentally unfair to the millions of Americans who rely on Social Security as their main form of retirement income.

Our Social Security system is already in peril—\$6.8 trillion will already have to be invested by Congress today to have enough money to pay all of the program's promised benefits between 2017 and 2081. So it is not a program that is financially sound.

To provide millions an opportunity to make a claim to receive Social Security benefits when they were illegally in the country—utilizing a fraudulent Social Security number, illegally taking employment when they were not entitled to it, perhaps taking a job from an American worker—to be re-

warded with Social Security benefits, I believe, is not required.

Basic law—having handled a number of cases that dealt with it—is that one cannot benefit or go to court to enforce an unlawful contract. If you are a drug dealer, you cannot sue another drug dealer to enforce a promise to pay for drugs. You should not be able to have a claim against the Government based on your fraudulent conduct and then go to court and file a lawsuit to enforce that claim. That is just a basic principle of law, so any bill that offers a compassionate solution for the illegal alien population should draw the line at allowing those who come to our country illegally, utilizing false Social Security numbers, to receive benefits because it is unjust. And, how could you ever calculate that?

I will mention one more thing and will wrap up. What about the earned-income tax credit? Will that be available to temporary workers or illegal aliens given status under the bill?

The earned-income tax credit is a benefit designed to assist low-income Americans. I do not believe it should be provided to foreign workers who we invite to perform labor in our economy, whose own choice was to come and work here.

The cost estimate released by CBO last August calculated that last year's bill would have increased outlays for refundable tax credits by \$24.5 billion in the first 10 years because most of these workers are on wage scale rates that qualify for the earned-income tax credit. It would be the largest direct spending effect in the entire bill.

Now, the earned income tax credit was a plan conjured up by President Nixon a number of years ago and has some legitimate basis. Many people—conservatives—like it, and some don't. But it was designed to help working Americans make extra money so they could take care of their families. It costs us \$40 billion a year. It is one of the biggest programs we have.

I see no reason in policy or equity that says if a person comes to America to work at a job at a certain wage rate and they would generally know what that wage rate is before they came, that they ought to be given an earned income tax credit, a credit designed to encourage American citizens to work. What kind of sense does that make? So we had a vote on that last year, and the vote was to continue to give this benefit, even to temporary workers.

These are some of the issues I think are important. We are going to treat compassionately the people who are here illegally, try to work something out that is acceptable to them on any reform; we are going to try to do the things that Americans want to do in terms of generous and fair treatment to everybody. But we don't need to go overboard and put things in the bill for political correctness or other reasons that don't make common sense, that threaten our Treasury, that could drive down the wages of American workers,

that could increase the flow of workers into our country to a degree that is much larger than we have seen in the past, and that would not move us effectively to a more merit-based system like our neighbors in Canada have adopted.

Those are some of my concerns. I value and appreciate the hard work of the people who are working to try to make a bill come together, but I want people to know that it is a scary thing. I think it was the Chinese who said, in defining crisis, it is a crossing of danger and opportunity. Yes, we do have an opportunity to produce a bill that could be far better than last year's bill—a bill we could all support, that could actually work, that we could be proud of. I actually think that is possible. This year's framework for a bill is certainly a lot better. I am excited about that. But I have to tell my colleagues from what we are hearing about the language that is actually going into the bill, we could have big print rubric letters that promise this and promise that, but when you read the fine print, it is not there.

We owe the American people an honest, hard study of any legislation we vote on. If that legislation is not produced until next week, even if we get an outline of some kind tomorrow, that is not enough time for us to study it.

I appreciate the opportunity to share these thoughts. I sincerely hope that a compromise can be reached, and I hope it is one that will serve the United States.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, after many hours of work behind the scenes and with the help of some extraordinary staff which I will talk about later tonight, we have come to the point where we are going to get this important legislation, the WRDA bill, completed. We are at that point.

AMENDMENT NO. 1145

(Purpose: To modify certain provisions relating to water resources development projects)

Mr. President, I, along with Senator INHOFE, have a managers' amendment at the desk which has been cleared by all sides. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered and agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to this package of amendments be printed in the RECORD as if read.

I further ask that upon adoption of this amendment, no further amend-

ments be in order; that the substitute, as amended, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time; that upon passage, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, with a ratio of 6 to 5; and that the vote on passage occur at 5:15 p.m. today, notwithstanding rule XII, paragraph 4, with the above occurring without further intervening action or debate, with the time until 5:15 equally divided and controlled between the chair and the ranking member or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1145) was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, this is a wonderful moment for me as the chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee, and I have to say I wouldn't be at this point without the amazing work of my ranking member, Senator INHOFE. Everyone knows there are times when we don't see eye to eye on certain issues, mostly around the environment. We get that. But when it comes to making sure the infrastructure of this Nation is where it should be, there is really no daylight between us.

I think it is very important to note that both Senators LANDRIEU and VITTER were determined to show us their needs for Louisiana, and both Senator INHOFE and I are very pleased we were able to work with both of them. We know we haven't met every single need, but we have taken an enormous step in that direction.

I mentioned the staff earlier, and I want to mention their names—my staff director, Bettina Poirier, and my deputy staff director, Ken Kopocis, Jeff Rosato, and Tyler Rushforth. On Senator INHOFE's staff, I thank Andrew Wheeler, Ruth Van Mark, Angie Giancarlo, and Let Mon Lee. Additionally, I thank Jo-Ellen Darcy and Paul Wilkins with Senator BAUCUS and Mike Quiello with Senator ISAKSON.

This has been a bipartisan endeavor. This has not been easy. Some day, when I write my book on how a bill really becomes a law, I will let everyone know what it really takes to get a bill like this done, a bill that is 7 years in the making. We need to get it done. Senator INHOFE and I are going to get into that conference committee with our colleagues, and we are going to iron out the differences and hopefully be back here with the final product.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, let me say I agree with the statement made by the chairman of the committee, Senator BOXER. She is

right, we have had differences in the past. But I can say this: Working on infrastructure, whether it is the Transportation reauthorization bill or the WRDA bill, we work things out. I think we do it the responsible way. We have criteria. We make sure every project out there has a report and meets the criteria. Sometimes it doesn't end up that way in conference. We are going to do our very best to have a bill as close to what we have now, when we get to conference, when we get out of conference.

Let's keep in mind, it has been 7 years since we have had one of these. While some of the numbers look high to people, if we were to discipline ourselves, which we should—and I think we will work toward that end from now on and have these every 2 years—then that will be a much better way to get things done.

I guess we are into our time, now, aren't we?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. INHOFE. I would like to yield whatever time the Senator from Louisiana would like to use. I have to say he has been very cooperative. I know he has gotten the most he could for Louisiana, and that is our job when we come down here. But he has been very cooperative in working things out, and I thank him so much for his cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. VITTER. I ask the Chair to tell me when 3½ minutes elapses, and I will wrap up very quickly thereafter to use a maximum of 4 minutes.

Mr. President, I rise in strong support of this WRDA bill and in strong support of the managers' amendment which is now finalizing the Senate version of the bill.

Hurricanes Katrina and Rita were devastating events on Louisiana. Even before those devastating events, any WRDA bill would be enormously important to us because we live with water resources all around us because of our coast, which is a vibrant, working coast. But because of the hurricanes, this WRDA bill is even that much more vital in terms of our security and our future. Passing this WRDA bill through the Senate and hopefully soon on to the President's desk is an enormous step in our recovery.

I wish to thank everyone who has been so helpful in that step, starting with our chair, Senator BOXER, and our ranking member, Senator INHOFE. They have been enormously cooperative and enormously helpful. Also, Senators Isakson and Baucus, the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee, have been very helpful. Our great staff have also been enormously helpful in this process.

Through this bill, we have been able to meet a number of urgent needs of Louisiana following the hurricanes. Corps reform is done the right way in this bill, particularly for Louisiana,

through language which I drafted for a Louisiana Water Resources Council. It will serve as the exclusive peer-review entity for all four projects in the Louisiana hurricane disaster area, and that is a very positive, proactive version of Corps reform for Louisiana projects in this bill.

The Louisiana coastal area project, our forward-looking coastal restoration program, is fully authorized in this bill. We lose a football field of land every 38 minutes in Louisiana, and in the horrible days after the two hurricanes, we lost 217 square miles of wetlands. Addressing that is authorized in this bill, and many other things, such as repairing our levees to a true 100-year level of flood protection, fixing the outfall canals in New Orleans, replacing the flawed I-walls with T-walls, preventing future flooding on the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, the closure and restoration of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, and authorizing the very important Morganza to the Gulf Hurricane Protection Project. These are all enormously important. That was largely done in committee.

Here on the floor, I proposed a number of amendments. I worked with my colleague from Louisiana and others, and we adopted a number of other important amendments about MRGO to make sure it is closed once and for all; clarifying that 100-year standard; eliminating obstacles to the renovation of the Industrial Canal Lock; providing credit to Lafourche Parish for work on their hurricane protection projects; authorizing the first and second phase of coastal restoration; and creating a real integration team for Corps reform.

Last, but not least, we just agreed on a crucial amendment to have an expedited process to consider the next generation of projects to provide our area true category 5 protection. That is absolutely crucial. That has been a top priority of mine, and I just finalized that negotiation here off the Senate floor. So I am very excited, because it is hot off the press, to announce we will have that expedited process to make sure the next generation of protection gets expedited consideration by the Corps and by the Congress.

So thanks to all of the leaders who have been so helpful in this process.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today because there is a very serious situation facing Great Lakes shipping. In Michigan, and throughout the Great Lakes, there is a significant dredging backlog. The corps estimates a backlog of 16 million cubic yards at commercial harbors, which has had very real impacts to Michigan shipping. Several freighters have gotten stuck in Great Lakes channels; ships have had to carry reduced loads, and many shipments have simply ceased altogether. This problem stems in part from the way the corps' budget is prepared using performance metrics such as cargo value, tonnage, and ship

miles. Beginning in fiscal year 2005, the Office of Management and Budget and the Army corps began implementing new budget guidelines and criteria for funding the operation and maintenance of commercial harbors that relied primarily on the amount of tonnage a harbor handles. Although I do not object to using performance metrics, I am concerned that the metrics currently used do not adequately account for the situation at smaller harbors, many with economies that revolve around the harbor. I filed an amendment yesterday that would help address this very serious situation. The amendment, which is cosponsored by Senators VOINOVICH and STABENOW, would direct the corps to use all available data relating to economic impacts, and to not solely use the tonnage handled by a harbor.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I join the senior Senator from Michigan in sponsoring this amendment because the Great Lakes shipping infrastructure is in peril. Commercial freighters working in the Great Lakes cannot carry full loads, making for very inefficient water transport, and leading to very real economic consequences, not only for the Great Lakes region, but also for the Nation. The Great Lakes are the waterways that carry the steel for our cars, the coal for our electricity, and the limestone for the construction industry. Light-loading vessels increases the prices of these goods and in turn the goods produced from them. It has been reported that in Toledo, what was once a 150-meter-wide channel is now a 30-meter channel. We need to correct the way the corps budgets for these Great Lakes harbors—the backbone of our Nation's manufacturing economy—so they are not faced with the very real possibility of having to shut down altogether. This amendment would require the corps to use all available economic data in making its budget decisions, something that I think all of us should support.

Mrs. BOXER. I agree with the Senators from Michigan and Ohio that the corps needs to address this dredging backlog. I also agree that the corps should make their budget decisions using all economic data available and not based only on an arbitrary tonnage limit. While the bill managers were not able to reach an agreement on an amendment, I will work with the Senators to ensure that Great Lakes dredging issues are addressed when the bill is in conference.

Mr. INHOFE. As I have said before, we have an infrastructure crisis in this country. If we do not provide for adequate water transportation infrastructure, we will force even more traffic to our already-clogged highways. I believe we need to provide proper maintenance of our entire system, including the Great Lakes, not just switch focus from one component to another as they begin to fail.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my colleagues for their recognition of the dredging

crisis in the Great Lakes. I also thank Senators BOXER and INHOFE for their support of another amendment that I filed to this bill, which is cosponsored by Senators VOINOVICH and STABENOW, that would direct the Army corps to expedite the operation and maintenance of the Great Lakes navigation system. Although that amendment would be helpful to the overall Great Lakes commercial shipping infrastructure, I remain concerned that the corps is using budgeting criteria that simply do not reflect the reality of the Great Lakes shipping system. The Great Lakes should not be compared with ports on our coasts. Tonnage alone should not be the criteria for making budget allocation decisions. We should not have to fight for our smaller ports and harbors each and every year. These ports and harbors are of commercial importance with large economic impacts. The corps' use of an arbitrary 1 million ton cut-off for prioritizing projects is simply unfair. There are about 300 harbors in the Great Lakes that handle less than 1 million tons of cargo per year. Two-thirds of all shipping in the United States either starts or finishes at small harbors. About half of the Great Lakes corps-authorized harbors are classified as small ports. The amount of cargo handled should not be the sole factor in determining priority for funding. A small harbor may in fact have a much greater economic impact on a community than a larger harbor does. For example, Manistee Harbor on Lake Michigan is classified as a smaller harbor by the corps. It handles less than 1 million tons of cargo annually; it handles 940,000 tons. Yet, multiple companies rely on this harbor, including Morton Salt, and there are 600 jobs that rely on the freighter traffic at Manistee. For a city with a population of about 6,500 people, this translates into about 10 percent of the population that is economically dependent on this harbor. And yet the corps would classify this as a lower priority project because it handles less than 1 million tons annually. Is that what you understand the Army corps is doing?

Mr. VOINOVICH. Yes, that is correct. That is what they are doing. A harbor handling less than 1 million tons, even if it has a large economic impact on the community, would have a lower budget priority specified by the corps because it only handles 940,000 tons. The amendment that we have filed would help address this inequity by requiring the corps to use all data regarding economic impacts and not just tonnage.

Mr. LEVIN. We have a problem that urgently needs to be addressed. The corps is using a budgeting system that does not reflect the reality of the Great Lakes shipping infrastructure. I receive reports on a regular basis of how this dredging crisis is threatening our economy: The Wirt Stone Dock in Buena Vista Township, MI, reported a reduction of 25 percent in shipped tonnage. Tugboats have been needed to

turn boats around because channels have not been dredged, at a cost of \$15,000 to \$20,000 each week. After one freighter ran aground at Saginaw, MI, last year, the ship's rudder was torn off, and never found.

Mrs. BOXER. I agree that we have a problem here, and I will work with you in conference to address this situation.

Mr. INHOFE. I agree that the corps needs to make sure that its funding allocations take into consideration small harbors with large economic impacts. The corps should not develop a budget that is unfairly biased against rural communities, and which will have a detrimental effect on small-town, rural America, causing job losses, and increased hardship for businesses. We must work to protect our Nation's shipping infrastructure.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO has added its name to the long list of supporters of this important legislation. I ask unanimous consent that their letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

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

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION
TRADES DEPARTMENT, AMERICAN
FEDERATION OF LABOR—CONGRESS
OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, DC, May 14, 2007.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the twelve international unions of the Building and Construction Trades Department, I respectfully urge you to vote in favor of S. 1248, the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (WRDA).

After seven long years it is time to end the impasse over the passage of a WRDA bill because our nation cannot afford further delay of this desperately needed legislation. Because of the limited opportunities, in an extremely crowded Senate agenda, the time to act is now.

We believe the enactment of a robust WRDA bill will enhance the environment, help grow our economy and help ease our Nation's growing congestion problem. Additionally, this bill has tremendous jobs creation potential that will create or sustain thousands of good paying American construction jobs. Studies have proven that for every \$1 billion expended on water resources development activities, approximately 40,000 direct and indirect jobs are created.

The Water Resources Development Act of 2007 will finally restore the regular process of meeting the nation's water resource needs as they arise. So, we urge you to vote YES for final passage of S. 1248 and we ask Congress to swiftly conference and enact this legislation so that our nation's acute and unmet water infrastructure needs are addressed as soon as possible.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

EDWARD C. SULLIVAN,
President.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise today to offer my support for the Water Resources Development Act. The Environment and Public Works Committee, on which I serve, has been trying—without success—to pass a WRDA

reauthorization since I began service in the U.S. Senate in the 107th Congress. But I think this year will be the year.

This bill includes several provisions that are very important to Delaware. First, this bill preserves the St. Georges Bridge over the Chesapeake and Delaware, or C&D, Canal. This 14-mile long canal owned and maintained by the Army Corps of Engineers, divides Delaware in half, disrupting the flow of people and commerce in my state in order to provide a shortcut for ship traffic to the Port of Baltimore.

In return for this imposition to Delaware, the Corps is obligated under Federal law to provide sufficient access across that canal. Yet in recent years, in spite of population growth that has stretched the capacity of the current bridges, the Corps has sought to reduce the number of bridges over the C&D Canal.

Thanks to support from chairman and ranking member of the EPW committee, this will not happen.

A second important provision in this bill is a late entry, but needs to be addressed immediately. Two scour holes have developed in the Indian River Inlet and Bay. One is an 80-foot hole that has developed within 100 feet of a bulkhead at the U.S. Coast Guard facility. The second is a 30-foot hole that has formed along a stone revetment that is currently protecting several structures recently constructed by the State of Delaware. I express my deep thanks to the committee for recognizing the immediacy of this request and making sure it is addressed in this bill.

There are other important provisions in this bill. Last year, I was pleased to support vital Corps reform measures that require independent peer review of projects, that improve mitigation practices, and that update the outdated principles and guidelines of the Corps. These reforms will result in stronger, more cost-effective projects that better support our economy and better protect our people.

I am very happy to say that these same provisions are included—word for word—in the measure we are considering today. Again, I thank our chairman and ranking member for retaining these important provisions.

After the lessons we learned in New Orleans, we need to be vigilant. We must continually reevaluate this program and look for the best way to better insure the Corps is designing their projects with long term needs of communities in mind. This is why I cosponsored Senators FEINGOLD and KERRY's amendment to require the Corps to take into account the impacts of global warming on water resources projects.

Shifting gears, let me note that addressing global climate change is a major priority that drives much of the work I do. Legislation to set emissions reductions may be a little ways off. But in the meantime, we should be taking steps to ensure that the people and communities who depend on Corps

projects can rest assured that those projects are built to withstand the stresses they are likely to face.

There is reason to believe that global climate change may lead to more frequent or intense severe weather events. Coastal communities and habitats, especially along the gulf and Atlantic coasts, likely will be stressed by increasing sea level and more intense storms. I think of my State of Delaware, much of which sits on the Atlantic coast. Delaware is on the front lines. We need to take the threat of global warming seriously and prepare ourselves accordingly.

Frankly, it doesn't matter whether you believe global warming is a man-made problem or that we are in a natural warming cycle. The evidence is overwhelming that our planet is getting warmer. Climate change will put added pressures on demands for water resources across the country. For example, diminished snow pack, earlier arrival of spring, tendency for more precipitation to fall as rain rather than snow, and increased evaporation will affect seasonal availability of water in much of the West. Our water resource projects should be built with that in mind to make sure that we are building the best possible projects to protect our constituents and ensure our nation's continued economic prosperity. This is absolutely as we prepare to face headon what is likely to be the greatest challenge of our generation.

Another important amendment that I have cosponsored will set priorities to address the Corps' backlog of projects. Considering recent appropriations for water resources projects—about \$2 billion a year—it would take over 35 years just to finish the projects on the books.

Since Hurricane Katrina ravaged the gulf coast in 2005, we better understand that the system by which we fund water resource projects is broken.

In Delaware, due to limited funds and the large number of requests, we have found it a challenge to get important beach replenishment projects funded, even as homes and infrastructure were threatened.

Many in this Chamber will recall that we voted on a prioritization amendment last Congress when we considered WRDA. That amendment failed by a large margin. In fact, I voted against the amendment at that time. But our colleagues from Wisconsin and my friend from Arizona heard our concerns and went back to the drawing board.

Last year's amendment would have tasked an interagency committee with prioritizing the \$58 billion backlog. Some people, including myself, felt this was taking power from the legislative branch and giving it to the executive branch. I also feared that projects in a small state like Delaware might not get due consideration.

This year, Senators FEINGOLD and MCCAIN redrafted the amendment to address a number of the concerns raised in the debate last year.

The amendment before us today would establish a Water Resources Commission. This Commission would have one shot at prioritizing many of the projects in the backlog. The Commission's work would provide a guide to Congress to ensure we are spending our limited funding on the most urgent and meritorious projects. Nothing in this amendment binds Congress. It is purely informational.

Further, this amendment specifically requires the commission to find a balance between the water resource needs of all States, regardless of size.

In closing, let me add that I am delighted that we have taken up this important legislation so early in this Congress. Again, I commend our leaders on the Environment and Public Works Committee for putting such a high priority on moving this bill. I urge my colleagues to support WRDA's passage.

I also urge my colleagues to support the global climate change and prioritization amendments. These amendments will strengthen the Army Corps and improve our constituents' faith in the projects the Corps builds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I believe that the passage of this bill is long overdue, and I commend Senator BOXER and Senator INHOFE for their efforts to pass this bill.

There are numerous projects in this bill that are important to each State. I would like to take a few moments and highlight what this bill means to New Mexico and our environment.

To begin with, I would like to point out that the projects in this that are related to New Mexico were included, at my request, in the WRDA bill we passed in 2006. So the content in this bill should not be a surprise to any of us and I hope that we can get this bill passed quickly.

One of the most critical projects contained in this year's WRDA bill involves New Mexico's Bosque. I have long envisioned the rehabilitation and restoration of the Bosque. In fact, I have introduced legislation in this Congress that would do just that. However, this bill will allow us to implement this vision that concerns this long neglected treasure of the Southwest.

The Albuquerque metropolitan area is the largest concentration of people in New Mexico. It is also the home to the irreplaceable riparian forest which runs through the heart of the city and surrounding towns that is the Bosque. It is the largest continuous cottonwood forest in the Southwest, and one of the last of its kind in the world.

Unfortunately, mismanagement, neglect, and the effects of upstream development have severely degraded the Bosque. As a result, public access is problematical and crucial habitat for scores of species is threatened.

Yet the Middle Rio Grande Bosque remains one of the most biologically diverse ecosystems in the Southwest. My goal is to restore the Bosque and create a space that is open and attrac-

tive to the public. I want to ensure that this extraordinary corridor of the Southwestern desert is preserved for generations to come—not only for generations of humans, but for the diverse plant and animal species that reside in the Bosque as well.

The rehabilitation of this ecosystem leads to greater protection for threatened and endangered species; it means more migratory birds, healthier habitat for fish, and greater numbers of towering cottonwood trees. This project can increase the quality of life for a city while assuring the health and stability of an entire ecosystem. Where trash is now strewn, paths and trails will run. Where jetty jacks and discarded rubble lie, cottonwoods will grow. The dead trees and underbrush that threaten devastating fire will be replaced by healthy groves of trees. School children will be able to study and maybe catch sight of a bald eagle. The chance to help build a dynamic public space like this does not come around often, and I would like to see Congress embrace that chance on this occasion.

Having grown up along the Rio Grande in Albuquerque, the Bosque is something I treasure, and I lament the degradation that has occurred. Because of this, I have been involved in Bosque restoration since 1991, and I commend the efforts of groups like the Bosque Coalition for the work they have done, and will continue to do, along the river.

Another project that is of great importance to New Mexico is the Southwest Valley Flood Control Project. New Mexico is a desert state prone to flash flooding during our monsoon season. In order to protect our cities we must take proactive steps to ensure that communities are prepared in the event of flooding. The Southwest Valley is one such area that is subject to flooding from rainfall runoff. Due to unfavorable topography, flood waters pond in low lying developed areas and cannot drain by gravity flow to the Rio Grande River. This project resolves this problem and calls for the construction of detention basins and a pumping station in Albuquerque for flood control in the Southwest Valley.

This legislation also has a significant impact on our environment. The Rio Grande Environmental Management Program authorizes the Corps to address environmental restoration and management on the Rio Grande and its tributaries through planning, design and construction of habitat rehabilitation and enhancement projects and a long term river data acquisition and management program. This simple provision establishes a continuing authority for addressing environmental restoration and management on the Rio Grande and its tributaries within the state of New Mexico. This project consists of two main components. The first component consists of planning, design and construction of small habitat rehabilitation and enhancement projects

and the second component calls for a long-term river data acquisition and management program. The impacts that this project will have on New Mexico will be tremendous.

Another program outlined in this year's WRDA bill provides authority to the Corps to study, adopt, and construct emergency streambank and shoreline protection works for protection of public highways and bridges, and other public works, and nonprofit public services such as churches, hospitals, and schools. This program provides authority for the Corps to carry out ecosystem restoration and protection projects if the project will improve environmental quality, is in the public interest, and is cost effective. This is a worthy initiative that will benefit the environment throughout the United States.

I urge my fellow Senators to help further enhance and protect our environment through passage of this legislation. I believe that each State will benefit once they receive these long overdue project authorizations.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we are operating under 20 minutes equally divided, although there is more time than that before the vote. I ask unanimous consent that we be able to continue our remarks up to the time of the vote at 5:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, I don't see Senator BAUCUS here. He is the chairman of the subcommittee. He did a great job on this. We worked closely together. They called us the big four, the chairman and ranking member and the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee. We all worked tirelessly on this. We are all pleased with the product we have.

Mrs. BOXER. How much time is left on my side, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 9 minutes 17 seconds, and there is 4 minutes 21 seconds on the other side.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I would love to hear from Senator ISAKSON because he has been a champion in assisting us and working on this. We are fortunate to have him as ranking member on the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I thank the chairman. About an hour and a half ago, we negotiated our final agreement to make this deal possible. Chairman BOXER and Senator INHOFE have been indispensable in making this a reality.

This bill, as I said last week when the bill came to the floor, is not a spending bill, it is an investment bill. As Senator VITTER recited, regarding Louisiana, it is a meaningful response to the tragedy that took place with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Across the country, projects that have needed to be done, or need to be focused on, are being authorized. We are finally doing

what, for 7 consecutive years, Congress failed to do.

This is a very important piece of legislation that has been handled in a bipartisan fashion. The chairman has been exceedingly fair to everyone. The ranking member has worked diligently, and Senator BAUCUS, myself and the ranking member and the chairman have stuck to the deals we made, which, in this body, is the most important thing of all. I acknowledge both of them and offer my appreciation.

On behalf of the citizens of Georgia, I thank the Corps of Engineers for what they do for our State and particularly the language in the bill that recognizes the possible bi-State port that will be built in South Carolina, and the multi-regional WRDA language for the metropolitan Atlanta-North Georgia Planning District, which is essential.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Yesterday morning, I was absent for vote No. 163 on amendment No. 1090. For the record, I was having a root canal, which is a bad way to miss a vote. I ask unanimous consent to let the record reflect that had I been here, I would have voted no, in accordance with my agreement with the chairman and the ranking member.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me make one comment. Something the Senator from Georgia said is very important. This is not a spending bill, this is an authorization bill. If we didn't have this bill in the process, then the appropriators, when the bill would come up, would have all kinds of projects that did not go through a process, where we would know if there is local support and so forth. So the conservative position is to authorize these things and, if there is something somebody doesn't like, go after it when the appropriations come.

We have a good bill. I thank the chairman for working with us. I know the Senator from Louisiana wants to be heard, also.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 9 minutes 2 seconds. The other side is 1 minute 4 seconds.

Mrs. BOXER. I yield 8 minutes to my colleague from Louisiana. She has been such a fighter for her State in all this. There isn't a day that has gone by since the very day of the disaster that struck when she hasn't come up and told me: Senator, you need to come and see and you need to help. I am so fortunate I am in a position to help, along with Senator INHOFE. This is a bill that is so important for her State.

I thank MARY LANDRIEU for all the contributions she has made. I yield to her 8 of the 9 minutes I have left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, Senator BOXER is true to her word as a leader of this committee. She came down to Louisiana, along with 4 or 5 members of her committee, about 2 months ago at my request, to not only

put her feet on the ground but also to get up in the air in a helicopter, if you will, to see the great wetlands and the outline and contours of the levees that protect not only the city of New Orleans but the parishes of Jefferson, St. Bernard, and Plaquemines, and to fly as far as we could to the western part of the State and see the entire southern part of our State, which, in large measure, depends on what this bill does, when it passes and what is in it because, as I have said many times, if we were talking about a desert bill, we would not be here. But we are talking about a WRDA bill.

It may be inconvenient to other States when this bill doesn't pass, but when WRDA doesn't pass for Louisiana, it is life and death. These projects authorize critical protection from Morganza to the gulf, which the President not too long ago threatened to veto. That is in this bill, and I don't believe this bill will be vetoed, but Morganza to the gulf is in there because of the work of this committee. They know that that project is critical to a large part of southeast Louisiana. We also have in this bill, at the request of myself and Senator VITTER, the closing of MRGO, the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, which has been part of the problem of the storm surge coming into St. Bernard to New Orleans east and parts of Orleans Parish. That is going to be closed because of the Senator's commitment and the recognition of the terrible environmental damage that has been caused to our region. In addition, there are many other projects. We do more than haul cargo and move cargo back and forth throughout our country, but we move it around the world. We also, as you know, produce a great deal of energy both on shore and offshore, and our energy ports contribute. The dredging, the channelization, the building of levees, closure of MRGO, and the expedited process for hurricane 5 levee protection, at my request, is in this bill.

So I appreciate the work of the chairman and the ranking member. Most importantly, 7 years have passed since a WRDA bill came this close to passage. I believe, under Senator BOXER's leadership, with Senator INHOFE's help, and our colleagues on the House side, that we can pass a WRDA bill. For Louisiana, it is the largest number of projects we have ever had. Senator VITTER, my colleague, serves on the committee and deserves a great deal of credit for this work. Before Senator VITTER got to the Senate, our office and Senator Breaux's office worked to help develop a lot of the foundations of this bill. It has been going on, as you know, for some time. It is a team effort, and it is a victory for Louisiana. There are things we need to improve as we go along, and we will continue to work on that. This project to secure south Louisiana is a decades' long project. It is stated that the total cost could be from \$30 billion to \$60 billion. Obviously, we are not going to get that

money in this bill. But the authorizations that are in this bill for Louisiana coastal restoration and for individual projects are going to go a long way to lay the foundation, and with the passage of the Domenici-Landrieu Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act last year, which this Congress passed by an overwhelming vote, Louisiana has now an independent source of revenue to direct to these projects.

So again, I thank the chair and the ranking member and commend my colleague who serves on this committee for his excellent work. I am happy I was able to contribute as well to the amendments both on the floor, to the building of this bill over 7 years, and to its ultimate passage. There are other things we would have liked to have gotten done. We will continue to work on that through the conference committee.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 3 minutes 17 seconds.

Mrs. BOXER. All right, in 3 minutes 17 seconds, I want to say again how happy I am. I am smiling from ear to ear because this has been an amazing road. I think it is important to note that when we started out, we had a little surprise from the CBO that both Senator INHOFE and I were surprised about—that our last bill had some open-ended language that we didn't realize. We had to make this fiscally responsible. We did.

Senator INHOFE is a man of his word. He said these are criteria I want. We have to make sure these projects have studies; that the local people want them and there will be a local match; that they stand up to the light of day. I agreed with him. Once we were able to agree on those criteria, the rest became easy because we had to tell people no, but we did it not on a whim but on a set of criteria that we agreed to.

Our staffs have come to know each other very well while working on this. So between the staff and colleagues coming and telling us what they needed, I think we have a bill that meets everybody's needs.

In closing, I thank Senator LANDRIEU for her comments because I think, as we look at this bill, clearly—and there is a lot of talk about priorities—we get our priorities straight. There are amendments we defeated that said we don't like the priorities. This bill looks at Louisiana and says you are our priority. That is important. We did it.

I wish to thank the groups and organizations outside the Chamber that helped us by writing letters of support and encouraging our colleagues to work with us: The American Society of Civil Engineers; the Audubon Society; the Building and Construction Trades; National Waterways Conference; the National Association of Manufacturers; the American Farm Bureau; the National Construction Alliance, made up

of the labor union; the National Union of Operating Engineers and Carpenters and Joiners; the Associated General Contractors of America.

It is rare that you have a bill that garners the support of so many from across this great country of ours. But it is about making sure that the WRDA infrastructure in this country is up to the task it faces. We have to be ready for whatever hits us by way of floods, hurricanes, disasters. We have to be ready for ecosystem restoration and all the rest. I left out the corn growers, who supported us also, and they sent us a letter. So from the corn growers to the carpenters, this is a bill everybody wants.

I hope my colleagues will come over, and I hope we get a huge vote in favor of this bill and we can go into conference, where we will have six Democrats and five Republicans, and we will sit down with our counterparts and bring a product back that everybody can be pleased with.

I think we are about ready for the vote; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the majority has expired. The minority has 1 minute 4 seconds.

Mr. INHOFE. With 1 minute left, I think it is very important. There are a lot of people who didn't get everything they wanted. Every time we pass an authorization bill, whether it is transportation or a WRDA bill, if you don't have a lot of people upset, then you didn't do a very good job. We had to shave a lot of places. This sets us up, and this offers us discipline for the appropriation process when it comes along.

I say to my good conservative friends, this is the best way to do it, so we know when appropriation bills come up, certain things have been done. This is a major accomplishment. We were able to pass this before, last year. We are hoping now we are going to conference, and we can come back with something we can all support. I believe we will.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the substitute amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The substitute amendment (No. 1065), as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass? The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN),

the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. DOLE) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 170 Leg.]

YEAS—91

Akaka	Durbin	Mikulski
Alexander	Ensign	Murkowski
Allard	Enzi	Murray
Baucus	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Graham	Pryor
Bingaman	Grassley	Reed
Bond	Hagel	Reid
Boxer	Harkin	Roberts
Brown	Hatch	Rockefeller
Brownback	Hutchison	Salazar
Bunning	Inhofe	Sanders
Burr	Inouye	Schumer
Byrd	Isakson	Sessions
Cantwell	Kennedy	Shelby
Cardin	Kerry	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Snowe
Casey	Kohl	Specter
Chambliss	Kyl	Stabenow
Clinton	Landrieu	Stevens
Cochran	Lautenberg	Tester
Coleman	Leahy	Thomas
Collins	Levin	Thune
Conrad	Lieberman	Vitter
Corker	Lincoln	Voinovich
Cornyn	Lott	Warner
Craig	Lugar	Webb
Crapo	Martinez	Whitehouse
Dodd	McCaskill	Wyden
Domenici	McConnell	
Dorgan	Menendez	

NAYS—4

Coburn	Gregg
DeMint	Sununu

NOT VOTING—5

Biden	Johnson	Obama
Dole	McCain	

The bill (H.R. 1495), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The Senate insists on its amendment, requests a conference with the House, and the Chair is authorized to appoint conferees with a ratio of 6 to 5.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I just want to say to all of my colleagues that this was a wonderful vote tonight, and I think the country will be very grateful because it has been 7 years since we have had a Water Resources Development Act. We desperately need to keep up the country's infrastructure with our needs, and this bill is a wonderful step in that direction. We are all set to go to conference with the House. I have already had some conversations with Congressman OBERSTAR. We are looking forward to getting this back and moving forward.

Again, to the staffs on both sides, thank you so much. To colleagues on the committee, thank you very much. To, of course, the ranking member, Senator INHOFE, I want to say again that without his partnership we never

could have come to this point. I think every State in the Union will be grateful because we worked together across party lines to achieve something that is 7 years in the making, something that we really needed—this water resources bill.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, would my distinguished colleague yield?

Mr. President, I would like to say thank you to the distinguished chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee for all her hard work. Nobody cares more about water resources than the Great Lakes States. I don't know, we may have a rival in California, but certainly the Great Lakes States. We are very grateful for the ability to work with the Senator to do some very positive things and to have such a strong vote on a bipartisan basis, and we appreciate her leadership.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my colleague very much.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there were ever a Senatorial odd couple, it is Boxer-Inhofe. But this odd couple has done some tremendous work legislatively. This bill is long in the making. They have worked extremely hard, through some very difficult negotiations.

I am sorry Mr. INHOFE is not here, but it is a wonderful piece of work, and they both should be very proud of their accomplishments. We are going to get this bill to conference as quickly as we can, and I am confident they will be able to work this out very quickly. This is a remarkably good piece of legislation. The public should know even odd couples in the Senate can do great things.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. I do wish to say, as I mentioned before, not only did the principals work well together, but the staffs did as well. I got to know the staff on the other side of the aisle. I really have enjoyed working with them. They are very fair. They represent their boss very well.

One thing about the staff across the aisle here is they have respect for each other. They tell each other the way they feel. It is the only way to work around here. You are only as good as your word. We had some tough moments here.

I also wish to thank the floor staff. I don't want to start naming names, but the floor staff on both sides were so helpful, because for me, this is my first major bill I ever managed, so clearly I needed a little direction. I am very fortunate to have all of this support from both sides of the aisle. I will mention Lula and Dave just because I happen to see them in front of me.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate has passed the Water Resources Development Act, WRDA, of 2007, which authorizes important water projects for Michigan, the Great Lakes region, and the Nation. After waiting nearly 7 years since the last WRDA bill was passed, I am hopeful that this bill can make its way

through conference and be signed into law by the President.

I am pleased that the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee included several of my requests in the bill and accepted one of my amendments. However, I want to emphasize that this is an authorization bill. The appropriations that are needed to make these authorized projects a reality lie down the road, and have not yet been secured. The next critical step in realizing these projects is to work to secure funding for these projects, which I intend to do.

Included in the WRDA bill is a provision that I filed as an amendment to the bill, which could help address a very serious problem facing the Great Lakes shipping infrastructure. Every year, hundreds of millions of tons of goods are transported through the Great Lakes waterways, and communities throughout the Great Lakes are economically tied to waterborne commerce. Unfortunately, however, the Great Lakes shipping infrastructure is threatened by a significant dredging backlog that has been exacerbated by historically low water levels. The Army Corps of Engineers estimates a backlog of 16 million cubic yards at commercial harbors, which has had very real impacts to Michigan shipping. Several freighters have gotten stuck in Great Lakes channels; ships have had to carry reduced loads, and many shipments have simply ceased altogether. The WRDA bill works to correct this situation by directing the Secretary of the Army to expedite the operation and maintenance, including dredging, of navigation projects in the Great Lakes.

Dredging to the needed depths is critical. According to the Great Lakes Maritime Task Force, a large freighter loses the carrying capacity of 8,000 tons of cargo for each 1-inch reduction in the load draft. A capacity of 8,000 tons can carry enough steel to produce 6,000 automobiles, enough coal to provide 3 hours of electricity for greater Detroit, or enough limestone to build 24 homes. That means that every dollar that can go towards maintaining harbors and navigation channels truly matters.

Although the navigation provision in the bill could be helpful to the overall Great Lakes shipping infrastructure, I remain concerned that the way the Corps of Engineers budgets for dredging projects is unfair to Great Lakes navigation projects, especially smaller harbors. Beginning in fiscal year 2005, the Office of Management and Budget and the Army Corps began implementing new budget guidelines and criteria for funding the Operation and Maintenance of commercial harbors that relied primarily on the amount of tonnage a harbor handles. I raised the Great Lakes dredging situation with the bill managers, and they have agreed to work with me to address this problem in the conference committee.

The bill also includes a provision that I have been working on for many

years: the improvement of Michigan's water and sewage infrastructure. The bill includes \$35 million for a statewide environmental infrastructure project to correct combined sewer overflows, which is a major source of pollution in the Great Lakes and other waterbodies in Michigan. Combined sewer overflows carry both stormwater and sewage, and these can be discharged into streams, rivers, and lakes during periods of heavy rains. The \$35 million provision in WRDA authorizes the Army Corps to partner with communities throughout Michigan to improve their sewer infrastructure. These improvements would not only benefit communities, but would also help protect our precious water resources.

I am also pleased that the bill also authorizes a number of specific projects in Michigan. Of importance, the bill authorizes \$20 million for the environmental restoration of Lake St. Clair. In 2005, the Corps completed a report outlining the steps needed in order to restore Lake St. Clair. This bill authorizes the Corps to implement the 2005 recommendations. The plan was drafted through a collaborative process by the stakeholders in the community, which will promote efficiencies and save Federal funds.

Section 1005 of the bill, which authorizes small projects for navigation, includes six important projects for Michigan. First, the Corps is authorized to reconstruct the harbor at Northwestern Michigan College in Traverse City, MI. The renovated harbor would support the operations of the Great Lakes Maritime Academy, our Nation's only freshwater State maritime academy, and vessels associated with the program, including the federally owned and operated *T/S State of Michigan*. The project would include dredging, construction of an eastern arm, reconstruction of the inner harbor area, and general site improvements. Second, section 1005 authorizes the Corps to dredge the outer channel and inner harbor of Menominee Harbor. Low lake levels, which have been prevalent in recent years, and present channel depth are threatening shipping vessels' ability to make deliveries and load at the commercial and industrial sites on the inner channel. This authorization will help support commercial navigation by authorizing dredging and other navigation-related projects to accommodate access to warehousing and commercial operations, which have loading docks on the inner river channel. The additional depth would benefit deep-draft commercial vessel traffic, which has increased over the years and is expected to continue to increase. Third, section 1005 authorizes the Corps to extend and deepen the Ontonagon Channel. The channel extension at Ontonagon Harbor is necessary to allow for better access to Ontonagon's port facilities. Currently, there is only one vessel that can handle the required volume of material for Ontonagon's industrial community that will enter the

harbor. Other ships have to back into the harbor to reach the dock and are unwilling to do so because of the prevailing currents at the mouth of the harbor. This authorization can help protect the vital shipping infrastructure in Ontonagon. Fourth, section 1005 authorizes the Corps to make repairs and improvements to the Sebewaing River. The north bank of the Sebewaing River has deteriorated over the years, which is resulting in excessive sedimentation being washed into the river channel from the Saginaw Bay. This project would authorize the repairs, which would result in less frequent dredging being needed. Fifth, this section authorizes the Corps to dredge the Au Sable River in the vicinity of Oscoda. This dredging is crucial so that boaters have access to local marinas, restaurants, and other businesses. Without this dredging, boaters could be prevented from accessing the river, which would be devastating for the tourism economy. Lastly, this section authorizes the Clinton River project, a navigation project that would decrease the amount of the time it would take boaters to get to Lake St. Clair.

Section 1006 authorizes a project that would improve the water quality and natural habitat of the Clinton River. The project would also examine a means to "daylight" the Clinton River under the city of Pontiac. In past years, the river was enclosed in a series of conduits under the city. By restoring the surface flow through the city, the river ecology can be restored, and economic development on the resulting waterfront be promoted.

Section 2037 authorizes the Corps to repair and rehabilitate the Hamilton Dam, located in the Flint River on the campus of the University of Michigan-Flint. Built in 1920, the dam is rapidly deteriorating and the prospect of dam failure and what that would mean to those living downstream continues to be a major concern. Authorizing this project is an important first step in making repairs to the dam.

Finally, section 4019 of the bill authorizes the Corps to study storm damage reduction and beach erosion protection projects along Lake Erie at Luna Pier, MI. The city of Luna Pier lies on the western end of Lake Erie in Monroe County, MI. The shoreline dike system and beach sills that were installed at Luna Pier continue to deteriorate because they are subjected to Lake Erie's severe storms. This study is a first step in making the necessary repairs at Luna Pier to provide adequate storm damage reduction, beach erosion protection, and flood prevention.

The Great Lakes are one of world's greatest natural resources, so I am very pleased that this bill takes some needed actions to protect and restore them.

First, the bill includes an extremely important provision to authorize the Corps of Engineers to complete the dispersal barrier in the Chicago Ship and

Sanitary Canal. In order to prevent aquatic invasive species, such as the Asian carp, from moving between the Mississippi River watershed and the Great Lakes, this dispersal barrier needs to be completed. Specifically, the Corps will be authorized to convert Barrier I into a permanent facility, to complete construction of Barrier II, and to operate and maintain both dispersal barriers at full Federal cost. The Corps is further authorized to study options for hydrologic separation while maintaining the movement of cargo and recreational vessels so that we can determine what a long-term solution should be.

Second, the bill reauthorizes the Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans and Sediment Remediation program and the Great Lakes Tributary Models Program. The Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans and Sediment Remediation Program has allowed the Corps to provide technical support to States and Remedial Action Plan committees so that the United States can meet international obligations. Michigan has several communities that request this assistance from the Corps every year. Using the Great Lakes Tributary Models Program, the Corps has developed computer models to simulate the erosion, transport and deposition of sediments within a watershed, and can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of soil conservation and other source control measures on the loadings of sediments and sediment contaminants to Great Lakes harbors and navigation channels.

Next, this bill brings equity to both the John Glenn Great Lakes Basin Program and the Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration Program so that in-kind contributions count towards the non-Federal cost-share requirements of those programs. Further, the bill clarifies that any reconnaissance studies under the Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration Program are to be performed at Federal expense. This was the original intent when the program was first authorized in 2000.

Lastly, this bill expands the type of beneficial use of dredge material projects eligible for inclusion under this authority. Dredging improves and maintains navigation channels in the Great Lakes and is used for other purposes such as waterfront construction, utilities placement, and environmental remediation. It only makes sense to use the dredge spoils for beneficial purposes rather than disposing of it in the middle of the lakes.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I would like to applaud the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, for her excellent work in swiftly bringing the Water Resources Development Act to final passage in the Senate. When the Senator from California became chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee at the beginning of the 110th Congress, she pledged that this important bill would receive Senate

consideration as quickly as possible. She kept that pledge, and I encourage all supporters of this bill to acknowledge that commitment.

During the 109th Congress, those of us who supported swift enactment of the Water Resources Development Act met considerable obstacles to that goal. I called upon Senate leadership to schedule this bill in the summer of 2005. Later, my colleague, the Senator from Missouri, Mr. BOND, and I worked together on a letter, signed by 40 of our colleagues, calling upon Senate leadership to schedule floor time for this bill. Still later, when we were told that 40 was not enough, that we needed 60 signatures, we came back and got 81. Seven months later, the Senate finally scheduled debate, but the final bill was never finished before the 109th Congress adjourned. It has now been 7 years since the last WRDA bill and it is long overdue.

This bill provides approximately \$2 billion for upgrades to locks and dams along the Mississippi and Illinois rivers. Illinois is the largest shipper of corn and soybeans on these rivers and the 70 year old system of locks and dams needs to be upgraded to ensure swifter access to export markets—something, by the way, that competitors like Brazil are doing right now. A significant part of competitive agriculture is about reducing transportation costs, so if we are to strengthen our agriculture markets, we need to strengthen waterway transportation, and that means upgrading these locks and dams.

Despite my longstanding support for WRDA, I was unable to cast a vote on the bill because I was scheduled to give a speech at the time of the vote. However, had I been able to vote, I would have supported the bill.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today I voted in support of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007. While I have concerns about the \$15 billion price tag of the Senate bill and Congress' failure to prioritize these new projects and the nearly \$60 billion of authorized but unconstructed Corps projects, I strongly support the reform provisions in the underlying bill. These reforms are absolutely essential for improving the Nation's water resources planning and should be the baseline of reforms coming out of conference.

These important reform provisions include independent peer review of costly or controversial Corps projects; dramatic improvements to the Corps' mitigation process; modernizing the Corps' woefully out of date planning guidelines; establishing a new national policy that directs the Corps to avoid impacts to floodplains; and requiring an interagency assessment of the nation's vulnerability to flood and related storm damage and recommendations to improve the Nation's various flood prevention programs.

Senator MCCAIN and I have long championed these reforms, and I thank him and his staff for their continued

commitment to this important issue. I also appreciate the support from my colleagues—and the cosponsorship by Senators MCCAIN, COBURN, CARPER, GREGG, SUNUNU, and DEMINT—for the prioritization amendment that I offered. Prioritization is essential to ensure Congress has the information it needs to assess the relative importance of Corps projects. This is not only our fiscal responsibility, but is important to the country's economic development and transportation systems, and our ability to protect citizens and property from natural disasters.

I am very pleased that Senator BOXER, Senator INHOFE, Senator BAUCUS, and Senator ISAKSON reported a WRDA bill that retained the hard-fought reforms from last Congress. Through negotiations and a successful independent review amendment on the floor, we took the first step to ushering in critical reforms to the Corps of Engineers in more than 20 years. As we look ahead to conference, I particularly appreciate Chairman BOXER's commitment to retain these reforms in conference. I thank Chairman BOXER and Majority Leader REID for joining me in a colloquy to this effect.

"Corps reform" has been an ongoing effort over the years. Many of my current and former colleagues, staff, and numerous taxpayer and environmental groups have played a role and I am grateful for all of those efforts. It is my hope that we can honor these efforts and recognize the importance of instituting significant policy changes by enacting a final bill that retains the Senate's strong reforms and keeps the cost to the taxpayer at the current level or less.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

THE PASSING OF YOLANDA KING

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today our nation mourns the loss of Yolanda King, the eldest daughter of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Coretta Scott King, and the "first daughter" of the civil rights movement.

Yolanda King's life moved in the stream of American civil rights history. Born in segregated Montgomery,

AL, in November of 1955, she came into this world only 3 weeks before the Interstate Commerce Commission issued its ban on racial segregation in interstate commerce and 2 weeks before Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat to a white passenger on a bus in Montgomery. Yolanda was 7 years old when her father, in his famous "I Have a Dream" speech, said "I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a Nation where they will not be judged by the color of the skin but by the content of their character."

In a 2004 statement entitled, "The Meaning of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday," Coretta Scott King recalled that "Dr. King once said that we all have to decide whether we will walk in the light of creative altruism or the darkness of destructive selfishness. Life's most persistent and nagging question . . . is what are you doing for others?"

Yolanda led a life that made her family and her Nation proud. She was an actress, an author, and a producer. But she also worked in service to others. The world will remember her as an activist for peace, an ardent supporter of nonviolence, and a torchbearer for Dr. King's dream of racial harmony.

Through her actions, the King family legacy lives on. Like her parents, Yolanda inspired a generation of youths to dedicate their lives to service. Her life is a shining example that we all can make a difference, and her deeds will continue to inspire generations to come.

Our thoughts are with the King family today. I salute Yolanda's life, and hope that our Nation will continue its march towards a more inclusive democracy.

PITTSBURGH HEALTHCARE SYSTEM

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, today I have sought recognition to comment on legislation to increase the authorized spending level for the ongoing consolidation project at the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, Pittsburgh Healthcare System.

In May 2004, then-VA Secretary Anthony Principi announced the final results of the Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES), plan, a nationwide effort to identify buildings and functions which do not merit continued operation and to create long-term budget efficiencies by getting rid of underutilized facilities while improving access to care. As a result of this process, the Highland Drive VA Medical Center, VAMC, in Pittsburgh was targeted for closure, and the facility's functions are to be consolidated within Pittsburgh's University Drive VAMC and H.J. Heinz VAMC. However, in order for this consolidation to move forward and for the VA to realize the desired savings, significant construction is necessary at the University Drive and Heinz campuses.

Initial estimates placed the total cost for construction at these two facilities at \$189.2 million. I introduced legislation which authorized construction at this level and have helped secure \$102.5 million in appropriations towards this effort—\$20 million in fiscal year 2004 and \$82.5 million in fiscal year 2006. I have pushed for Congress to fully fund this project in order to avoid cost overruns and to help the VA realize long-term savings which can be used to better serve our Nation's veterans.

Despite the Pittsburgh project being ahead of schedule and ready for additional funding, I was disappointed to see that the administration did not seek funding for any component of the Pittsburgh project in its fiscal year 2007 budget request. On February 28, 2006, Senator Rick Santorum and I wrote VA Secretary Jim Nicholson a letter seeking clarification on VA's future plans for funding the project. According to his May 8, 2006, response, "Funding for construction of the mental health and research facilities at the University Drive VAMC and the ambulatory care center at the Heinz VAMC will be incorporated into VA's fiscal year 2008 budget request." The response also stated, ". . . closure of the Highland Drive Division will not be accomplished until all construction is completed." I will ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

However, I was disappointed to learn that the VA's fiscal year 2008 Budget request indicates that the estimated total cost to complete these projects has risen dramatically to \$248 million. Further, the VA has only requested \$40 million for these projects in fiscal year 2008, which would leave \$105.5 million remaining to be appropriated to complete construction. I believe Congress should fully fund this project now in order to avoid additional cost increases in the future.

This bill simply raises the authorization to the level indicated by the VA necessary to complete these construction projects. I urge my colleagues to support this technical legislation, which is intended to allow the VA to realize the savings envisioned by the 2004 CARES process on an expedited basis, making more money available for the care of our Nation's veterans.

I ask unanimous consent that the February 28, 2006, letter Senator Santorum and I wrote to Secretary Nicholson and the Secretary's May 8, 2006 response be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Washington, May 8, 2006.

HON. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: Thank you for your letter and continued support of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Pittsburgh Healthcare System Major Construction Project. I regret the delay in this reply.

VA planned to fund the consolidation of the Highland Drive psychiatry, mental health, research, and administrative functions within the University Drive and the H. John Heinz VA Medical Center (VAMC) in Pittsburgh over a 3-year period from 2004 through 2007. Planning for this project began in 2003. This preplanning led to \$35 million being made available in fiscal year (FY) 2005, one year ahead of the initial schedule.

This \$35 million plus \$20 million appropriated in FY 2004 supported design and construction of the 1,500 car parking garage for the University Drive VAMC; demolition of vacant structures at the Heinz VAMC; and master design services and multiple renovation projects to immediately enhance care. These projects are being completed on time and within budget. In FY 2006, \$50 million is being used for the construction of the 98-bed residential living center, administration building, and various infrastructure and support facilities at the Heinz VAMC. These projects are also on time and within budget.

Funding for construction of the mental health, and research facilities at the University Drive VAMC and the ambulatory care center at the Heinz VAMC will be incorporated into VA's FY 2008 budget request. The project can still be completed with a marginal delay in schedule. As various buildings are completed, services will be gradually relocated; however, full closure of the Highland Drive Division will not be accomplished until all construction is completed.

Your assistance and support have been instrumental in ensuring this project remains on schedule and fully funded. A similar letter has been sent to Senator Rick Santorum, who co-signed your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

R. JAMES NICHOLSON.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, February 28, 2006.

The Hon. R. JAMES NICHOLSON,
Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Department of Veterans Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY NICHOLSON: We write today with regard to the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 budget, particularly with respect to funding levels to support the Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) recommendations.

As you know, the recent VA CARES process closed the Highland Drive VA Medical Center (VAMC) in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. As a result, that facility's psychiatry, mental health, research, and administrative functions are to be consolidated within the University Drive VAMC and the H. John Heinz VAMC in Pittsburgh. VA officials promised Congress that there would be no termination of services at the Highland Drive facility until construction of the new facilities is completed and the transfer of patients from the Highland Drive VAMC to the University Drive VAMC and the Heinz VAMC is completed.

Included in the VA Budget Request for FY 2007 is a request for \$457 million for the CARES program, which includes funding for the continuation of specific medical facility projects and the funding of new projects. Notably absent from this request is funding for the continuation of the VA CARES construction project within the VA Pittsburgh Healthcare System. We are concerned that any delay of funding for this crucial initiative will negatively impact the construction

of the Ambulatory Care Center at the Heinz VAMC and the Behavioral Health Pavilion at the University Drive VAMC.

It is our understanding that the VA Pittsburgh Healthcare System is currently progressing on schedule and within its budget. Since the Highland Drive VAMC cannot close until the construction on the other facilities is complete, we ask for your clarification on the VA's future plans for construction project funding for the VA Pittsburgh Healthcare System.

Thank you for your attention to this inquiry.

Sincerely,

RICK SANTORUM,
ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate.

SENATOR TED STEVENS OF ALASKA

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on April 13, 2007, my dear friend and colleague Senator TED STEVENS became the longest serving Republican Senator in the history of this body. Today, I would like to pay tribute to my friend and his more than 38 years of service to our Nation and the people of Alaska.

I have known and worked with TED for over 34 years. We have served together on the Appropriations, Budget, and Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committees and many others. TED and I have been in the Senate together for so long some of the committees on which we served no longer exist. We have collaborated on more pieces of legislation than I can remember and worked to resolve many issues. Most recently, I was thankful for his hard work in the effort to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and increase the strategic security of the country.

I am happy to say TED has made the trip to New Mexico and I to Alaska so we could appreciate the needs of each other's home States. I have also had the pleasure of taking several trips with TED abroad, some more enjoyable than others. One that stands out in my mind is the fact-finding trip we took to North Korea several years ago to better understand the threat that nation poses to the world. I don't believe many people can say they have traveled there, even fewer can say they did it with TED STEVENS. I am very thankful I can.

I think it is safe to say TED has had a remarkable life and career, born in Indianapolis, he has lived in California, Oregon, and Montana—finally settling in his beloved Alaska. During the Second World War, TED left college to join the Army Air Corps and became a decorated pilot. After the war TED attended Harvard Law School, became a U.S. Attorney, worked in the Department of the Interior, started his own law firm, and was elected to the Alaska House of Representatives. For most individuals these accomplishments, all before he came to the Senate, would have marked a full and successful life. However, for TED it was just the beginning and I believe this Nation is lucky it was.

After serving with TED for so many years I know of no one who cares more about the people of Alaska and this Nation or serves either with more dedication and distinction. I would like to personally thank TED for his friendship and hope to have the honor of serving alongside him for many years to come.

CONGRESSMAN JIM JONTZ

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I note the loss of former Congressman Jim Jontz, who died last month after a 2-year battle against colon cancer. All of us, and especially our Nation's political discourse, are much the poorer for the loss of Jim's energetic voice for progressive politics and his use of grassroots organizing to connect people not only to elective politics, but even more important, to the politics of governing—to the art of making our government institutions respond and work for the people they serve.

Jim's indefatigable, tireless approach to politics put him in the Indiana House of Representatives at age 22. He won that race, against the sitting House majority leader, by two votes, which he claimed to have picked up in a laundromat late in the night just hours before the election. He served in the Indiana House for 10 years, then in the Indiana Senate for 2 years.

Jim was elected to Congress in 1986 and served in the House of Representatives from 1987 to 1993. A big part of his successful congressional campaign was his call for more effective Federal action responding to the worst economic crisis in American agriculture since the Great Depression. It was typical of Jim that he saw the pervasive ramifications of the farm crisis as striking at the heart and character of rural America. And he fought to turn that situation around.

During his time in Congress, Jim emphasized environmental issues, as he had in the Indiana Legislature, including pushing for protection of forests in the Pacific Northwest. As a member of the House Agriculture Committee during debate on the 1990 farm bill, he was out front, in truth ahead of his time, in calling for a greater emphasis on promoting and supporting more effective agricultural conservation and environmental practices.

As could be expected, some who were beholden to the conventional wisdom sought to portray Jim as attacking the very underpinnings of U.S. agriculture. There was the politics of division, of contriving threats and sowing fear, but his approach, as usual, was not to deepen divisions but rather to find common ground.

In Jim's proposals, stronger Federal policies to help agricultural producers practice better conservation and stewardship would also improve their prospects for making a living and remaining in agriculture, while enhancing the environment and quality of life for their families and others living in rural communities.

Looking back from today's vantage point, much of what Jim was proposing for the conservation of our Nation's resources is now widely accepted as a fundamental part of our Nation's agricultural policy—although we still have a long way to go to fulfill the vision Jim did so much to instill.

For a second-term Congressman working on his first farm bill, Jim played an unusually significant and effective role in the 1990 farm bill. Many of his amendments promoting agricultural conservation and sustainable agriculture were adopted in the House bill and ultimately in the conference report enacted as the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990. He also successfully pushed for initiatives involving packer concentration, grain quality, food aid, agricultural research and farm income assistance.

After leaving Congress, Jim served for several years as the president of Americans for Democratic Action, and in recent years served as ADA's president emeritus. In that capacity, he led ADA's Working Families Win project which focused on heightening the profile of fair trade and environmental issues among presidential and Congressional candidates. True to his grassroots organizing origins, Jim employed the Working Families Win project to activate and motivate local efforts on outsourcing, minimum wage and health care issues.

Jim's untimely death at age 55 leaves a big hole in the leadership of America's progressive politics. We should all take inspiration and instruction from this master in the art of deploying grassroots organizing and high-minded politics toward the highest ideals and aspirations for our great Nation.

Along with my colleagues, I extend my deepest sympathy and condolences to Jim's mother, stepfather, sister and three nieces, and to the many friends and people he touched in his abundant but too short life.

FISCAL YEAR 2008 BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I believe that my service in the Senate has been highlighted by my interest in the budget process.

As this year's budget negotiations continue, I would like to draw the attention of other Senators to a recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal concerning the single largest day of tax collection in U.S. history. The editorial is entitled "April Revenue Shower."

I think this editorial raises some very interesting points that are particularly relevant as Congress debates the fiscal year 2008 budget resolution. The Wall Street Journal points out that in April alone the U.S. Government collected \$70 billion in tax receipts above the same month last year and for the current fiscal year tax receipts are up 11.3 percent or \$153 billion from last year. I am not sure if most

people are aware of the fact that on April 24, 2007, the United States collected a record setting \$48.7 billion in tax receipts. I think these numbers are certainly worth our attention.

What I find so interesting about these record-breaking tax revenues is the fact they were achieved without raising taxes and without a Federal budget in place. Rather, the American economy is the driving force behind these windfalls. I would pose the question that maybe; just maybe, we should maintain the status quo instead of entering into the budget resolution that is being proposed.

I think Congress should think long and hard about these numbers before we consider making any change to current budget policy. Because of these record tax revenues the budget deficit could be slashed in more than half from this same time last year. The deficit could be reduced by \$150 billion this year, which equates to approximately 1 percent of gross domestic product. I believe our current budget policy is paying off and in the next 18 to 24 months the deficit could completely disappear, if we here in Congress do not veer off course.

I am not surprised that we are collecting nearly 30 percent more from nonwithheld income. Moreover, I also do not find it surprising that individual income tax receipts are up by almost 17.5 percent. I believe that the tax relief that we instituted in 2001 and 2003 is paying large dividends and our economy is benefiting.

I hope my colleagues in the Senate will consider these facts and not attempt to fix something that is not broken. I am simply saying that maybe we should not be rushed into action.

Additionally, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Wall Street Journal be printed in the RECORD.

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

APRIL REVENUE SHOWER

Here's the "surge" you aren't reading about: the continuing flood of tax revenue into the federal Treasury. Tax receipts for April were \$70 billion above the same month in 2006, and April 24 marked the single biggest day of tax collections in U.S. history, at \$48.7 billion, according to the latest Treasury report.

The April comparison is slightly askew because the IRS processed more returns than usual this year. But there's no denying that Americans are sending more money than ever to Washington; revenues for the first seven months of fiscal 2007 are up 11.3%, or \$153 billion. This Beltway bonanza has helped to slash the projected federal budget deficit by more than half from the same point last year. Across the past three Aprils, federal red ink has sunk by nearly \$300 billion. The deficit this year could tumble to \$150 billion, or an economically trivial 1% of GDP.

This revenue boom certainly casts doubt on the political walls about tax loopholes for the rich. So far this year, the taxes paid on so-called nonwithheld income, which are dollars that don't come from normal wages and salaries, have climbed by nearly 30%. This is income largely derived from capital gains,

dividends and other investment sources—i.e., the tax rates that President Bush cut in 2003. Individual income taxes are also up by 17.5%—a handsome fiscal dividend from rising wages and low unemployment.

In other good news, the pace of federal spending, which was pedal-to-the-metal in Mr. Bush's first term, has finally decelerated. So far this year federal outlays have climbed by 3%, and, save for Medicare and Medicaid, federal expenditures are nearly flat from 2006. Spending will climb again once the Iraq supplemental passes, and revenues can't keep rising at a double digit pace forever.

Still, you'd think this dramatic fiscal turnaround would cheer up Capitol Hill. Instead, Congressional Democrats seem to live in a parallel universe—one that they claim is starved for revenues, with a runaway deficit, and is dominated by the rich who pay no taxes at all. The reality is that the wealthy are financing Democratic spending ambitions, and the deficit could easily vanish within a year or two if Congress has the good sense to leave current tax policy in place.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I wish today, on National Police Week, to honor this Nation's law enforcement officers. Our law enforcement officers are some of the bravest men and women we will ever come across. They selflessly dedicate their lives to keeping our communities safe and taking dangerous individuals off our streets.

Tragically, some of those officers lose their lives while on duty. The National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial currently bears the names of more than 17,500 officers who have been killed or died while on duty. This week, 382 additional names will be added. Two of those fallen officers are from my home State of Wisconsin.

Jackie Ryden dedicated his life to law enforcement, spending 33 years with the Ellsworth Police Department, the Pierce County Sheriff's Department, and the Prescott Police Department. He was a well-liked and well-respected member of the police force, as well as his community.

On September 2, 2006, Jackie responded to a natural gas explosion and the resulting fire. He helped to evacuate a number of local citizens from their homes. Shortly after Officer Ryden returned to his patrol car to help direct traffic, he suffered a heart attack and died. According to those who knew him best, he passed away doing what he loved best—serving and protecting his community. Jackie Ryden is survived by his wife, two children, and three grandchildren.

The second officer whom I seek to honor today is Stephen Hahn. Stephen was a special deputy with the Eau Claire County Sheriff's Office, serving approximately 40 years in law enforcement. Mr. Hahn was killed in a traffic accident while transporting an inmate. A vehicle heading in the opposite direction lost control and struck the van being driven by Deputy Hahn. He is survived by his wife and two children.

We mourn the loss of these two great, brave men and attempt to honor them

by recognizing the sacrifices they made for the benefit of others. Both of their communities, and the State of Wisconsin as a whole, are worse off because of the loss of these two public safety officers. I am pleased, however, that their names are being added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, so they can forever be remembered for their hard work and dedication to improving the lives of those around them.

VOTE EXPLANATIONS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I regret that on May 15 I was unable to vote on certain provisions of H.R. 1495, the Water Resources Development Act of 2007. I wish to address these votes, so that the people of the great State of Kansas, who elected me to serve them as U.S. Senator, may know my position.

Regarding vote No. 163, on amendment No. 1090, I would not have voted in favor of this amendment. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

Regarding vote No. 164, on amendment No. 1089, I would not have voted in favor of this amendment. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

Regarding vote No. 165, on amendment No. 1086, I would have voted in favor of this amendment. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

Regarding vote No. 166, on amendment No. 1094, I would not have voted in favor of this amendment. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I missed today's votes on Iraq because I was attending the college graduation of my daughter, Elizabeth.

But I want to express my unqualified support for the amendment offered by my colleagues, Senator FEINGOLD and Senator REID.

This amendment says that our entanglement in another country's civil war has gone on long enough.

This amendment says that Congress must stop playing the role of spectator and start standing up for our overtaxed and inadequately protected troops.

This amendment says we must stand up for their families.

This amendment says that we have an obligation to support our men and women in uniform, not only by funding them, but by bringing them home.

The funding for our troops is assured, whether they are deployed in Iraq or redeployed from Iraq.

This amendment calls for their redeployment.

Those who claim this amendment would cut off funding for our troops are actually saying that the President, if required to redeploy our troops, would instead cut off their funding.

I may not see eye to eye with our President, but I don't believe him capable of that.

The Feingold-Reid amendment says "enough is enough."

A majority of Americans want our troops to come home. It is time to bring them home.

I thank Senator FEINGOLD and Leader REID for having the conviction and the courage to stand up for our troops.

Patriotism is not passive. It is not swayed by inflammatory rhetoric or false accusations.

In the case of Iraq, patriotism does not mean blindly following the current path, it means carving out the right one.

Bringing our troops home is an act of patriotism. The Feingold-Reid amendment is an act of patriotism, and I fully support its intent.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING JANET TURCOTTE

• Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, today I wish to recognize Janet Turcotte, of Bowie, MD, for her courageous efforts to raise awareness of colon cancer and promote screening. Janet was first diagnosed with Stage IV colorectal cancer 4 years ago at age 53, and she is currently battling her third recurrence of the disease. I met Janet in March when she came to my office on behalf of C3, the Colorectal Cancer Coalition. C3 is a national organization whose mission is to eliminate suffering and death due to colorectal cancer. Janet has joined the coalition in its push for "more research to improve screening, diagnosis, and treatment of colorectal cancer; for policy decisions that make the most effective colorectal cancer prevention and treatment available for all; and for increased awareness that colorectal cancer is preventable, treatable, and beatable."

Last year, Janet Turcotte brought her fight against colorectal cancer to a new venue, the Preakness Stakes at Pimlico Race Course. The Preakness is the second and shortest leg of horse racing's prestigious Triple Crown, being preceded by the Kentucky Derby and followed by the Belmont Stakes. The race was inaugurated in 1873 for 3 year-old thoroughbreds, and its 132nd running will be held this coming Saturday, May 19 in Baltimore, MD. Janet has embroidered the saddlecloths for thoroughbreds at the annual race for over 2 decades. Last May, she added the colorectal cancer "Blue Star of Hope" to the saddlecloths of the 11 contenders. Pimlico Race Course will again support Janet's efforts to fight colorectal cancer this coming weekend. More than 17 million people will view this weekend's race and her efforts will make a true difference in raising awareness. Of the millions of viewers, it's estimated that nearly 1 million of them are at risk for developing the disease. Janet, along with race course officials, hopes that this symbol will encourage early screening and detection of colorectal cancer.

Janet's message is an urgent and important one. In 2006 alone, according to the American Cancer Society, more

than 150,000 new cases were diagnosed and more than 50,000 Americans died from colon cancer. In my own State of Maryland, nearly 1,000 people lost their lives to this disease last year. What many people are not as aware of is that colon, cancer is preventable with appropriate screening, highly detectable, and curable if found early.

This past April, I introduced the Colon Cancer Screen for Life Act of 2007 along with my colleagues, Senator COLLINS, Senator LIEBERMAN, and Senator GRAHAM. This bill would help eliminate the barriers that currently exist under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening and increase the number of seniors who receive this potentially lifesaving benefit. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, if everyone age 50 and older were screened regularly, as many as 60 percent of deaths from colorectal cancer could be prevented. When colorectal cancer is found early and treated, the 5-year survival rate is greater than 90 percent. With the number of lives at stake, the efforts of Janet Turcotte and other brave survivors deserve special recognition. As Janet has said, "As the thoroughbreds carry this symbol in the race to the finish line, I can only hope that through awareness and prevention, we too can win the race against colorectal cancer." I wish Janet Turcotte all the best on Saturday and ask my colleagues to join me in commending her for this important effort.●

CIVIC EDUCATION IN IDAHO

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the dedicated efforts of the students at Orofino High School who came to Washington to represent Idaho in the finals of the annual We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution Program.

The national finals include a hearing which gives the students the opportunity to apply their specialized learning in history, social studies, government, and civics during "testimony" before a panel of judges. As they use their newly gained knowledge of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights to examine, counter, and defend issues facing America today, students come to appreciate the timeless nature of this great document. This experience gives young people the opportunity to apply civic values to real-life challenges and serves them in whatever they choose to do after they graduate from high school.

Orofino High School was excellently represented by Jennifer Cluck, Justin Haag, Gary Hardin, George Korbel, Nathan LeBaron, Ryan Lundgren, Madison Morrow, Eric Petersen, Jessica Robbeloth, Ashley Roshitsh, Capri Savage, Kelsey Stemrich, and Bret Zender.

Cindy Wilson, the teacher who prepared these exceptional students, deserves recognition for her tremendous efforts. Also worthy of special recognition is Peter Kavouras, the State coordinator, who is among those responsible for implementing the We the People Program in my State.

Idahoans can be proud of the growth of civic virtue in their young people.

As they look beyond themselves to the realm of the public good, Idaho and America will benefit as these individuals develop into responsible, intelligent citizens who practice discernment in judgment in matters of concern to our State and Nation. In the future, these student citizens will be more inclined to exhibit leadership faithful to the ideals upon which our country was built and consonant with the notions of liberty, freedom, justice, and rule of law.●

CANNON AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO

• Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the importance of Cannon Air Force Base, NM.

Cannon Air Force Base's primary mission is an F-16 fighter wing able to perform day or night operations. However, the base is currently undergoing an exciting transition to be an Air Force special operations base. I am excited about this mission and the work that will be done in eastern New Mexico, but with every new mission, we must also remember prior missions.

Today I want to commemorate the last mission of the 27th Fighter Wing's 523rd Fighter Squadron, which was flown on May 10, 2007, as the 523rd is being deactivated in preparation for Cannon's new mission.

The 523rd Fighter Squadron has a unique history that dates back to well before their time in New Mexico. It was established on February 1, 1940, as a bombardment squadron with B-18s. The squadron arrived at Cannon in 1959. One of its missions from Cannon came after September 11, 2001, when the 523rd flew 24-hour-per-day operations in defense of our Nation.

This fighter squadron will not be the last to leave Cannon Air Force Base, as other departures are expected in this summer and fall as well as next spring. However, the 523rd Fighter Squadron has long been a vital part of our Nation's defense as well as Cannon's 27th Fighter Wing, and I am proud of all of the men and women who have served in the 523rd.

Today I want to honor them, as well as all of the men and women who have served at Cannon Air Force Base. I am proud New Mexico has been home to so many outstanding individuals, and I look forward to working with more such soldiers as Cannon Air Force Base transitions to an Air Force special operations base in October.●

IN MEMORY OF PHIL B. CURLS, SR.

• Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to join me today in honoring the life of Phil Curls, a much-loved member of the Kansas City community. With his passing, Phil has left a legacy of public service that will always be cherished, but Kansas City will not be the same without him.

During his life, Phil was an integral member of the Kansas City community and was considered by many to be a local patriarch. Phil always cared deeply about others, whether it was his family, a political cause, or mentoring young leaders through Freedom, Inc.

Phil was a graduate of DeLaSalle High School and earned a bachelor's degree in business administration from Rockhurst College. He served 11 years in the Missouri House and 16 years in the State Senate before retiring in 1998.

I had the distinct honor of serving with Phil in the Missouri General Assembly, where his tenure was marked by excellence and community involvement and where I learned important lessons about public leadership from him. Phil was always regarded highly by everyone he interacted with, including his contemporaries as well as older and younger politicians. Through his public service, Phil helped to shape the course that the city and State has taken.

Phil was deeply involved in Freedom, Inc., making sure the community he loved had the political power necessary to bring about positive change. In addition to Freedom, Inc., Phil was involved in so many organizations and had so many achievements and awards that it would be very difficult to list them all. I can, however, state with total certainty that Phil left a permanent mark on Kansas City and will be fondly remembered and dearly missed.

With Phil's passing, we have lost a prolific public servant and a passionate individual. I will miss him as a close friend. Phil is survived by his wife of 43 years, Councilwoman Melba Curls; daughter Monica; sons Phil II, Michael, Quincy and Louis; four grandchildren; and a large extended family.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate join me in honoring the life and legacy of Phil B. Curls, Sr. ●

2007 WE THE PEOPLE NATIONAL FINALS

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, from April 28-30, 2007, more than 1,200 students from across the country visited Washington, DC to take part in the National Finals of the We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution competition. Administered by the Center for Civic Education, the We the People program is funded by the U.S. Department of Education by Act of Congress, and is an innovative national educational program developed to educate young people about the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Sixteen outstanding students from West Anchorage High School of Anchorage, AK, through their knowledge of the U.S. Constitution, won their statewide competition and earned the chance to come to Washington, DC, and compete at the national level. I am proud to announce that these talented young people won the Region One: Western States Award at this prestigious national event. The regional awards are presented to one class from each of the five geographic regions that has the highest cumulative score during the first 2 days of competition.

While in Washington, the students participated in a 3-day academic com-

petition that simulates a congressional hearing in which they "testify" before a panel of judges. Students demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of constitutional principles as they evaluate, take, and defend positions on relevant historical and contemporary issues.

The We the People competition is a rigorous program and students enter prepared to answer tough questions, some of which Americans have been debating since the Constitution was ratified. For example, participants in this year's competition were asked to evaluate the following constitutional principles: States rights—Evaluate the proposal in the Virginia Plan to give Congress the power to strike down state laws that it considered to be in violation of the national constitution or of the national interest; The rights of the individual—Evaluate the anti-Federalist argument that a bill of rights is as necessary to defend an individual against the majority in a republic as against the king in a monarchy; equal protection—How, if at all, is the concept of equal protection of the laws related to the natural rights philosophy and the idea of a social contract? America's role as an example to other countries—Which aspects of American constitutional democracy have been the most influential in other countries?

I am so proud to recognize the outstanding students from West Anchorage High School, this year's We the People Region One winners:

Kristin Baylon, Justin Birchell, Kathryn Braden, Chloe Cotton, Taylor Evenson, Emmaus Finau, Colby Gerik, Matthew Legacki, Elyse Lindsay, Patrick Marcil, Sara Perman, Molly Quinn, Leyna Rynearson, Henrik Strand, Chandra Suriano, and Brianna Thompson.

I also wish to commend the teacher of the class, Pamela Orme, who is responsible for preparing these young constitutional experts for the National Finals. Also worthy of special recognition is Maida Buckley, the state coordinator, and Todd Heuston, the district coordinator, who are among those responsible for implementing the We the People program in Alaska.

I congratulate these students on their exceptional achievement at the We the People National Finals. ●

HONORING ISADORE ERWIN MILLSTONE

● Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to join me in recognizing Isadore Erwin "I.E." Millstone of Saint Louis, MO. It is an honor to celebrate I.E.'s centennial birthday and to pay tribute to all that he has accomplished in his 100 years. Through his business and philanthropic interests, Mr. Millstone has helped shape the course of the city of Saint Louis over the past century.

Born on January 6, 1907, in North Saint Louis, I.E. graduated from Sol-

dan High School in 1923. He then continued his education at Washington University in St. Louis, studying architecture and engineering, and graduating in 1927.

During his life, I.E. has been an integral member and patriarch of the Saint Louis community. He is a life member of the United Hebrew Congregation in Saint Louis, where he earned money as a child checking hats and coats, and served as global president of the World Federation of YMHA's and Jewish Community Centers Association.

Following the Great Depression, I.E. formed Millstone Construction Company with his wife and became involved in the creation of many landmarks throughout the Saint Louis area—due in part to his revolutionary use of reinforced concrete. These projects include the old Busch Stadium, Highway 40, and the Jewish Community center in Creve Coeur. As the city is being redeveloped, both the old Busch Stadium and Highway 40 are being transformed to serve a new generation, but the original structures are forever a part of the city's history.

A giant among men, I.E. demonstrates a passion that does not lie solely in building Saint Louis from a physical standpoint. As a dedicated philanthropist, I.E. has supported many causes, including funding a program to support nearly 60 scholarships at Washington University in St. Louis. His dedication to helping others, however, is not limited to the Saint Louis area. Following World War II, I.E. joined a small group of builders to help the new State of Israel construct emergency housing for thousands of immigrants, many of whom were Holocaust survivors.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate join me in honoring I.E. Millstone for 100 years of dedicated service to Saint Louis and to the world. I am proud to recognize this extraordinary Missourian and wish him many more healthy and happy years to come. ●

HONORING LYMAN MORSE BOATBUILDING

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize for the week of May 13 an outstanding small business from my home State of Maine that has not only succeeded in manufacturing a product of great quality, but has also made its facilities environmentally friendly and energy efficient. Lyman Morse Boatbuilding of Thomaston, ME has produced boats for over 100 years. Noted for their expert craftsmanship and storied history, Lyman Morse has a proven track record of quality and success. In their great spirit of innovation, Lyman Morse will be unveiling, on May 26, a "green"—or energy efficient—boat-building facility, and I want to take this opportunity to commend them for this fabulous attempt at conservation.

Lyman Morse's new "green" building is a temperature-controlled facility

that is designed for the construction and service of large yachts. Completed in less than a year, the building is 140 feet long, 160 feet wide, and stands 55 feet high. What is particularly remarkable is that heat generated on the building's roof from the sun can be absorbed and used as energy for the building—a truly impressive feat in efficiency. While the new “green” building will be Lyman Morse’s largest, it will also be their most energy efficient, proving that conservation does not have to hamper effectiveness.

To construct its new facility, I would like to point out that Lyman Morse took advantage of a tax deduction for energy efficient commercial buildings Congress enacted as part of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and extended in the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006. Congress should heed the example of Lyman Morse, because by incorporating “green” building practices, we can reduce energy consumption, increase profitability—and create more jobs.

While Lyman Morse Boatbuilding follows in the historic tradition of New England boat building, particularly that of Midcoast Maine, I am so pleased that it has decided to take advantage of modern technology to be environmentally responsible. In fact, Lyman Morse has been a terrific corporate citizen for many years. I want to point out that in January 2006, the State of Maine declared Lyman Morse Boatbuilding a Maine Clean Boatyard and Marina. A program designed to help preserve and improve natural resources while reducing pollution, the Maine Clean Boatyard and Marinas Program is a partnership of industry, state and federal agencies, and environmental organizations dedicated to promoting best management practices in boatyards and marinas. Participants must exceed Federal and State environmental compliance standards to achieve designation. It is their commitment to environmental safety and energy efficiency, combined with their impressive and trustworthy labor, that makes Lyman Morse a truly special Maine business and worthy of this recognition.

I wish Lyman Morse all the best for the grand opening of their building. It is always inspiring to see examples of good stewards of the environment in Maine, a state that has always appreciated the importance of nature in our everyday lives. Their willingness to protect the one environment that we have is a beautiful example to all of us. ●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United

States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 634. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of veterans who became disabled for life while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

H.R. 692. An act to amend title 4, United States Code, to authorize the Governor of a State, territory, or possession of the United States to order that the National flag be flown at half-staff in that State, territory, or possession in the event of the death of a member of the Armed Forces from that State, territory, or possession who dies while serving on active duty.

H.R. 916. An act to provide for loan repayment for prosecutors and public defenders.

H.R. 1036. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property to the Alaska Railroad Corporation.

H.R. 1505. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 131 East 4th Street in Davenport, Iowa, as the “James A. Leach Federal Building.”

H.R. 1700. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the COPS ON THE BEAT grant program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1773. An act to limit the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to grant authority to motor carriers domiciled in Mexico to operate beyond United States municipalities and commercial zones on the United States-Mexico border.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 634. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of veterans who became disabled for life while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 692. An act to amend title 4, United States Code, to authorize the Governor of a State, territory, or possession of the United States to order that the National flag be flown at half-staff in that State, territory, or possession in the event of the death of a member of the Armed Forces from that State, territory, or possession who dies while serving on active duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1036. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property to the Alaska Railroad Corporation; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 1505. To designate the United States courthouse located at 131 East 4th Street in Davenport, Iowa, as the “James A. Leach Federal Building.”; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 1773. An act to limit the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to grant authority to motor carriers domiciled in Mexico to operate beyond United States municipalities and commercial zones on the United States-Mexico border; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 916. An act to provide for loan repayment for prosecutors and public defenders.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1904. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “*Aspergillus flavus* NRRL 21882 on Corn; Temporary Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 8130-6) received on May 11, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1905. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Chlorantraniliprole; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 8128-2) received on May 11, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1906. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Acetochlor; Pesticide Tolerance” (FRL No. 8126-2) received on May 11, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1907. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pendimethalin; Pesticide Tolerance” (FRL No. 8120-2) received on May 11, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1908. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pythium Oligandrum DV 74; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 7713-1) received on May 11, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1909. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of the Navy pursuing a multi-year procurement for the V-22 Osprey for the fiscal year 2008 through fiscal year 2012 program years; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1910. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the

Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1911. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Burma that was declared in Executive Order 13047 of May 20, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1912. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Development Fund for Iraq and certain property in which Iraq has an interest that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1913. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1914. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1915. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the accomplishments made under the Airport Improvement Program during fiscal year 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1916. A communication from the Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulated Navigation Area; Cumberland River, Clarksville, TN" ((RIN1625-AA11)(CGD08-07-010)) received on May 14, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1917. A communication from the Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulations (including 2 regulations beginning with CGD05-07-047)" ((RIN1625-AA09)) received on May 14, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1918. A communication from the Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone: Queen of England Visit, Jamestown Island, VA" ((RIN1625-AA00)(CGD05-07-038)) received on May 14, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1919. A communication from the Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Roanoke River, Plymouth, North Carolina" ((RIN1625-AA08)(CGD05-07-028)) received on May 14, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1920. A communication from the Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations for Marine Events (including 3 regulations beginning with CGD05-07-009)" ((RIN1625-AA08)) received on May 14, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1921. A communication from the Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone (including 4 regulations beginning with COTP SAVANNAH 06-160)" ((RIN1625-AA87)) received on May 14, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1922. A communication from the Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones (including 12 regulations beginning with CGD05-07-024)" ((RIN1625-AA00)) received on May 14, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1923. A communication from the Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operations (including 3 regulations beginning with CGD07-06-050)" ((RIN1625-AA09)) received on May 14, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1924. A communication from the Director, Office of Management, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's 2006 lists of Government activities determined to be inherently governmental and those to be not inherently governmental in nature; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1925. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Redesignation of the Weirton, WV Portion of the Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Area's Maintenance Plan" ((FRL No. 8314-1)) received on May 11, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1926. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Redesignation of the West Virginia Portion of the Wheeling, WV-OH 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Area's Maintenance Plan" ((FRL No. 8314-6)) received on May 11, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1927. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Michigan; Redesignation of Flint, Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo-Battle Creek, Lansing-East Lansing, Muskegon, Benton Harbor, Benzie County, Cass County, Huron County, and Mason County 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Areas to Attainment for Ozone" ((FRL No. 8314-4)) received on May 11, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1928. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oil Pollution Prevention; Non-Transportation Related Onshore and Offshore Facilities" ((RIN2050-AG36)) ((FRL No. 8315-1)) received on May 11, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1929. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants, and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories" ((RIN2060-AN84)) ((FRL No. 8315-2)) received on May 11, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1930. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Field Directive on the Proper Treatment of Upfront Fees, Milestone Payments, Royalties, and Deferred Income Upon Entering into a Collaboration Agreement in the Biotech and Pharmaceutical Industries" ((UIL 263.13-02)) received on May 9, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1931. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance Regarding Public Inspection of Unrelated Business Income Tax Returns" (Notice 2007-45) received on May 9, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1932. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Section 856—Definition of Real Estate Investment Trust" ((Rev. Rul. 2007-33)) received on May 9, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1933. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the certification of a proposed export of defense articles, technical data and defense services for major defense equipment in the amount of \$25,000,000 or more to Denmark; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1934. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment in the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1935. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2007-100—2007-107); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1936. A communication from the Staff Director, U.S. Sentencing Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2006 Annual Report and Sourcebook of Federal Sentencing Statistics"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1937. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, two legislative proposals relating to the implementation of treaties concerning maritime terrorism and the maritime transportation of weapons of mass destruction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1938. A communication from the National Treasurer, American Ex-Prisoners of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, the organization's audit for the year 2005-2006; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1939. A communication from the Chairman, U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2006 Audit of the

Corps along with its 2006 Annual Report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1940. A communication from the Regulatory Contact, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Official Fees and Tolerances for Barley Protein Testing" (RIN0580-AA95) received on May 11, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1941. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, the report of the authorization of Colonel Charles W. Hooper to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1942. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, the report of the authorization of Brigadier General James L. Williams to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1943. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indiana Regulatory Program" (IN-157-POR) received on May 16, 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1944. A communication from the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the findings of a study of issues regarding energy rights-of-way on tribal land; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1945. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certification relative to the importation of harvested shrimp; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1946. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance Regarding Heavy Hybrid Motor Vehicles" (Notice 2007-46) received on May 15, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1947. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Discontinue Publication of BLS-LIFO Department Store Inventory Price Indexes" (Notice 2007-44) received on May 15, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1948. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Bureau of Labor Statistics Price Indexes for Department Stores—March 2007" (Notice 2007-34) received on May 15, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1949. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Withdrawal of Obsolete Guidance on Blocked Income" (Rev. Rul. 2007-35) received on May 15, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1950. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Health Savings Accounts Inflation Adjustments" (Rev. Proc. 2007-36) received on May 15, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1951. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, two draft bills relative to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1952. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the removal of radiation-hardened microelectronic circuits from the United States Munitions List; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1953. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an amendment to Part 121 of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1954. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final report of the Academic Competitiveness Council; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1955. A communication from the Chairman and Commissioners, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting, a draft bill intended to "amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 to revise the Act to clarify the scope of the National Indian Gaming Commission's authority and to make such other technical amendments as are required"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-1956. A communication from the Chair, U.S. Sentencing Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the federal cocaine sentencing policy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1957. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, a legislative proposal entitled "Intellectual Property Protection Act of 2007"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. INOUE for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*David James Gribbin IV, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Transportation.

*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Craig E. Bone and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Brian M. Salerno, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 29, 2007.

Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. COBURN):

S. 1405. A bill to enhance the ability of community banks to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 1406. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to strengthen polar bear conservation efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1407. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily provide a shorter recovery period for the depreciation of certain systems installed in nonresidential and residential rental buildings; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 1408. A bill to improve quality in health care by providing incentives for adoption of modern information technology; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. CLINTON:

S. 1409. A bill to provide and enhance education, housing, and entrepreneur assistance for veterans who serve in the Armed Forces after September 11, 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of hearing aids; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 1411. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to establish within the Environmental Protection Agency an office to measure and report on greenhouse gas emissions of Federal agencies; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 1412. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Development Act of 2002 to support beginning farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 1413. A bill to provide for research and education with respect to uterine fibroids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1414. A bill to amend the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act to require State academic assessments of student achievement in United States history and civics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 1415. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Social Security Act to improve screening and treatment of cancers, provide for survivorship services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. KOHL, Mr. DODD, Mr. ENSIGN, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 1416. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction for mortgage insurance premiums; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. DOLE, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. DODD):

S. Res. 203. A resolution calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to stop genocide and violence in Darfur, Sudan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. Res. 204. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with regard to the importance of National Women's Health Week, which promotes awareness of diseases that affect women and which encourages women to take preventive measures to ensure good health; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. OBAMA, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. BAYH, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. DOMENICI):

S. Res. 205. A resolution designating June 2007 as "National Internet Safety Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 67

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 67, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit former members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability rated as total to travel on military aircraft in the same manner and to the same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces are entitled to travel on such aircraft.

S. 150

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 150, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to protect the health of pregnant women, fetuses, infants, and children by requiring a health advisory and drinking water standard for perchlorate.

S. 340

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) were added as cosponsors of S. 340, a bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 368

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 368, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the COPS ON THE BEAT grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 558

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Kentucky

(Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 558, a bill to provide parity between health insurance coverage of mental health benefits and benefits for medical and surgical services.

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 558, *supra*.

S. 626

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 626, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for arthritis research and public health, and for other purposes.

S. 694

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 694, a bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations to reduce the incidence of child injury and death occurring inside or outside of light motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 831

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 831, a bill to authorize States and local governments to prohibit the investment of State assets in any company that has a qualifying business relationship with Sudan.

S. 849

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 849, a bill to promote accessibility, accountability, and openness in Government by strengthening section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 901, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide additional authorizations of appropriations for the health centers program under section 330 of such Act.

S. 935

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 935, a bill to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 971

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 971, a bill to establish the National Institute of Food and Agriculture, to provide funding for the support of fundamental agricultural research of the highest quality, and for other purposes.

S. 1003

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1003, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to emergency medical services and the quality and efficiency of care furnished in emergency departments of hospitals and critical access hospitals by establishing a bipartisan commission to examine factors that affect the effective delivery of such services, by providing for additional payments for certain physician services furnished in such emergency departments, and by establishing a Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Working Group, and for other purposes.

S. 1060

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1060, a bill to reauthorize the grant program for reentry of offenders into the community in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to improve reentry planning and implementation, and for other purposes.

S. 1175

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1175, a bill to end the use of child soldiers in hostilities around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 1183

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1183, a bill to enhance and further research into paralysis and to improve rehabilitation and the quality of life for persons living with paralysis and other physical disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1224

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1224, a bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to reauthorize the State Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1226

At the request of Mr. BAYH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1226, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to establish programs to improve the quality, performance, and delivery of pediatric care.

S. 1232

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1232, a bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, to develop a voluntary policy for managing the risk of food allergy and anaphylaxis in schools, to establish school-based food allergy management grants, and for other purposes.

S. 1328

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1328, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate discrimination in the immigration laws by permitting permanent partners of United States citizens and lawful permanent residents to obtain lawful permanent resident status in the same manner as spouses of citizens and lawful permanent residents and to penalize immigration fraud in connection with permanent partnerships.

S. 1379

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of S. 1379, a bill to amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to strike the exception to the residency requirements for United States attorneys.

AMENDMENT NO. 1094

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1094 proposed to H.R. 1495, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1098

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1098 proposed to H.R. 1495, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1098 proposed to H.R. 1495, *supra*.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 1408. A bill improve quality in health care by providing incentives for adoption of modern information technology; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, the evidence showing the ability of health IT to reduce costs and improve quality of care is simply overwhelming.

That is why Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE and I are reintroducing our Health-Tech legislation to accelerate the adoption of health information technology.

Businesses across the country are struggling to remain competitive in a

global market with skyrocketing health care costs.

The use of electronic medical records could save more than \$80 billion annually, reducing costs for businesses and taxpayers alike. We should be putting these systems in place immediately!

And, despite the best doctors, nurses, hospitals, and other health care providers in the world, some patients just are not getting the care they need.

Often times that is because our health care providers do not have the information they need about their patients, when they need it and where they need it.

And, our health care system are not currently set up to prevent errors; the most common medical errors include medication errors and the extra costs of treating drug-related injuries amount to at least \$3.5 billion a year.

As compelling as the cost savings is the promise health IT holds for improving the quality of our health care system.

Getting health IT into the hands of our doctors, hospitals, nursing homes and community clinics will mean patients get the care they need, at the right time, and in the best setting.

The value of health IT—saving lives and saving money—is well-known.

So why is it not being used more widely?

Health care providers are struggling to keep up with their daily needs; a major barrier to widespread use of IT is the initial investment cost.

The costs of implementing health IT can be staggering.

For example, the cost of an integrated electronic health record system for a three- to six-member physician practice is estimated to be \$70,000–\$100,000.

And, the savings from using health IT go primarily to the patients, employers, and insurers, not the providers.

If a patient needs one less x-ray because a hospital can pull up the x-ray performed by a radiologist in a different setting, that is one less co-payment for the patient, and one less bill to the patient's employer or insurer, or to the Medicare program.

It only makes sense for the Federal Government to invest some seed money.

Every day we delay providing Federal dollars, we delay getting health information technology systems in place, and businesses, taxpayers and patients pay in both dollars and lives.

The bill that Senator SNOWE and I are reintroducing today would address just that: It would put IT systems in the hands of providers by establishing a 5-year, \$4 billion grant program for health care providers and by providing tax incentives and adjusting Medicare payments for providers who use these systems.

The bill will be referred to the Finance Committee; Senator SNOWE and I are both members of the committee and will work to include our legislation

in any appropriate package the committee considers.

We have made an important change to our bill this Congress.

A patient's right to health information privacy is paramount, and is essential to the health care provider-patient relationship.

Therefore we have added a requirement that health IT systems funded by our legislation ensure the privacy and security of personal medical information, and that patients be informed if there is a breach in the privacy of their medical record.

We need to get this done. Widespread use of health information technology can revolutionize our health care system. Getting systems into the hands of providers is the first step.

Our legislation has the support of many consumer, provider, labor and business groups including: AFL-CIO, Altarum, American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Cardiology, American College of Emergency Physicians, American College of Physicians, American Health Care Association, American Heart Association, American Society of Health-System Pharmacists, Ascension Health, Automation Alley, BlueCross/BlueShield of Michigan, DaimlerChrysler, Detroit Medical Center, e-Health Initiative, Families USA, Federation of American Hospitals, Ford Motor Company, General Motors Corporation, Greenway Medical Technologies, Healthcare Information and Management Systems Society (HIMSS), HR Policy Association, IBM, Marquette General Health System, McLaren Health Care Corporation, Michigan Health and Hospital Association, Michigan State Medical Society, National Association of Children's Hospitals, National Association of Community Health Centers, National Business Coalition on Health, National Business Group on Health, National Partnership for Women and Families, National Rural Health Association, Oracle, Saint John Health, Saint Joseph Mercy Health System—Ann Arbor, Michigan; Saint Joseph Mercy Oakland—Pontiac, Michigan; Saint Mary's Health Care—Grand Rapids, Michigan and Trinity Health.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. SNOWE. President, today I join my colleague, Senator STABENOW of Michigan, in introducing the Health Information Technology Act of 2007, which will serve to improve the quality of health care through implementation of information technology, IT, in hospitals, health centers and physician practices throughout the country. Our legislation is necessary because as a nation we face two stark problems.

The first of these is a serious patient-safety problem. Indeed if most Americans were told today that 98,000 lives were lost needlessly last year and a cure was available they would undoubtedly call for action. Yet the Institute of Medicine, IOM, has reported that medical errors inflict that toll every

year, and we have the technology at our disposal to dramatically reduce those deaths.

The good news is that solutions exist. We have the technological ability to dramatically reduce medical errors and thus save lives. Many of us have heard about how drug interactions can be avoided by software systems which check a patient's prescriptions for hazards. Yet there are so many other applications which can improve health. For example, by reviewing and analyzing information, a health provider can help a patient better manage chronic diseases such as diabetes and heart disease, and avoid adverse outcomes.

Our second major problem is the escalating cost of health care. Our health spending now comprises 16 percent of GNP, and the price of coverage has grown so high that the number of Americans without health insurance reached nearly 47 million last year. Those trends are threatening our economic competitiveness in the world and each American's health security as well. The answer is not to simply expand coverage, because on our current trajectory, escalating costs would simply erode our ability to provide care. It is clear that some fundamental changes must be made in health care.

One of those changes must be the application of modern data technology to save lives and reduce costs. Indeed consider the savings when a physician can locate information efficiently. Tests do not have to be repeated and data is not delayed. In fact, a patient may obtain faster, higher quality care when, for example, multiple practitioners can review diagnostic test results right at their desktops. In an age where millions of Americans share family pictures over the internet in seconds, is it not long past time that a physician should be able to retrieve an x-ray just as easily?

The President certainly recognizes the disparity in technology in health versus other parts of our economy. He has declared a goal for every American to have an electronic medical record within ten years. I concur, we need this and more. In fact, once that record is in place we can do so many things better. From preventing drug interactions, to managing chronic diseases, to simply helping providers operate more efficiently. Most of us have been told at one time or another, "we're waiting to get the test results mailed," or "we're still waiting for your chart." Health care is one of the last bastions of such inefficiency. Indeed it is often easier to track the service history on one's automobile than to see your own health history.

The bad news is that the cost of new systems and a lack of standards have prevented us from reaping the benefits of new technologies. The President has made technology implementation a priority, and there is no doubt that a lack of standards has played a role in slowing IT adoption by many health

care providers. One must know that a system purchased will be compatible with others, and that, no matter what may happen in the future to a vendor, the huge investment one makes in building an electronic medical records would not be lost. In other words, your system must be able to communicate with other systems, and your investment in building electronic medical records must be preserved. So when a patient moves, their electronic "chart" should be able to move right along with them, and their continuity of care shouldn't be interrupted.

Yet standards alone aren't enough. Today many providers are struggling to make these investments, and for those which serve beneficiaries of Medicare, Medicaid and SCHIP, it can be exceedingly difficult. Our physicians, for example, have seen recent Medicare payment updates which have not even kept pace with inflation . . . and at the same time some expect that they will make a major investment in health IT.

The failure of that logic is clear because we know where the benefits are realized. The benefits to patients are evident, in fewer delays, in better outcome, lives saved. Health IT reduces costs as well, but primarily to those who pay for services, not to providers. Indeed it has been estimated that 89 percent of cost savings accrue to those who pay for services. It should be obvious then that the Federal Government would invest in health IT to reduce its expenditures on Medicare, Medicaid and SCHIP.

That is precisely what this legislation would do. Because as we look to the many studies and reports on health IT, one thing is clear. The annual cost savings actually exceeds the price of implementation. With that kind of return, it is indisputable that the Federal Government must employ health IT to see not only the savings in lives, but also better management of health care spending.

This legislation does that by providing grants to spur adoption among physicians, hospitals, long term care facilities, and both federally qualified health centers and community mental health centers. These grants are targeted to help provide the health IT resources providers need to serve our Federal beneficiaries. In fact, the size of an allowable grant for each provider is keyed to the proportion of the patient care which they deliver to Federal beneficiaries. So we will help these providers deliver better care to those on Medicare, Medicaid and SCHIP . . . while working to see costs reduced in those programs. That is simple common sense.

The legislation supports reasonable expenditures for a variety of expenses required to implement health care information technology. These include such components as computer hardware and software, plus installation and training costs. In addition, when installed we require that every system

must meet the HHS Secretary's interoperability standards.

Our new legislation even provides an alternative to those for-profit providers who do not wish to apply for a grant. Under this bill, such providers will be able to expense the cost of a qualified system.

I again want to stress the first goal of this legislation: to help build a safer medical-delivery system. The great successes of our health care system are largely due to our highly committed and talented health care professionals. The problem we are addressing today is not theirs, but is an endemic weakness of the system they depend upon. However, to utilize the solution, the Federal Government must step forward and provide the leadership necessary to make system changes a reality.

When the Medicare and Medicaid Programs began, we could only have dreamed about computerized clinical information systems. Now, today, we have this technology at our disposal, and I strongly believe that we cannot afford to delay implementation. In fact, as we face challenges in the financing of health entitlements, this is exactly the sort of initiative which will enable us to achieve the fundamental improvements to make these benefits more fiscally secure.

I hope my colleagues will join us in support of this legislation so we may soon achieve the goals of improving patient safety and reducing our escalating health care costs.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 1411. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to establish within the Environmental Protection Agency an office to measure and report on greenhouse gas emissions of Federal agencies; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Federal Government Greenhouse Gas Registry Act. This bill will create an inventory of the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Federal Government. This includes the Government's buildings, automotive fleets and other sources of emissions. Understanding the "footprint" of the Federal Government's emission is essential to reducing those emissions.

The Federal Government is one of the largest emitters of greenhouse gases in the world. In particular, the largest owner or renter of buildings and owns the single largest fleet of cars in the United States. The buildings and the transportation sectors account for nearly two-thirds of all of the greenhouse gases in the country. The Federal Government must lead by example by reducing its own emissions.

Understanding the extent of an entity's emissions, through the development of a registry, is important to ultimately reducing emissions. The private sector already understands this. It has found that tracking and monitoring corporate emissions creates an

opportunity to easily reduce emissions by seeing where energy is inefficiently used. According to a recent report by the Pew Center on Global Climate Change, “the first step in developing a climate strategy is to analyze a company’s GHG emissions profile . . .”

My bill uses the GHG protocol, a rigorous standard developed by experts and used by companies, States and trading regimes around the world, including Johnson & Johnson, the California Climate Action Registry and the EU’s emission trading schemes. Utilizing such a well known and frequently used standard is important because it allows for comparison and benchmarking with other large emitters.

The Government Accountability Office, GAO, has also recognized the importance of measuring greenhouse gas emissions. According to a GAO report from April 2007—“Energy Audits Are Key to Strategy for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions”—conducting emissions assessments would “. . . include information on cost-effectiveness and potential for reducing emissions.”

In closing, the Federal Government has an obligation to lead by example and this bill is a critical first step in reducing its emissions.

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

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

S. 1411

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 “Federal Government Greenhouse Gas Registry Act of 2007”.

SEC. 2. FEDERAL GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

The Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE VII—FEDERAL GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

“SEC. 701. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) AGENCY EMISSION BASELINE.—The term ‘agency emission baseline’, with respect to a Federal agency, means such quantity of the aggregate quantity of direct emissions, energy indirect emissions, and indirect emissions used to calculate the emission baseline as is attributable to the Federal agency.

“(2) DIRECT EMISSION.—The term ‘direct emission’ means an emission of a greenhouse gas directly from a source owned or controlled by the Federal Government, such as from a fleet of motor vehicles.

“(3) EMISSION ALLOWANCE.—The term ‘emission allowance’ means an authorization to emit, for any fiscal year, 1 ton of carbon dioxide (or the equivalent quantity of any other greenhouse gas, as determined by the Administrator).

“(4) EMISSION BASELINE.—The term ‘emission baseline’ means a quantity of greenhouse gas emissions equal to the aggregate quantity of direct emissions, energy indirect emissions, and indirect emissions for fiscal year 2005, as determined by the Office in accordance with section 702(b)(3).

“(5) ENERGY INDIRECT EMISSION.—The term ‘energy indirect emission’ means an emis-

sion of a greenhouse gas resulting from the production of electricity purchased and used by the Federal Government.

“(6) GREENHOUSE GAS.—The term ‘greenhouse gas’ means any of—

- “(A) carbon dioxide;
- “(B) methane;
- “(C) nitrous oxide;
- “(D) hydrofluorocarbons;
- “(E) perfluorocarbons; and
- “(F) sulfur hexafluoride.

“(7) INDIRECT EMISSION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘indirect emission’ means an emission of greenhouse gases resulting from the conduct of a project or activity (including outsourcing of a project or activity) by the Federal Government (or any Federal officer or employee acting in an official capacity).

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘indirect emission’ includes an emission of a greenhouse gas resulting from—

- “(i) employee travel; or
- “(ii) the use of an energy-intensive material, such as paper.

“(C) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘indirect emission’ does not include an energy indirect emission.

“(8) OFFICE.—The term ‘Office’ means the Federal Emissions Inventory Office established by section 702(a).

“(9) PROTOCOL.—The term ‘protocol’ means the Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard developed by the World Resources Institute and World Business Council on Sustainable Development.

“SEC. 702. FEDERAL EMISSIONS INVENTORY OFFICE.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Environmental Protection Agency an office to be known as the ‘Federal Emissions Inventory Office’.

“(b) DUTIES.—The Office shall—

“(1) as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this title, develop an emission inventory or other appropriate system to measure and verify direct emissions, energy indirect emissions, indirect emissions, and offsets of those emissions;

“(2) ensure that the process of data collection for the inventory or system is reliable, transparent, and accessible;

“(3)(A)(i) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this title, establish an emission baseline for the Federal Government; or

“(ii) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this title, if the Office determines that Federal agencies have not collected enough information, or sufficient data are otherwise unavailable, to establish an emission baseline, submit to Congress and the Administrator a report describing the type and quantity of data that are unavailable; and

“(B) after establishment of an emission baseline under subparagraph (A), periodically review and, if new information relating to the base year becomes available, revise the emission baseline, as appropriate;

“(4) upon development of the inventory or system under paragraph (1), use the inventory or system to begin accounting for direct emissions, energy indirect emissions, and indirect emissions in accordance with the protocol;

“(5) ensure that the inventory or other appropriate system developed under paragraph (1) is periodically audited to ensure that data reported in accordance with the inventory or system are relevant, complete, and transparent;

“(6) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this title—

“(A) develop such additional procedures as are necessary to account for emissions de-

scribed in paragraph (3), particularly indirect emissions; and

“(B) submit to Congress and the Administrator a report that describes any additional data necessary to calculate indirect emissions;

“(7) coordinate with climate change and greenhouse gas registries being developed by States and Indian tribes; and

“(8) not later than October 1 of the year after the date of enactment of this title, and annually thereafter, submit to Congress and the Administrator a report that, for the preceding fiscal year, for the Federal Government and each Federal agency—

“(A) describes the aggregate quantity of emissions (including direct emissions, energy indirect emissions, and indirect emissions); and

“(B) specifies separately the quantities of direct emissions, energy indirect emissions, and indirect emissions comprising that aggregate quantity.

“SEC. 703. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this title.”.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 1412. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Development Act of 2002 to support beginning farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today, along with Senators GRASSLEY, BROWN, and BAUCUS, I am introducing legislation that will expand opportunities for our next generation of farmers and ranchers. Over the next two decades, an estimated 400 million acres of agricultural land will be transferred to new owners. Today, farmers over the age of 65 outnumber those below the age of 35 by a margin of nearly two to one. The future structure, health and vitality of our Nation’s food and agriculture system depend on sound public policies that provide the next generation of farmers and ranchers the help they need to successfully enter farming and ranching.

The next generation of farmers and ranchers need access to training and mentoring which will help them obtain the critical management and marketing skills vital to their success. The Beginning Farmer and Rancher Program, created in the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, is the first USDA program other than credit financing to focus specifically on beginning farmers and ranchers. The Beginning Farmer and Rancher Opportunity Act of 2007 would reauthorize this program and provide \$25 million a year in mandatory funding. We also propose to make beginning farmer issues, such as land transition, farm transfer and succession, and entry into farming priority research areas within the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems.

Beginning farmers and ranchers who are unable to obtain credit from commercial sources are eligible for Farm Service Agency direct farm ownership and operating loans up to an amount of \$200,000 for each type of loan. This limit has not been adjusted in nearly

two decades despite the rising cost of land, equipment and energy, and thus it is no longer sufficient. We propose to increase direct farm ownership and operating loan limits from \$200,000 to \$300,000 to reflect economic realities. The authorization of appropriations for direct loans is adjusted in the bill to reflect the new loan limits. It is important to increase direct loan authorization levels and appropriations, along with adjusting the direct farm ownership and operating loan limits or the net result may well be larger loans to fewer borrowers out of a constant pool of loan funds.

We propose several adjustments to the beginning farmer and rancher down payment loan program. This loan combines the financial resources of the beginning farmer, the Farm Service Agency and commercial or private lenders. Throughout the 1990s this program was very successful, but in recent years it has not been widely used due to low interest rates on traditional direct farm ownership loans. The interest rates on the down payment loan and direct farm ownership loan have been comparable so qualified borrowers have chosen to use the traditional FSA direct farm ownership loan for which no down payment is required.

The Beginning Farmer and Rancher Opportunity Act of 2007 would adjust the current interest rate of 4 percent for beginning farmer and rancher down payment loans to a floating rate of 4 percent below the regular FSA direct farm ownership interest rates, or 1 percent, whichever is greater. It would also reduce the beginning farmer's down payment from 10 percent to 5 percent of the total price of land and increase the FSA portion of the loan to 45 percent from 40 percent. A commercial lender or private seller would still be required to supply the remaining portion of the partnership loan.

These changes, along with a few others, would make the program more attractive for beginning farmers and ranchers. Creating more attractive incentives in this beginning farmer and rancher down payment loan program should result in limited Federal dollars supporting more qualified borrowers since the government's portion of financing a farm purchase is only 45 percent as opposed to the traditional direct farm ownership loan where the government finances 100 percent of the loan.

The Beginning Farmer and Rancher Opportunity Act of 2007 creates a new beginning farmer and rancher individual development account pilot program. This program is designed to help beginning farmers and ranchers with limited resources establish savings. Eligible program participants agree to save money which is matched by federal and local money. The savings may be used by a participant for capital expenditures for farm and ranch operation, including the purchase of land, buildings, equipment and livestock. This program will help participating

beginning farmers and ranchers save and invest in assets that will increase their long-term equity and likelihood of success.

The challenges beginning farmers and ranchers face are immense. The cost of land and equipment, obtaining credit, turning a profit and building equity in a highly uncertain business are just a few of the challenges. The Beginning Farmer and Rancher Opportunity Act of 2007 will help address the big challenge facing America's next generation of farmers and ranchers. This bill is a comprehensive initiative which provides farmers and ranchers critical help they need to enter and succeed in farming and ranching, to be good stewards of the land, to be innovative and entrepreneurial and to respond to rapidly changing markets and economic realities. I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation and help enact it this year.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1414. A bill to amend the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act to require State academic assessments of student achievement in United States history and civics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator ALEXANDER this year in introducing the American History and Civics Achievement Act. The bill is part of a continuing effort to renew the national commitment to teaching history and civics in the Nation's public schools. It lays the foundation for more effective ways of teaching children about the Nation's past and the importance of civic responsibility. It contains no new requirements for schools, but it does offer a more frequent and effective analysis of how America's students are learning these important subjects.

The NAEP U.S. History and Civics results released today, for example, show that 86 percent of America's high school seniors cannot explain why this country was involved in the Korean war.

Nearly all eighth graders struggle to explain how the fall of the Berlin Wall affected our foreign policy.

Nearly 75 percent of eighth graders cannot explain the historical purpose of the Declaration of Independence.

We can't allow this trend to continue. While some progress has been made in improving student achievement in these subjects, too many students are still unable to grasp their importance.

Our economy and our future security rely on good schools that help students develop specific skills, such as reading and math. But the strength of our democracy and our standing in the world also depend on ensuring that children have a basic understanding of the Nation's past and what it takes to engage in our democracy. An appreciation of

the defining events in our Nation's history can be a catalyst for civic involvement.

Instilling such appreciation, and teaching the values of justice, equality, and civic responsibility should be an important mission of our public schools. Thanks to the hard work of large numbers of history and civics teachers in classrooms throughout America, we are making progress. Research conducted in history classrooms shows that children are using primary sources and documents more often to explore history, and are being assigned historical and biographical readings by their teachers more frequently.

But much more remains to be done to improve students' understanding of both of these subjects, and see to it that they are not left behind in their classrooms.

Good standards matter. They are the foundation for teaching and learning in every school. With the right resources, time, and attention, it is possible to develop creative and effective history and civics standards in every State.

Meeting high standards in reading and math is important, but it should not come at the expense of scaling back teaching in other core subjects such as history and civics. Integrating reading and math with other subjects often gives children a better way to master literacy and number skills, even while studying history, geography, and government.

That type of innovation deserves special attention in our schools. Making it happen requires a focus on good standards and student achievement, which we're proposing today. But it also requires added investments in teacher preparation and teacher mentoring, so that teachers are well prepared to use interdisciplinary methods in their lesson plans.

Our bill today takes several important steps to strengthen the teaching of American history and civics, and raise the standing of these subjects in school curriculums. Through changes in the National Assessment for Educational Progress, schools will be better able to achieve success on this important issue.

First, we propose a more frequent national assessment of children in American history under the NAEP—every 4 years. NAEP is the gold standard for measuring progress by students and reporting to the Nation on that progress. It makes sense to measure the knowledge and skills of children on the NAEP more frequently than every 5 or 6 years, to obtain a more timely picture of student progress and better address gaps in learning.

The bill also proposes to strengthen state standards in American history and civics, through a new State-level pilot assessment of these subjects under NAEP. The assessment would be conducted on an experimental basis in 10 States in grades 8 and 12. The National Assessment Governing Board will ensure that States with model

standards, as well as those whose standards are still under development, will participate in this assessment.

Moving NAEP to the State level does not carry any high stakes for schools. But it will provide an additional benchmark for States to develop and improve their standards. It is our hope that States will also be encouraged to undertake improvements in their history curricula and in their teaching of civics, and ensure that both subjects are a beneficiary and not a victim of school reform.

America's past encompasses great leaders with great ideas that contributed to our heritage and to the principles of freedom, equality, justice, and opportunity for all. Today's students will be better citizens in the future if they learn more about that history and about the skills needed to participate in our democracy. The American History and Civics Achievement Act is an important effort to reach that goal, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 1415. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Social Security Act to improve screening and treatment of cancers, provide for survivorship services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am honored to join with the distinguished Senator from Maine, Ms. SNOWE, to introduce the Cancer Screening, Treatment and Survivorship Act of 2007.

Last summer, Lance Armstrong came to Iowa to testify at a field hearing on cancer research. He is a national hero for winning the Tour de France 7 years in a row. But he has become a national treasure as America's No. 1 advocate for cancer research, detection, and treatment. I deeply appreciate his advocacy and tireless efforts to fight this disease. Lance is one of the millions of people across America who has been touched by cancer.

The bill I am introducing today is personal with me. I have lost 4 of my 5 siblings to cancer. And, with better detection and screenings, perhaps my siblings would have had a better outcome.

I believe passionately in doing our best to prevent cancer, by encouraging appropriate lifestyle choices. But I am equally passionate about the need to do a better job of detecting cancer as early as possible, so we have a better chance of beating it.

And that is the aim of the Cancer Screening, Treatment, and Survivorship Act of 2007. We have simple goals: To detect cancer earlier. To reduce cancer mortality rates. To improve the quality of life for those diagnosed with cancer. And, yes, to save health care dollars.

As I said, my hope is that the bill we are introducing today will take us to the next level and begin addressing survivorship and people that are living with this chronic disease. Together, we can work to improve the quality of life

for those diagnosed with cancer and save lives. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that this legislation is passed and signed into law.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, today I am pleased to join my colleague, Senator HARKIN of Iowa, to introduce the Cancer Screening, Treatment and Survivorship Act of 2007. This legislation will help us to realize a long-held vision—to see cancer conquered within our lifetimes.

Today nearly half of all Americans can expect to suffer from an invasive form of cancer. So it is indisputable that cancer research, screening, and treatment should continue to be a high public health priority. Many have called for an elimination of cancer death and suffering by 2015, and I supported that ambitious goal along with 91 of my Senate colleagues. Yet it is concrete action which is required if we are to make progress towards that objective.

Indeed, we have already seen remarkable progress in the diagnosis and treatment of cancer. Today, for example, more women are surviving breast cancer. Early diagnosis and modern treatments are saving lives. We have even seen that drug treatment can substantially reduce the recurrence of breast cancer.

And it is the strides which we have made in scientific discovery is fueling those advances. Senator HARKIN and I both worked to support the doubling of NIH funding—and the landmark work to map the human genome—and today we sit poised to make the progress of which generations have dreamed.

Yet, no matter what we learn, no matter what cures are developed—without access to screening and treatment, no cure is possible. And if one does not even know that the need for cure exists, no action can be taken. So cancer is one of a number of areas where we see stark disparities in health.

That is why I have joined with Senator HARKIN to introduce this legislation. As co-chairs of the Senate Prevention Coalition, we recognize that if we are to fundamentally improve both the quality and the cost of health care, we cannot continue to use a band-aid approach. Indeed to address illness late is only to increase the risk that individuals will not survive, and that we will provide only the most expensive tertiary care.

So we need a new approach—a new mind set. Part of that is prevention, but not just prevention of the disease, but also avoidance of the negative consequences of disease.

In no case is this so clear as with cancer. Because we know that early detection is so crucial to successful treatment, and this legislation recognizes that.

Under our legislation we will see cancer screening extended to those who today, too often are without such care. This act would provide grants to states

to employ screening programs to detect cancer early—when it is most treatable. Under our legislation, the HHS Secretary will examine those diagnostics which meet the standards of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force and select those with highest promise in order to see that we can reduce the toll of cancer.

Those receiving grants will see that the public's awareness of screenings improves, that health professionals receive additional training in cancer detection and control, and that as new and better diagnostics are developed, Americans will have access to those advances without regard to their inability to pay. That is the first step in reducing the toll of cancer.

Those who do receive a positive diagnosis as a result of this act will obtain treatment referrals, and states will have the option to provide treatment to those individuals without access to care under Medicaid. States which elect to do so would receive an enhanced Federal match to provide the very treatment which we know not only saves lives, but reduces costs as well.

I know that some will argue that we cannot afford to add additional coverage to Medicaid. Yet to that I must answer that without coverage, many will simply see their disease progress, and ultimately end up Medicaid-eligible—but at a point when therapy is so much less effective. The cost of such deferral of care in both lives and health expenditures is enormous. So I hope that many states will elect to cover treatment, just as many already have for those women screened under the Breast and Cervical Cancer Screening program today.

This is a milestone moment, because today we begin to move forward in how we address cancer—giving the HHS Secretary the authority to work in cooperation with the states to see that we work to see every American has access to screening and treatment for cancer.

The step we are taking forward today is the product of so much work through the years. And this week, as cancer advocates—including Lance Armstrong and representatives of his foundation—press for action to achieve our vision of ending cancer in our lifetime, I am heartened by the promise before us.

I hope my colleagues will join us in support of this legislation so we may soon achieve the vision of our long war on cancer.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 203—CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO USE ITS UNIQUE INFLUENCE AND ECONOMIC LEVERAGE TO STOP GENOCIDE AND VIOLENCE IN DARFUR, SUDAN

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LIEBERMAN,

Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. DOLE, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. DODD) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 203

Whereas since the conflict in Darfur, Sudan began in 2003, hundreds of thousands of people have been killed and more than 2,500,000 displaced as a result of the ongoing and escalating violence;

Whereas on July 23, 2004, Congress declared, "the atrocities unfolding in Darfur, Sudan, are genocide" and on September 23, 2004, then Secretary of State Colin Powell stated before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that, "genocide has occurred and may still be occurring in Darfur," and "the Government of Sudan and the Janjaweed bear responsibility";

Whereas on October 13, 2006, the President signed the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act (Public Law 109-344), which identifies the Government of Sudan as complicit with the forces committing genocide in the Darfur region and urges the President to, "take all necessary and appropriate steps to deny the Government of Sudan access to oil revenues";

Whereas President George W. Bush declared in a speech delivered on April 18, 2007, at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum that no one "can doubt that genocide is the only word for what is happening in Darfur and that we have a moral obligation to stop it";

Whereas the presence of approximately 7,000 African Union peacekeepers has not deterred the violence and the increasing attacks by the Government-sponsored Janjaweed militia and rebel groups.

Whereas the Government of Sudan continues to refuse to allow implementation of the full-scale peacekeeping mission authorized under United Nations Security Council Resolution 1706;

Whereas former United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan subsequently negotiated a compromise agreement with the Government of Sudan for a hybrid United Nations-African Union peacekeeping mission to be implemented in three phases;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China has long-standing economic and military ties with Sudan and continues to strengthen these ties in spite of the on-going genocide in Darfur, as evidenced by the following actions:

(1) China reportedly purchases as much as 70 percent of Sudan's oil;

(2) China currently has at least \$3,000,000,000 invested in the Sudanese energy sector, for a total of \$10,000,000,000 since the 1990s;

(3) Sudan's Joint Chief of Staff, Haj Ahmed El Gaili, recently visited Beijing for discussions with Chinese Defense Minister Cao Gang Chuan and other military officials as part of an eight-day tour of China; Cao pledged closer military relations with Sudan, saying that China was "willing to further develop cooperation between the two militaries in every sphere";

(4) China has reportedly cancelled approximately \$100 million in debt owed by the Sudanese Government; and

(5) China is building infrastructure in Sudan and provided funds for a presidential palace in Sudan at a reported cost of approximately \$20,000,000;

Whereas given its economic interests throughout the region, China has a unique ability to positively influence the Government of Sudan to abandon its genocidal policies and to accept United Nations peacekeepers to join a hybrid United Nations-African Union peacekeeping mission;

Whereas the President's Special Envoy to Sudan, Andrew S. Natsios, further said in

testimony on April 11, 2007, that "China's substantial economic investment in Sudan gives it considerable potential leverage, and we have made clear to Beijing that the international community will expect China to be part of the solution";

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China has previously influenced the Government of Sudan to take steps toward reducing violence and conflict by—

(1) abstaining from, and choosing not to obstruct, several important votes in the United Nations Security Council on resolutions related to Sudan, including Resolution 1556, which demanded Sudan disarm militias in Darfur, and Resolution 1706, which called for the deployment of additional United Nations peacekeepers, including up to 17,300 military personnel and up to 3,300 civilian police;

(2) helping to facilitate the Addis Ababa framework reached on November 16, 2006, which provides for a joint United Nations-African Union peacekeeping force;

(3) sending high-level delegations, including Chinese President Hu Jintao, to Sudan, and encouraging President Bashir to show flexibility and allow the joint United Nations-African Union peacekeeping force to be deployed;

(4) making frequent public statements that the Government of Sudan must carry out agreements made within the Addis Ababa framework of November 2006 to admit United Nations peacekeepers to join the United Nations-African Union peacekeeping force in Darfur;

(5) pledging to provide military engineers to support African Union peacekeeping forces in Darfur; and

(6) announcing on May 10, 2007, the appointment of a senior diplomat as China's special representative on African affairs who is to focus specific attention on the Darfur issue.

Whereas due to its vast population, its rapidly growing global economy, its large research and development investments and military spending, its seat as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council and on the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, China is an emerging power that is increasingly perceived as a leader with significant international reach and responsibility;

Whereas in November 2006, China hosted its third Forum on China-Africa Cooperation with more than 40 heads of state in attendance and which focused heavily on trade relations and investment on the African continent as it is expected to double by 2010;

Whereas China is preparing to host the Olympic Summer Games of 2008, the most honorable, venerated, and prestigious international sporting event;

Whereas China should be held accountable to act consistently with the Olympic standard of preserving human dignity in Darfur, Sudan and around the world; and

Whereas China has been reluctant to use its full influence to improve the human rights situation in Darfur: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the close relationship between China and Sudan and strongly urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to use its full influence to—

(A) urge the President of Sudan, Omar al-Bashir, to allow a robust peacekeeping force as described in United Nations Security Council Resolution 1706;

(B) call for Sudanese compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1556 and 1564, and the Darfur Peace Agreement, all of which demand that the Government of Sudan disarm militias operating in Darfur;

(C) call on all parties to the conflict to adhere to the 2004 N'Djamena ceasefire agreement and the recently-agreed United Nations communiqué which commits the Sudanese Government to improve conditions for humanitarian organizations and ensure they have unfettered access to the populations they serve;

(D) emphasize that there can be no military solution to the conflict in Darfur and that the formation and implementation of a legitimate peace agreement between all parties will contribute toward the welfare and stability of the entire nation and broader region;

(E) urge all rebel groups to unify and assist all parties to come to the negotiating table in good faith;

(F) urge the Government of southern Sudan to play a more active role in pressing for legitimate peace talks and take immediate steps to support and assist in the revitalization of such talks along one single coordinated track;

(G) engage collaboratively in high-level diplomacy and multilateral efforts toward a renewed peace process; and

(H) join the international community in imposing economic and other consequences on the Government of Sudan if that Government continues to carry out or support attacks on innocent civilians and frustrate diplomatic efforts; and

(2) recognizes that the spirit of the Olympics, which is to bring together nations and people from all over the world in peace, is incompatible with any actions, directly or indirectly, supporting acts of genocide.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, as I rise today to talk about the genocide in Darfur, I ask myself: How long will we wait until we invoke real sanctions on the Sudan? How long will we wait until a hybrid African Union/United Nations peacekeeping force is in place? And how many more reports must we read about how the African Union troops are overstretched, underfunded, and ill-equipped before the international community provides them with the support they need to be effective?

How many more people from Darfur must be driven from their homes and forced to give up their livelihoods before the world says enough is enough? How many more hundreds of thousands of people must die before we do everything—everything—in our power to stop the atrocities? When will we give real meaning to our commitment to the phrase "never again?"

After 4 years, hundreds of thousands of Darfurians killed, more than 2.5 million people displaced, and some 80,000 people in Darfur who have spilled into refugee camps this year alone, it is time that we act more strategically and effectively to stop the genocide in Darfur.

Despite our efforts thus far, it is clear that we have seen no real change for the people of Darfur who continue to be attacked and killed. It is time to stop wringing our hands. We must take a hard look at our current policy and ask ourselves: Why, after years of international engagement, has the genocide not stopped in Darfur, and what can we do differently now?

The simple answer is: We must deal with Darfur's economic lifeline, China. Right now, China has unique ties, influence, and leverage over the Sudanese Government. Here we see the Chinese Prime Minister meeting with the Sudanese President in Beijing, the capital of China.

China has unique ties, influence, and leverage over the Sudanese Government. Because of China's close economic relationship with Khartoum, Sudan is able to expand its infrastructure, increase its defense budget, and profit from its oil exports. It is time to diminish the strength of this lifeline.

Over the last decade we have watched China and Sudan forge a strong economic partnership. We have here, as I said, a picture of the Chinese Premier meeting with the Sudanese President last November. China currently has at least \$3 billion invested in the Sudanese energy sector for a total of \$10 billion since the 1990s.

China reportedly buys as much as 70 percent of Sudan's oil. They recently canceled over \$100 million in Sudanese debt, and they are building vast infrastructure and new government offices for Sudan.

China has even committed to providing funds so that Khartoum can build a new \$20 million Presidential palace. A Presidential palace.

The fact is, with China as their friend, the impact of international action against the Sudanese Government has been diluted, and the genocide has continued. Because of China's investment and attention, Sudan has reportedly been able to double—double—its defense budget. In fact, according to the Heritage Foundation, Sudan is spending between 60 percent to 80 percent of its oil revenue, its national treasure, on what? On weapons.

A report by Amnesty International released last week concluded that these weapons come from—guess where—China, which has continued its arms sales to the Sudanese Government despite the March 2005 arms embargo imposed by the United Nations Security Council.

Simply put, Chinese investment fuels the atrocities taking place in Darfur. It is time that China uses its power and influence over Khartoum to do more than fill its own pocketbook. China is an emerging power on the world stage, and it is time they act accordingly with this responsibility.

Because of their close economic ties with the Sudan, China is in the position to significantly influence Khartoum, and it must use its clout to convince President Bashir to allow a hybrid African Union/United Nations peacekeeping force into Darfur.

This is one of the most pressing actions to help stop the genocide in Darfur. Last year, Chinese President Hu mentioned the peacekeeping with Sudan's President when the two met in Khartoum. But talk is cheap. It is time for real action.

As John Prendergast, the senior adviser to the International Crisis Group,

said a few weeks ago in testimony before Congress, "Barking without biting is the diplomatic equivalent of giving comfort to the enemy."

Now is the time to bite. Now is the time for China to use the full weight of its economic influence to change Khartoum's policies. Now, I know China has taken some positive steps in the past to address the crisis in Darfur. They helped facilitate the Addis Ababa framework in November of 2006; they have pledged to provide military engineers to support African Union peacekeepers in Darfur; and they have appointed a special Africa envoy to focus on Darfur.

While we are certainly happy to see those positive measures, I am still concerned that China will continue its habit of taking small steps each time the international community turns up the heat but will not take major steps that will affect Darfur in the long run.

The simple fact is, China needs to do more to be actively involved in the solution. Next year, we will see China take center stage when it hosts the 2008 Olympic games. Frankly, I find it shocking that China is going to host an Olympics under the theme "One World and One Dream" while they help fuel the economy of a nation that has allowed genocide to ravage its country for some 4 years.

This is certainly not the "One World One Dream" we share. That is why today I am introducing a bipartisan resolution with Senator BROWNBACK, Senator FEINGOLD, and others, a version of which is also being introduced in the House, to let China know that as much as it cherishes its Olympic moment, the country should be held accountable to act consistently with the Olympic standard of preserving human dignity around the world, including in Darfur.

The resolution recognizes that the spirit of the Olympics, which is to bring nations and people from all over the world in peace, is incompatible with any actions to support acts of genocide. This legislation specifically calls on China to use its full influence to urge the President of Sudan to allow a robust peacekeeping force into Darfur; to comply with past United Nations Security Council resolutions and the Darfur Peace Agreement, which demand that the Government of the Sudan disarm militias in Darfur; and to improve the conditions for humanitarian organizations.

It also calls on all parties involved in the conflict to adhere to the 2004 ceasefire agreement and to work toward a legitimate peace deal.

This resolution I am submitting is only a first step. It is an invitation to the Chinese Government to take more of an initiative to set President Bashir on a straight path and allow a hybrid African Union/United Nations force into the country. I hope China takes this opportunity to act now, and that they understand Congress will be watching very closely to see what they actually do.

Our message for today is clear. We need to see real progress from China on this issue. We need to see it now. Along with stronger measures by the Chinese Government, the United States must continue in its efforts to end the genocide in Darfur.

After threatening more punitive measures for months, the administration must stop talking about what they define as plan B, which is more significant sanctions, and start enacting plan B. If we were stuck in the refugee camps in Darfur in the Sudan, being attacked by the jinjaweit, with our children slaughtered, seeing women raped, who among us would be content with those who counsel patience and delay?

Plan B's tightening sanctions against Sudan, targeting individuals responsible for the atrocious acts, and negotiating a new United Nations Security Council resolution is the right thing to do now.

Finally, the fact is, the situation in Darfur is a timebomb that could explode at any moment. The humanitarian crisis has become ever more perilous. As we speak today, the number of dead and displaced persons continues to grow, and women and young girls continue to be raped. The refugee crisis continues to worsen. This year alone, at least 80,000 people in Darfur have spilled into refugee camps. The atrocities against these innocent refugees are no longer contained within Sudan, as refugees spill across borders into eastern Chad and the Central African Republic. The lives of these millions of displaced persons hang in a delicate balance between life and death. The world's largest humanitarian effort has been keeping that balance from tipping completely toward death.

The new United Nations Humanitarian chief, John Holmes, has warned that if the situation does not get better or if there are more serious incidents involving humanitarian workers, some organizations could start to withdraw and the humanitarian operation could start to unravel. I am deeply concerned we could soon begin to witness a catastrophic collapse of the humanitarian aid effort. Several international aid agencies, including the British group Oxfam, Save the Children Spain, and the United States-based Mercy Corps, reported in April that they were temporarily suspending their work in Darfur because of attacks. They reported attacks on their operations had increased over the past 3 weeks. Soon only a small number of aid workers may be left in this region, which could result in unimaginable destruction and death. Who would be there to protect these innocent victims? The overstretched and inadequately funded African Union Mission in Sudan?

Recently, chairperson of the African Union Commission said that if the current trend continues, the peacekeeping operation in Darfur will be in serious jeopardy. In reality, the African Union Mission may already be in deep jeopardy. According to a Washington Post article published last Sunday:

The African Union's first major peace-keeping mission—once considered the last line of defense for Darfur civilians—has been crippled by funding and equipment shortages, government harassment and an upsurge in armed attacks by rebel forces that last month left seven African troops dead.

The setbacks have sapped morale among peacekeepers, many of whom have not been paid for months. It has also compelled the force—which numbered 7,000 troops at its peak—to scale back its patrols and has diminished its capacity to protect civilians, aid workers and its own peacekeepers.

Simply put, the African Union force alone cannot end the violence in Darfur.

That is why it is imperative that the international community, with the explicit help of the Chinese Government, convince Sudan to allow a hybrid African Union-United Nations peace-keeping force into Darfur. Unfortunately, Khartoum continues to be complicit in allowing the destruction to continue. A recent United Nations report, described in the New York Times, detailed how the Government of Sudan is flying arms and heavy military equipment into Darfur in clear violation of Security Council resolutions. Even more egregious, the report describes how the Sudanese Government is painting their military planes white to disguise them as United Nations or African Union aircraft. President Bashir has toyed with the international community for long enough. Time and time again he has balked at agreements and promises. Time and time again he has manipulated the international community with last-minute agreements that he reneges on only a minute later. It is time for the games to end.

Because in this respect, silence in the face of genocide is complicity, we must continue to speak out. "Never again" is an empty promise if we do not take action to stop the murder of innocent people when we know it is happening. Once again, we find ourselves in a position to make that choice. We must choose to exhaust all options until our collective voices are heard and murder ends. We must convince China to use its power and influence over Khartoum to do more than fill its own pocket-book. We must ensure that rather than standing here a year from now talking about ending genocide in Darfur, we are celebrating a peaceful solution to the 21st century's first, and hopefully last, genocide.

We must choose—I urge members of the Senate to join us in this regard—to make sure that when we say "never again," we mean never again.

SENATE RESOLUTION 204—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH REGARD TO THE IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL WOMEN'S HEALTH WEEK, WHICH PROMOTES AWARENESS OF DISEASES THAT AFFECT WOMEN AND WHICH ENCOURAGES WOMEN TO TAKE PREVENTIVE MEASURES TO ENSURE GOOD HEALTH

Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. 204

Whereas women of all backgrounds have the power to greatly reduce their risk of common diseases through preventive measures such as a healthy lifestyle and frequent medical screenings;

Whereas significant disparities exist in the prevalence of disease among women of different backgrounds, including women with disabilities, African American women, Asian and Pacific Islander women, Latinas, and American Indian and Alaska Native women;

Whereas healthy habits should begin at a young age;

Whereas preventive care saves Federal dollars designated for health care;

Whereas it is important to educate women and girls about the significance of awareness of key female health issues;

Whereas it is recognized that the Offices of Women's Health within the Food and Drug Administration, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Office on Women's Health of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Office of Research on Women's Health of the National Institutes of Health, and the Women's Health Program of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality provide critical services in supporting women's health research, education, and other necessary services that benefit women of any age, race, or ethnicity;

Whereas National Women's Health Week begins on Mother's Day annually and celebrates the efforts of national and community organizations working with partners and volunteers to improve awareness of key women's health issues; and

Whereas, in 2007, the week of May 13 through May 19 is dedicated as National Women's Health Week;

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of preventing diseases that commonly affect women;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Women's Health Week;

(3) calls on the people of the United States to use National Women's Health Week as an opportunity to learn about health issues that face women;

(4) calls on the women of the United States to observe National Women's Check-Up Day by receiving preventive screenings from their health care providers; and

(5) recognizes the importance of federally funded programs that provide research and collect data on common diseases in women.

SENATE RESOLUTION 205—DESIGNATING JUNE 2007 AS "NATIONAL INTERNET SAFETY MONTH"

Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. OBAMA, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. BAYH, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. DOMENICI) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 205

Whereas there are more than 1,000,000,000 Internet users worldwide;

Whereas, in the United States, 35,000,000 children in kindergarten through grade 12 have Internet access;

Whereas approximately 80 percent of the children of the United States in grades 5 through 12 are online for at least 1 hour per week;

Whereas approximately 41 percent of students in grades 5 through 12 do not share with their parents what they do on the Internet;

Whereas approximately 24 percent of students in grades 5 through 12 have hidden their online activities from their parents;

Whereas approximately 31 percent of the students in grades 5 through 12 have the skill to circumvent Internet filter software;

Whereas 61 percent of the students admit to using the Internet unsafely or inappropriately;

Whereas 20 percent of middle school and high school students have met face-to-face with someone they first met online;

Whereas 23 percent of students know someone who has been bullied online;

Whereas 56 percent of parents feel that online bullying of children is an issue that needs to be addressed;

Whereas 47 percent of parents feel that their ability to monitor and shelter their children from inappropriate material on the Internet is limited; and

Whereas 61 percent of parents want to be more personally involved with Internet safety: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 2007 as "National Internet Safety Month";

(2) recognizes that National Internet Safety Month provides the citizens of the United States with an opportunity to learn more about—

(A) the dangers of the Internet; and

(B) the importance of being safe and responsible online;

(3) commends and recognizes national and community organizations for—

(A) promoting awareness of the dangers of the Internet; and

(B) providing information and training that develops critical thinking and decision-making skills that are needed to use the Internet safely; and

(4) calls on Internet safety organizations, law enforcement, educators, community leaders, parents, and volunteers to increase their efforts to raise the level of awareness for the need for online safety in the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1136. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1495, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to

authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1137. Mr. LEVIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1097 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. REID)) to the bill H.R. 1495, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1138. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2206, making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1139. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. SMITH, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2206, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1140. Mr. HARKIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1495, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1141. Mr. NELSON of Nebraska submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2206, making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1142. Mr. BOND (for himself and Mrs. McCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2206, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1143. Mr. STEVENS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2206, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1144. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1495, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1145. Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. INHOFE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1065 proposed by Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. ISAKSON) to the bill H.R. 1495, *supra*.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1136. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1495, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 200, line 22, insert “, NEW MEXICO,” after “MISSOURI”.

On page 201, line 17, insert “, New Mexico,” after “Missouri”.

On page 202, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

(6) Rio Grande Floodway, Albuquerque Unit, New Mexico.

On page 202, line 25, strike “\$50,000,000” and insert “\$150,000,000”.

SA 1137. Mr. LEVIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1097 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. REID)) to the bill H.R. 1495, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4 strike all from section 5 to the end and insert the following:

SEC. 5 REDUCTION OF FORCES

The Secretary of Defense shall commence the reduction of the number of United States Armed Forces in Iraq not later than October 1, 2007, with a goal of completing such reduction within 180 days. The goal of completing such reduction shall be accelerated if the President is unable to report that the Government of Iraq is making substantial progress towards meeting each of the benchmarks set forth in subsection (a) (1) of Section 4 by October 15, 2007.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act are available for obligation and expenditure to plan and execute a safe and orderly reduction of the Armed Forces in Iraq.

(c) The reduction of forces required by this section shall be implemented as part of a comprehensive diplomatic, political, and economic strategy that includes sustained engagement with Iraq's neighbors and the international community for the purpose of working collectively to bring stability to Iraq.

(d) After the conclusion of the reduction required by this section, the Secretary of Defense may not deploy or maintain members of the Armed Forces in Iraq for any purpose other than the following:

- (1) Protecting American diplomatic facilities and American citizens, including members of the U.S. armed forces;
- (2) Serving in roles consistent with customary diplomatic positions;
- (3) Engaging in targeted actions against members of al-Qaeda and allied parties and other terrorist organizations with global reach; and
- (4) Training and equipping members of the Iraqi Security Forces.

SA 1138. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2206, making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 91, strike lines 7 through 15 and insert the following:

SEC. 3301. The Secretary is authorized and directed to reimburse local governments for expenses the governments have incurred in storm-proofing pumping stations, constructing safe houses for operators, and

other interim flood control measures in and around the New Orleans metropolitan area, on the condition that the Secretary determines those elements of work and related expenses to be integral to the overall plan to ensure operability of the stations during hurricanes, storms, and high water events and the flood control plan for the area.

SA 1139. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. SMITH, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2206, making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 2201 of division B and insert the following:

SEC. 2201. SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION PROGRAM.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION OF THE SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000.—The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 500 note; Public Law 106-393) is amended by striking sections 1 through 403 and inserting the following:

“SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

“This Act may be cited as the ‘Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000’.

“SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

“The purposes of this Act are—

“(1) to stabilize and transition payments to counties to provide funding for schools and roads that supplements other available funds;

“(2) to make additional investments in, and create additional employment opportunities through, projects that—

“(A)(i) improve the maintenance of existing infrastructure;

“(ii) implement stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems; and

“(iii) restore and improve land health and water quality;

“(B) enjoy broad-based support; and

“(C) have objectives that may include—

“(i) road, trail, and infrastructure maintenance or obliteration;

“(ii) soil productivity improvement;

“(iii) improvements in forest ecosystem health;

“(iv) watershed restoration and maintenance;

“(v) the restoration, maintenance, and improvement of wildlife and fish habitat;

“(vi) the control of noxious and exotic weeds; and

“(vii) the reestablishment of native species; and

“(3) to improve cooperative relationships among—

“(A) the people that use and care for Federal land; and

“(B) the agencies that manage the Federal land.

“SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

“In this Act:

“(1) ADJUSTED SHARE.—The term ‘adjusted share’ means the number equal to the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(A) the number equal to the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(i) the base share for the eligible county; by

“(ii) the income adjustment for the eligible county; by

“(B) the number equal to the sum of the quotients obtained under subparagraph (A) and paragraph (8)(A) for all eligible counties.

“(2) **BASE SHARE.**—The term ‘base share’ means the number equal to the average of—

“(A) the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(i) the number of acres of Federal land described in paragraph (7)(A) in each eligible county; by

“(ii) the total number acres of Federal land in all eligible counties in all eligible States; and

“(B) the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(i) the amount equal to the average of the 3 highest 25-percent payments and safety net payments made to each eligible State for each eligible county during the eligibility period; by

“(ii) the amount equal to the sum of the amounts calculated under clause (i) and paragraph (9)(B)(i) for all eligible counties in all eligible States during the eligibility period.

“(3) **COUNTY PAYMENT.**—The term ‘county payment’ means the payment for an eligible county calculated under section 101(b).

“(4) **ELIGIBLE COUNTY.**—The term ‘eligible county’ means any county that—

“(A) contains Federal land (as defined in paragraph (7)); and

“(B) elects to receive a share of the State payment or the county payment under section 102(b).

“(5) **ELIGIBILITY PERIOD.**—The term ‘eligibility period’ means fiscal year 1986 through fiscal year 1999.

“(6) **ELIGIBLE STATE.**—The term ‘eligible State’ means a State or territory of the United States that received a 25-percent payment for 1 or more fiscal years of the eligibility period.

“(7) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term ‘Federal land’ means—

“(A) land within the National Forest System, as defined in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)) exclusive of the National Grasslands and land utilization projects designated as National Grasslands administered pursuant to the Act of July 22, 1937 (7 U.S.C. 1010–1012); and

“(B) such portions of the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant land as are or may hereafter come under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, which have heretofore or may hereafter be classified as timberlands, and power-site land valuable for timber, that shall be managed, except as provided in the former section 3 of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 875; 43 U.S.C. 1181c), for permanent forest production.

“(8) **50-PERCENT ADJUSTED SHARE.**—The term ‘50-percent adjusted share’ means the number equal to the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(A) the number equal to the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(i) the 50-percent base share for the eligible county; by

“(ii) the income adjustment for the eligible county; by

“(B) the number equal to the sum of the quotients obtained under subparagraph (A) and paragraph (1)(A) for all eligible counties.

“(9) **50-PERCENT BASE SHARE.**—The term ‘50-percent base share’ means the number equal to the average of—

“(A) the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(i) the number of acres of Federal land described in paragraph (7)(B) in each eligible county; by

“(ii) the total number acres of Federal land in all eligible counties in all eligible States; and

“(B) the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(i) the amount equal to the average of the 3 highest 50-percent payments made to each

eligible county during the eligibility period; by

“(ii) the amount equal to the sum of the amounts calculated under clause (i) and paragraph (2)(B)(i) for all eligible counties in all eligible States during the eligibility period.

“(10) **50-PERCENT PAYMENT.**—The term ‘50-percent payment’ means the payment that is the sum of the 50-percent share otherwise paid to a county pursuant to title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (chapter 876; 50 Stat. 875; 43 U.S.C. 1181f), and the payment made to a county pursuant to the Act of May 24, 1939 (chapter 144; 53 Stat. 753; 43 U.S.C. 1181f–1 et seq.).

“(11) **FULL FUNDING AMOUNT.**—The term ‘full funding amount’ means—

“(A) \$526,079,656 for fiscal year 2007;

“(B) \$520,000,000 for fiscal year 2008; and

“(C) for fiscal year 2009 and each fiscal year thereafter, the amount that is equal to 90 percent of the full funding amount for the preceding fiscal year.

“(12) **INCOME ADJUSTMENT.**—The term ‘income adjustment’ means the square of the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(A) the per capita personal income for each eligible county; by

“(B) the median per capita personal income of all eligible counties.

“(13) **PER CAPITA PERSONAL INCOME.**—The term ‘per capita personal income’ means the most recent per capita personal income data, as determined by the Bureau of Economic Analysis.

“(14) **SAFETY NET PAYMENTS.**—The term ‘safety net payments’ means the special payment amounts paid to States and counties required by section 13982 or 13983 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–66; 16 U.S.C. 500 note; 43 U.S.C. 1181f note).

“(15) **SECRETARY CONCERNED.**—The term ‘Secretary concerned’ means—

“(A) the Secretary of Agriculture or the designee of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the Federal land described in paragraph (7)(A); and

“(B) the Secretary of the Interior or the designee of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the Federal land described in paragraph (7)(B).

“(16) **STATE PAYMENT.**—The term ‘State payment’ means the payment for an eligible State calculated under section 101(a).

“(17) **25-PERCENT PAYMENT.**—The term ‘25-percent payment’ means the payment to States required by the sixth paragraph under the heading of ‘**FOREST SERVICE**’ in the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500), and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500).

“TITLE I—SECURE PAYMENTS FOR STATES AND COUNTIES CONTAINING FEDERAL LAND

“SEC. 101. SECURE PAYMENTS FOR STATES CONTAINING FEDERAL LAND.

“(a) **STATE PAYMENT.**—For each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011, the Secretary of Agriculture shall calculate for each eligible State an amount equal to the sum of the products obtained by multiplying—

“(1) the adjusted share for each eligible county within the eligible State; by

“(2) the full funding amount for the fiscal year.

“(b) **COUNTY PAYMENT.**—For each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011, the Secretary of the Interior shall calculate for each eligible county that received a 50-percent payment during the eligibility period an amount equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

“(1) the 50-percent adjusted share for the eligible county; by

“(2) the full funding amount for the fiscal year.

“SEC. 102. PAYMENTS TO STATES AND COUNTIES.

“(a) **PAYMENT AMOUNTS.**—Except as provided in section 103, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to—

“(1) a State or territory of the United States an amount equal to the sum of the amounts elected under subsection (b) by each county within the State or territory for—

“(A) if the county is eligible for the 25-percent payment, the share of the 25-percent payment; or

“(B) the share of the State payment of the eligible county; and

“(2) a county an amount equal to the amount elected under subsection (b) by each county for—

“(A) if the county is eligible for the 50-percent payment, the 50-percent payment; or

“(B) the county payment for the eligible county.

“(b) ELECTION TO RECEIVE PAYMENT AMOUNT.—

“(1) **ELECTION; SUBMISSION OF RESULTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The election to receive a share of the State payment, the county payment, a share of the State payment and the county payment, a share of the 25-percent payment, the 50-percent payment, or a share of the 25-percent payment and the 50-percent payment, as applicable, shall be made at the discretion of each affected county by August 1, 2007, and August 1 of each second fiscal year thereafter, in accordance with paragraph (2), and transmitted to the Secretary concerned by the Governor of each eligible State.

“(B) **FAILURE TO TRANSMIT.**—If an election for an affected county is not transmitted to the Secretary concerned by the date specified under subparagraph (A), the affected county shall be considered to have elected to receive a share of the State payment, the county payment, or a share of the State payment and the county payment, as applicable.

“(2) **DURATION OF ELECTION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A county election to receive a share of the 25-percent payment or 50-percent payment, as applicable shall be effective for 2 fiscal years.

“(B) **FULL FUNDING AMOUNT.**—If a county elects to receive a share of the State payment or the county payment, the election shall be effective for all subsequent fiscal years through fiscal year 2011.

“(3) **SOURCE OF PAYMENT AMOUNTS.**—The payment to an eligible State or eligible county under this section for a fiscal year shall be derived from—

“(A) any revenues, fees, penalties, or miscellaneous receipts, exclusive of deposits to any relevant trust fund, special account, or permanent operating funds, received by the Federal Government from activities by the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service on the applicable Federal land;

“(B) for fiscal year 2007, any funds appropriated to carry out this Act; and

“(C) to the extent of any shortfall, out of any amounts in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated.

“(c) DISTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE OF PAYMENTS.—

“(1) **DISTRIBUTION METHOD.**—A State that receives a payment under subsection (a) for Federal land described in section 3(7)(A) shall distribute the appropriate payment amount among the appropriate counties in the State in accordance with—

“(A) the Act of May 23, 1908 (16 U.S.C. 500); and

“(B) section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500).

“(2) **EXPENDITURE PURPOSES.**—Subject to subsection (d), payments received by a State under subsection (a) and distributed to counties in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be expended as required by the laws referred to in paragraph (1).

“(d) EXPENDITURE RULES FOR ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.—

“(1) ALLOCATIONS.—

“(A) USE OF PORTION IN SAME MANNER AS 25-PERCENT PAYMENT OR 50-PERCENT PAYMENT, AS APPLICABLE.—Except as provided in paragraph (3)(B), if an eligible county elects to receive its share of the State payment or the county payment, not less than 80 percent, but not more than 85 percent, of the funds shall be expended in the same manner in which the 25-percent payments or 50-percent payment, as applicable, are required to be expended.

“(B) ELECTION AS TO USE OF BALANCE.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), an eligible county shall elect to do 1 or more of the following with the balance of any funds not expended pursuant to subparagraph (A):

“(i) Reserve any portion of the balance for projects in accordance with title II.

“(ii) Reserve not more than 7 percent of the total share for the eligible county of the State payment or the county payment for projects in accordance with title III.

“(iii) Return the portion of the balance not reserved under clauses (i) and (ii) to the Treasury of the United States.

“(C) COUNTIES WITH MODEST DISTRIBUTIONS.—In the case of each eligible county to which more than \$100,000, but less than \$350,000, is distributed for any fiscal year pursuant to either or both of paragraphs (1)(B) and (2)(B) of subsection (a), the eligible county, with respect to the balance of any funds not expended pursuant to subparagraph (A) for that fiscal year, shall—

“(i) reserve any portion of the balance for—

“(I) carrying out projects under title II;

“(II) carrying out projects under title III; or

“(III) a combination of the purposes described in subclauses (I) and (II); or

“(ii) return the portion of the balance not reserved under clause (i) to the Treasury of the United States.

“(2) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Funds reserved by an eligible county under subparagraph (B)(i) or (C)(i) of paragraph (1) for carrying out projects under title II shall be deposited in a special account in the Treasury of the United States.

“(B) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts deposited under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(i) be available for expenditure by the Secretary concerned, without further appropriation; and

“(ii) remain available until expended in accordance with title II.

“(3) ELECTION.—

“(A) NOTIFICATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An eligible county shall notify the Secretary concerned of an election by the eligible county under this subsection not later than September 30 of each fiscal year.

“(ii) FAILURE TO ELECT.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if the eligible county fails to make an election by the date specified in clause (i), the eligible county shall—

“(I) be considered to have elected to expend 85 percent of the funds in accordance with paragraph (1)(A); and

“(II) return the balance to the Treasury of the United States.

“(B) COUNTIES WITH MINOR DISTRIBUTIONS.—In the case of each eligible county to which less than \$100,000 is distributed for any fiscal year pursuant to either or both of paragraphs (1)(B) and (2)(B) of subsection (a), the eligible county may elect to expend all the funds in the same manner in which the 25-percent payments or 50-percent payments, as applicable, are required to be expended.

“(e) TIME FOR PAYMENT.—The payments required under this section for a fiscal year shall be made as soon as practicable after the end of that fiscal year.

“SEC. 103. TRANSITION PAYMENTS TO THE STATES OF CALIFORNIA, OREGON, AND WASHINGTON.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ADJUSTED AMOUNT.—The term ‘adjusted amount’ means, with respect to a covered State—

“(A) for fiscal year 2007—

“(i) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under section 102(a)(2) (as in effect on September 29, 2006) for the eligible counties in the covered State that have elected under section 102(b) to receive a share of the State payment for fiscal year 2007; and

“(ii) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under section 103(a)(2) (as in effect on September 29, 2006) for the eligible counties in the State of Oregon that have elected under section 102(b) to receive the county payment for fiscal year 2007;

“(B) for fiscal year 2008, 90 percent of—

“(i) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under section 102(a)(2) (as in effect on September 29, 2006) for the eligible counties in the covered State that have elected under section 102(b) to receive a share of the State payment for fiscal year 2008; and

“(ii) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under section 103(a)(2) (as in effect on September 29, 2006) for the eligible counties in the State of Oregon that have elected under section 102(b) to receive the county payment for fiscal year 2008;

“(C) for fiscal year 2009, 81 percent of—

“(i) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under section 102(a)(2) (as in effect on September 29, 2006) for the eligible counties in the covered State that have elected under section 102(b) to receive a share of the State payment for fiscal year 2009; and

“(ii) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under section 103(a)(2) (as in effect on September 29, 2006) for the eligible counties in the State of Oregon that have elected under section 102(b) to receive the county payment for fiscal year 2009; and

“(D) for fiscal year 2010, 73 percent of—

“(i) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under section 102(a)(2) (as in effect on September 29, 2006) for the eligible counties in the covered State that have elected under section 102(b) to receive a share of the State payment for fiscal year 2010; and

“(ii) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under section 103(a)(2) (as in effect on September 29, 2006) for the eligible counties in the State of Oregon that have elected under section 102(b) to receive the county payment for fiscal year 2010.

“(2) COVERED STATE.—The term ‘covered State’ means each of the States of California, Oregon, and Washington.

“(b) TRANSITION PAYMENTS.—For each of fiscal years 2007 through 2010, in lieu of the payment amounts that otherwise would have been made under paragraphs (1)(B) and (2)(B) of section 102(a), the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the adjusted amount to each covered State and the eligible counties within the covered State, as applicable.

“(c) DISTRIBUTION OF ADJUSTED AMOUNT IN OREGON AND WASHINGTON.—It is the intent of Congress that the method of distributing the payments under subsection (b) among the counties in the States of Oregon and Washington for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2010 be in the same proportion that the payments were distributed to the eligible counties in fiscal year 2006.

“(d) DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS IN CALIFORNIA.—The following payments shall be distributed among the eligible counties in the State of California in the same proportion that payments under section 102(a)(2)

(as in effect on September 29, 2006) were distributed to the eligible counties for fiscal year 2006:

“(1) Payments to the State of California under subsection (b).

“(2) The shares of the eligible counties of the State payment for California under section 102 for fiscal year 2011.

“(e) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—For purposes of this Act, any payment made under subsection (b) shall be considered to be a payment made under section 102(a).

“TITLE II—SPECIAL PROJECTS ON FEDERAL LAND

“SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) PARTICIPATING COUNTY.—The term ‘participating county’ means an eligible county that elects under section 102(d) to expend a portion of the Federal funds received under section 102 in accordance with this title.

“(2) PROJECT FUNDS.—The term ‘project funds’ means all funds an eligible county elects under section 102(d) to reserve for expenditure in accordance with this title.

“(3) RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The term ‘resource advisory committee’ means—

“(A) an advisory committee established by the Secretary concerned under section 205; or

“(B) an advisory committee determined by the Secretary concerned to meet the requirements of section 205.

“(4) RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term ‘resource management plan’ means—

“(A) a land use plan prepared by the Bureau of Land Management for units of the Federal land described in section 3(7)(B) pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712); or

“(B) a land and resource management plan prepared by the Forest Service for units of the National Forest System pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604).

“SEC. 202. GENERAL LIMITATION ON USE OF PROJECT FUNDS.

“(a) LIMITATION.—Project funds shall be expended solely on projects that meet the requirements of this title.

“(b) AUTHORIZED USES.—Project funds may be used by the Secretary concerned for the purpose of entering into and implementing cooperative agreements with willing Federal agencies, State and local governments, private and nonprofit entities, and landowners for protection, restoration, and enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat, and other resource objectives consistent with the purposes of this Act on Federal land and on non-Federal land where projects would benefit the resources on Federal land.

“SEC. 203. SUBMISSION OF PROJECT PROPOSALS.

“(a) SUBMISSION OF PROJECT PROPOSALS TO SECRETARY CONCERNED.—

“(1) PROJECTS FUNDED USING PROJECT FUNDS.—Not later than September 30 for fiscal year 2007, and each September 30 thereafter for each succeeding fiscal year through fiscal year 2011, each resource advisory committee shall submit to the Secretary concerned a description of any projects that the resource advisory committee proposes the Secretary undertake using any project funds reserved by eligible counties in the area in which the resource advisory committee has geographic jurisdiction.

“(2) PROJECTS FUNDED USING OTHER FUNDS.—A resource advisory committee may submit to the Secretary concerned a description of any projects that the committee proposes the Secretary undertake using funds from State or local governments, or from the private sector, other than project funds and funds appropriated and otherwise available to do similar work.

“(3) JOINT PROJECTS.—Participating counties or other persons may propose to pool project funds or other funds, described in paragraph (2), and jointly propose a project or group of projects to a resource advisory committee established under section 205.

“(b) REQUIRED DESCRIPTION OF PROJECTS.—In submitting proposed projects to the Secretary concerned under subsection (a), a resource advisory committee shall include in the description of each proposed project the following information:

“(1) The purpose of the project and a description of how the project will meet the purposes of this title.

“(2) The anticipated duration of the project.

“(3) The anticipated cost of the project.

“(4) The proposed source of funding for the project, whether project funds or other funds.

“(5)(A) Expected outcomes, including how the project will meet or exceed desired ecological conditions, maintenance objectives, or stewardship objectives.

“(B) An estimate of the amount of any timber, forage, and other commodities and other economic activity, including jobs generated, if any, anticipated as part of the project.

“(6) A detailed monitoring plan, including funding needs and sources, that—

“(A) tracks and identifies the positive or negative impacts of the project, implementation, and provides for validation monitoring; and

“(B) includes an assessment of the following:

“(i) Whether or not the project met or exceeded desired ecological conditions; created local employment or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps where appropriate.

“(ii) Whether the project improved the use of, or added value to, any products removed from land consistent with the purposes of this title.

“(7) An assessment that the project is to be in the public interest.

“(c) AUTHORIZED PROJECTS.—Projects proposed under subsection (a) shall be consistent with section 2.

“SEC. 204. EVALUATION AND APPROVAL OF PROJECTS BY SECRETARY CONCERNED.

“(a) CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL OF PROPOSED PROJECT.—The Secretary concerned may make a decision to approve a project submitted by a resource advisory committee under section 203 only if the proposed project satisfies each of the following conditions:

“(1) The project complies with all applicable Federal laws (including regulations).

“(2) The project is consistent with the applicable resource management plan and with any watershed or subsequent plan developed pursuant to the resource management plan and approved by the Secretary concerned.

“(3) The project has been approved by the resource advisory committee in accordance with section 205, including the procedures issued under subsection (e) of that section.

“(4) A project description has been submitted by the resource advisory committee to the Secretary concerned in accordance with section 203.

“(5) The project will improve the maintenance of existing infrastructure, implement stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems, and restore and improve land health and water quality.

“(b) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.—

“(1) REQUEST FOR PAYMENT BY COUNTY.—The Secretary concerned may request the resource advisory committee submitting a proposed project to agree to the use of project funds to pay for any environmental review,

consultation, or compliance with applicable environmental laws required in connection with the project.

“(2) CONDUCT OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.—If a payment is requested under paragraph (1) and the resource advisory committee agrees to the expenditure of funds for this purpose, the Secretary concerned shall conduct environmental review, consultation, or other compliance responsibilities in accordance with Federal laws (including regulations).

“(3) EFFECT OF REFUSAL TO PAY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a resource advisory committee does not agree to the expenditure of funds under paragraph (1), the project shall be deemed withdrawn from further consideration by the Secretary concerned pursuant to this title.

“(B) EFFECT OF WITHDRAWAL.—A withdrawal under subparagraph (A) shall be deemed to be a rejection of the project for purposes of section 207(c).

“(c) DECISIONS OF SECRETARY CONCERNED.—

“(1) REJECTION OF PROJECTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A decision by the Secretary concerned to reject a proposed project shall be at the sole discretion of the Secretary concerned.

“(B) NO ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL OR JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a decision by the Secretary concerned to reject a proposed project shall not be subject to administrative appeal or judicial review.

“(C) NOTICE OF REJECTION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary concerned makes the rejection decision, the Secretary concerned shall notify in writing the resource advisory committee that submitted the proposed project of the rejection and the reasons for rejection.

“(2) NOTICE OF PROJECT APPROVAL.—The Secretary concerned shall publish in the Federal Register notice of each project approved under subsection (a) if the notice would be required had the project originated with the Secretary.

“(d) SOURCE AND CONDUCT OF PROJECT.—Once the Secretary concerned accepts a project for review under section 203, the acceptance shall be deemed a Federal action for all purposes.

“(e) IMPLEMENTATION OF APPROVED PROJECTS.—

“(1) COOPERATION.—Notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, using project funds the Secretary concerned may enter into contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements with States and local governments, private and nonprofit entities, and landowners and other persons to assist the Secretary in carrying out an approved project.

“(2) BEST VALUE CONTRACTING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For any project involving a contract authorized by paragraph (1) the Secretary concerned may elect a source for performance of the contract on a best value basis.

“(B) FACTORS.—The Secretary concerned shall determine best value based on such factors as—

“(i) the technical demands and complexity of the work to be done;

“(ii)(I) the ecological objectives of the project; and

“(II) the sensitivity of the resources being treated;

“(iii) the past experience by the contractor with the type of work being done, using the type of equipment proposed for the project, and meeting or exceeding desired ecological conditions; and

“(iv) the commitment of the contractor to hiring highly qualified workers and local residents.

“(3) MERCHANTABLE TIMBER CONTRACTING PILOT PROGRAM.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary concerned shall establish a pilot program to implement a certain percentage of approved projects involving the sale of merchantable timber using separate contracts for—

“(i) the harvesting or collection of merchantable timber; and

“(ii) the sale of the timber.

“(B) ANNUAL PERCENTAGES.—Under the pilot program, the Secretary concerned shall ensure that, on a nationwide basis, not less than the following percentage of all approved projects involving the sale of merchantable timber are implemented using separate contracts:

“(i) For fiscal year 2007, 25 percent.

“(ii) For fiscal year 2008, 35 percent.

“(iii) For fiscal year 2009, 45 percent.

“(iv) For each of fiscal years 2010 and 2011, 50 percent.

“(C) INCLUSION IN PILOT PROGRAM.—The decision whether to use separate contracts to implement a project involving the sale of merchantable timber shall be made by the Secretary concerned after the approval of the project under this title.

“(D) ASSISTANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary concerned may use funds from any appropriated account available to the Secretary for the Federal land to assist in the administration of projects conducted under the pilot program.

“(ii) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE.—The total amount obligated under this subparagraph may not exceed \$1,000,000 for any fiscal year during which the pilot program is in effect.

“(E) REVIEW AND REPORT.—

“(i) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2009, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committees on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report assessing the pilot program.

“(ii) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary concerned shall submit to the Committees on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources of the House of Representatives an annual report describing the results of the pilot program.

“(f) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROJECT FUNDS.—The Secretary shall ensure that at least 50 percent of all project funds be used for projects that are primarily dedicated—

“(1) to road maintenance, decommissioning, or obliteration; or

“(2) to restoration of streams and watersheds.

“SEC. 205. RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE OF RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary concerned shall establish and maintain resource advisory committees to perform the duties in subsection (b), except as provided in paragraph (4).

“(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of a resource advisory committee shall be—

“(A) to improve collaborative relationships; and

“(B) to provide advice and recommendations to the land management agencies consistent with the purposes of this title.

“(3) ACCESS TO RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—To ensure that each unit of Federal land has access to a resource advisory committee, and that there is sufficient interest in participation on a committee to ensure that membership can be balanced in terms of the points of view represented and the functions to be performed, the Secretary concerned may, establish resource advisory

committees for part of, or 1 or more, units of Federal land.

“(4) EXISTING ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An advisory committee that meets the requirements of this section, a resource advisory committee established before September 29, 2006, or an advisory committee determined by the Secretary concerned before September 29, 2006, to meet the requirements of this section may be deemed by the Secretary concerned to be a resource advisory committee for the purposes of this title.

“(B) CHARTER.—A charter for a committee described in subparagraph (A) that was filed on or before September 29, 2006, shall be considered to be filed for purposes of this Act.

“(C) BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—The Secretary of the Interior may deem a resource advisory committee meeting the requirements of subpart 1784 of part 1780 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, as a resource advisory committee for the purposes of this title.

“(b) DUTIES.—A resource advisory committee shall—

“(1) review projects proposed under this title by participating counties and other persons;

“(2) propose projects and funding to the Secretary concerned under section 203;

“(3) provide early and continuous coordination with appropriate land management agency officials in recommending projects consistent with purposes of this Act under this title;

“(4) provide frequent opportunities for citizens, organizations, tribes, land management agencies, and other interested parties to participate openly and meaningfully, beginning at the early stages of the project development process under this title;

“(5)(A) monitor projects that have been approved under section 204; and

“(B) advise the designated Federal official on the progress of the monitoring efforts under subparagraph (A); and

“(6) make recommendations to the Secretary concerned for any appropriate changes or adjustments to the projects being monitored by the resource advisory committee.

“(c) APPOINTMENT BY THE SECRETARY.—

“(A) APPOINTMENT AND TERM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary concerned, shall appoint the members of resource advisory committees for a term of 4 years beginning on the date of appointment.

“(B) REAPPOINTMENT.—The Secretary concerned may reappoint members to subsequent 4-year terms.

“(2) BASIC REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary concerned shall ensure that each resource advisory committee established meets the requirements of subsection (d).

“(3) INITIAL APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary concerned shall make initial appointments to the resource advisory committees.

“(4) VACANCIES.—The Secretary concerned shall make appointments to fill vacancies on any resource advisory committee as soon as practicable after the vacancy has occurred.

“(5) COMPENSATION.—Members of the resource advisory committees shall not receive any compensation.

“(d) COMPOSITION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

“(1) NUMBER.—Each resource advisory committee shall be comprised of 15 members.

“(2) COMMUNITY INTERESTS REPRESENTED.—Committee members shall be representative of the interests of the following 3 categories:

“(A) 5 persons that—

“(i) represent organized labor or non-timber forest product harvester groups;

“(ii) represent developed outdoor recreation, off highway vehicle users, or commercial recreation activities;

“(iii) represent—

“(I) energy and mineral development interests; or

“(II) commercial or recreational fishing interests;

“(iv) represent the commercial timber industry; or

“(v) hold Federal grazing or other land use permits, or represent nonindustrial private forest land owners, within the area for which the committee is organized.

“(B) 5 persons that represent—

“(i) nationally recognized environmental organizations;

“(ii) regionally or locally recognized environmental organizations;

“(iii) dispersed recreational activities;

“(iv) archaeological and historical interests; or

“(v) nationally or regionally recognized wild horse and burro interest groups, wildlife or hunting organizations, or watershed associations.

“(C) 5 persons that—

“(i) hold State elected office (or a designee);

“(ii) hold county or local elected office;

“(iii) represent American Indian tribes within or adjacent to the area for which the committee is organized;

“(iv) are school officials or teachers; or

“(v) represent the affected public at large.

“(3) BALANCED REPRESENTATION.—In appointing committee members from the 3 categories in paragraph (2), the Secretary concerned shall provide for balanced and broad representation from within each category.

“(4) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—The members of a resource advisory committee shall reside within the State in which the committee has jurisdiction and, to extent practicable, the Secretary concerned shall ensure local representation in each category in paragraph (2).

“(5) CHAIRPERSON.—A majority on each resource advisory committee shall select the chairperson of the committee.

“(e) APPROVAL PROCEDURES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), each resource advisory committee shall establish procedures for proposing projects to the Secretary concerned under this title.

“(2) QUORUM.—A quorum must be present to constitute an official meeting of the committee.

“(3) APPROVAL BY MAJORITY OF MEMBERS.—A project may be proposed by a resource advisory committee to the Secretary concerned under section 203(a), if the project has been approved by a majority of members of the committee from each of the 3 categories in subsection (d)(2).

“(f) OTHER COMMITTEE AUTHORITIES AND REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) STAFF ASSISTANCE.—A resource advisory committee may submit to the Secretary concerned a request for periodic staff assistance from Federal employees under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

“(2) MEETINGS.—All meetings of a resource advisory committee shall be announced at least 1 week in advance in a local newspaper of record and shall be open to the public.

“(3) RECORDS.—A resource advisory committee shall maintain records of the meetings of the committee and make the records available for public inspection.

“SEC. 206. USE OF PROJECT FUNDS.

“(a) AGREEMENT REGARDING SCHEDULE AND COST OF PROJECT.—

“(1) AGREEMENT BETWEEN PARTIES.—The Secretary concerned may carry out a project submitted by a resource advisory committee under section 203(a) using project funds or

other funds described in section 203(a)(2), if, as soon as practicable after the issuance of a decision document for the project and the exhaustion of all administrative appeals and judicial review of the project decision, the Secretary concerned and the resource advisory committee enter into an agreement addressing, at a minimum, the following:

“(A) The schedule for completing the project.

“(B) The total cost of the project, including the level of agency overhead to be assessed against the project.

“(C) For a multiyear project, the estimated cost of the project for each of the fiscal years in which it will be carried out.

“(D) The remedies for failure of the Secretary concerned to comply with the terms of the agreement consistent with current Federal law.

“(2) LIMITED USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—The Secretary concerned may decide, at the sole discretion of the Secretary concerned, to cover the costs of a portion of an approved project using Federal funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Secretary for the same purposes as the project.

“(b) TRANSFER OF PROJECT FUNDS.—

“(1) INITIAL TRANSFER REQUIRED.—As soon as practicable after the agreement is reached under subsection (a) with regard to a project to be funded in whole or in part using project funds, or other funds described in section 203(a)(2), the Secretary concerned shall transfer to the applicable unit of National Forest System land or Bureau of Land Management District an amount of project funds equal to—

“(A) in the case of a project to be completed in a single fiscal year, the total amount specified in the agreement to be paid using project funds, or other funds described in section 203(a)(2); or

“(B) in the case of a multiyear project, the amount specified in the agreement to be paid using project funds, or other funds described in section 203(a)(2) for the first fiscal year.

“(2) CONDITION ON PROJECT COMMENCEMENT.—The unit of National Forest System land or Bureau of Land Management District concerned, shall not commence a project until the project funds, or other funds described in section 203(a)(2) required to be transferred under paragraph (1) for the project, have been made available by the Secretary concerned.

“(3) SUBSEQUENT TRANSFERS FOR MULTIYEAR PROJECTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For the second and subsequent fiscal years of a multiyear project to be funded in whole or in part using project funds, the unit of National Forest System land or Bureau of Land Management District concerned shall use the amount of project funds required to continue the project in that fiscal year according to the agreement entered into under subsection (a).

“(B) SUSPENSION OF WORK.—The Secretary concerned shall suspend work on the project if the project funds required by the agreement in the second and subsequent fiscal years are not available.

“SEC. 207. AVAILABILITY OF PROJECT FUNDS.

“(a) SUBMISSION OF PROPOSED PROJECTS TO OBLIGATE FUNDS.—By September 30 of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2011, a resource advisory committee shall submit to the Secretary concerned pursuant to section 203(a)(1) a sufficient number of project proposals that, if approved, would result in the obligation of at least the full amount of the project funds reserved by the participating county in the preceding fiscal year.

“(b) USE OR TRANSFER OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Subject to section 208, if a resource advisory committee fails to comply with subsection (a) for a fiscal year, any project

funds reserved by the participating county in the preceding fiscal year and remaining unobligated shall be available for use as part of the project submissions in the next fiscal year.

“(c) **EFFECT OF REJECTION OF PROJECTS.**—Subject to section 208, any project funds reserved by a participating county in the preceding fiscal year that are unobligated at the end of a fiscal year because the Secretary concerned has rejected one or more proposed projects shall be available for use as part of the project submissions in the next fiscal year.

“(d) **EFFECT OF COURT ORDERS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If an approved project under this Act is enjoined or prohibited by a Federal court, the Secretary concerned shall return the unobligated project funds related to the project to the participating county or counties that reserved the funds.

“(2) **EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS.**—The returned funds shall be available for the county to expend in the same manner as the funds reserved by the county under subparagraph (B) or (C)(1) of section 102(d)(1).

“SEC. 208. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The authority to initiate projects under this title shall terminate on September 30, 2011.

“(b) **DEPOSITS IN TREASURY.**—Any project funds not obligated by September 30, 2012, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

“TITLE III—COUNTY FUNDS

“SEC. 301. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) **COUNTY FUNDS.**—The term ‘county funds’ means all funds an eligible county elects under section 102(d) to reserve for expenditure in accordance with this title.

“(2) **PARTICIPATING COUNTY.**—The term ‘participating county’ means an eligible county that elects under section 102(d) to expend a portion of the Federal funds received under section 102 in accordance with this title.

“SEC. 302. USE.

“(a) **AUTHORIZED USES.**—A participating county, including any applicable agencies of the participating county, shall use county funds, in accordance with this title, only—

“(1) to carry out activities under the Firewise Communities program to provide to homeowners in fire-sensitive ecosystems education on, and assistance with implementing, techniques in home siting, home construction, and home landscaping that can increase the protection of people and property from wildfires;

“(2) to reimburse the participating county for search and rescue and other emergency services, including firefighting, that are—

“(A) performed on Federal land after the date on which the use was approved under subsection (b);

“(B) paid for by the participating county; and

“(3) to develop community wildfire protection plans in coordination with the appropriate Secretary concerned.

“(b) **PROPOSALS.**—A participating county shall use county funds for a use described in subsection (a) only after a 45-day public comment period, at the beginning of which the participating county shall—

“(1) publish in any publications of local record a proposal that describes the proposed use of the county funds; and

“(2) submit the proposal to any resource advisory committee established under section 205 for the participating county.

“SEC. 303. CERTIFICATION.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than February 1 of the year after the year in which any county funds were expended by a partici-

pating county, the appropriate official of the participating county shall submit to the Secretary concerned a certification that the county funds expended in the applicable year have been used for the uses authorized under section 302(a), including a description of the amounts expended and the uses for which the amounts were expended.

“(b) **REVIEW.**—The Secretary concerned shall review the certifications submitted under subsection (a) as the Secretary concerned determines to be appropriate.

“SEC. 304. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The authority to initiate projects under this title terminates on September 30, 2011.

“(b) **AVAILABILITY.**—Any county funds not obligated by September 30, 2012, shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

“TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

“SEC. 401. REGULATIONS.

“The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall issue regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act.

“SEC. 402. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

“(b) **EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) for fiscal year 2007, \$425,000,000 is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress).

“SEC. 403. TREATMENT OF FUNDS AND REVENUES.

“(a) **RELATION TO OTHER APPROPRIATIONS.**—Funds made available under section 402 and funds made available to a Secretary concerned under section 206 shall be in addition to any other annual appropriations for the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

“(b) **DEPOSIT OF REVENUES AND OTHER FUNDS.**—All revenues generated from projects pursuant to title II, including any interest accrued from the revenues, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.”

(b) **FOREST RECEIPT PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE STATES AND COUNTIES.**—

(1) **ACT OF MAY 23, 1908.**—The sixth paragraph under the heading “**FOREST SERVICE**” in the Act of May 23, 1908 (16 U.S.C. 500) is amended in the first sentence by striking “twenty-five percentum” and all that follows through “shall be paid” and inserting the following: “an amount equal to the annual average of 25 percent of all amounts received for the applicable fiscal year and each of the preceding 6 fiscal years from each national forest shall be paid”.

(2) **WEEKS LAW.**—Section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the “Weeks Law”) (16 U.S.C. 500) is amended in the first sentence by striking “twenty-five percentum” and all that follows through “shall be paid” and inserting the following: “an amount equal to the annual average of 25 percent of all amounts received for the applicable fiscal year and each of the preceding 6 fiscal years from each national forest shall be paid”.

(c) **PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6906 of title 31, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 6906. Funding

“For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012—

“(1) each county or other eligible unit of local government shall be entitled to payment under this chapter; and

“(2) sums shall be made available to the Secretary of the Interior for obligation or

expenditure in accordance with this chapter.”

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 6906 and inserting the following:

“6906. Funding.”

(3) **BUDGET SCOREKEEPING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines and the accompanying list of programs and accounts set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105-217, the amendment made by paragraph (1)—

(i) shall be treated under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect before September 30, 2002), by the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Budget of the Senate, as appropriate, for purposes of budget enforcement in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) as changing direct spending or receipts, as appropriate (as if such language were included in an Act other than an appropriations Act); and

(ii) shall be treated in the baseline after fiscal year 2008 for purposes of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907) (as in effect before September 30, 2002), by the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Budget of the Senate, as appropriate, for purposes of budget enforcement in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) as if Payment in Lieu of Taxes (14-1114-0-1-806) were an account designated as Appropriated Entitlements and Mandatories for Fiscal Year 1997 in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105-217.

(B) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This paragraph shall—

(i) be effective beginning on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(ii) remain in effect for any fiscal year for which the entitlement in section 6906 of title 31, United States Code (as amended by paragraph (1)), applies.

(d) **MODIFICATION OF EFFECTIVE DATE OF LEASING PROVISIONS OF THE AMERICAN JOBS CREATION ACT OF 2004.**—

(1) **LEASES TO FOREIGN ENTITIES.**—Section 849(b) of the American Jobs Creation Act of 2004 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) **LEASES TO FOREIGN ENTITIES.**—In the case of tax-exempt use property leased to a tax-exempt entity which is a foreign person or entity, the amendments made by this part shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006, with respect to leases entered into on or before March 12, 2004.”

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this subsection shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Jobs Creation Act of 2004.

(e) **APPLICATION OF RULES TREATING INVERTED CORPORATIONS AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS TO CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS OCCURRING AFTER MARCH 20, 2002.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 7874(b) (relating to inverted corporations treated as domestic corporations) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **INVERTED CORPORATIONS TREATED AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 7701(a)(4), a foreign corporation shall be treated for purposes of this title as a domestic corporation if such corporation would be

a surrogate foreign corporation if subsection (a)(2) were applied by substituting '80 percent' for '60 percent'.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS OCCURRING AFTER MARCH 20, 2002.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If—

“(i) paragraph (1) does not apply to a foreign corporation, but

“(ii) paragraph (1) would apply to such corporation if, in addition to the substitution under paragraph (1), subsection (a)(2) were applied by substituting ‘March 20, 2002’ for ‘March 4, 2003’ each place it appears, then paragraph (1) shall apply to such corporation but only with respect to taxable years of such corporation beginning after December 31, 2006.

“(B) SPECIAL RULES.—Subject to such rules as the Secretary may prescribe, in the case of a corporation to which paragraph (1) applies by reason of this paragraph—

“(i) the corporation shall be treated, as of the close of its last taxable year beginning before January 1, 2007, as having transferred all of its assets, liabilities, and earnings and profits to a domestic corporation in a transaction with respect to which no tax is imposed under this title.

“(ii) the bases of the assets transferred in the transaction to the domestic corporation shall be the same as the bases of the assets in the hands of the foreign corporation, subject to any adjustments under this title for built-in losses,

“(iii) the basis of the stock of any shareholder in the domestic corporation shall be the same as the basis of the stock of the shareholder in the foreign corporation for which it is treated as exchanged, and

“(iv) the transfer of any earnings and profits by reason of clause (i) shall be disregarded in determining any deemed dividend or foreign tax creditable to the domestic corporation with respect to such transfer.

“(C) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out this paragraph, including regulations to prevent the avoidance of the purposes of this paragraph.”

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

SA 1140. Mr. HARKIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1495, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3 . RATHBUN LAKE, IOWA.

(a) RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL.—The Secretary shall provide, in accordance with the recommendations in the Rathbun Lake Reallocation Report approved by the Chief of Engineers on July 22, 1985, the Rathbun Regional Water Association with the right of first refusal to contract for or purchase any increment of the remaining allocation (8,320 acre-feet) of water supply storage in Rathbun Lake, Iowa.

(b) PAYMENT OF COST.—The Rathbun Regional Water Association shall pay the cost of any water supply storage allocation provided under subsection (a).

SA 1141. Mr. NELSON of Nebraska submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R.

2206, making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . IRAQ.

(a) UNITED STATES STRATEGY IN IRAQ.—The United States strategy in Iraq, hereafter, shall be conditioned on the Government of Iraq meeting benchmarks including the following:

(1) Whether the Government of Iraq has given United States Armed Forces and Iraqi Security Forces the authority to pursue all extremists, including Sunni insurgents and Shiite militias, and is making substantial progress in delivering necessary Iraqi Security Forces for Baghdad and protecting such Forces from political interference; intensifying efforts to build balanced security forces throughout Iraq that provide even-handed security for all Iraqis; ensuring that Iraq's political authorities are not undermining or making false accusations against members of the Iraqi Security Forces; eliminating militia control of local security; establishing a strong militia disarmament program; ensuring fair and just enforcement of laws; establishing political, media, economic, and service committees in support of the Baghdad Security Plan; and eradicating safe havens.

(2) Whether the Government of Iraq is making substantial progress in meeting its commitment to pursue reconciliation initiatives, including enactment of a hydro-carbon law; adoption of legislation necessary for the conduct of provincial and local elections; reform of current laws governing the de-Baathification process; amendment of the Constitution of Iraq; and allocation of Iraqi revenues for reconstruction projects.

(3) Whether the Government of Iraq and United States Armed Forces are making substantial progress in reducing the level of sectarian violence in Iraq.

(4) Whether the Government of Iraq is ensuring the rights of minority political parties in the Iraqi Parliament are protected.

(b) REPORTS ON PROGRESS IN IRAQ.—On July 15, 2007, the Commander, Multi-National Forces-Iraq and the United States Ambassador to Iraq shall jointly submit to Congress a report describing and assessing in detail the current progress being made by the Government of Iraq on the matters set forth in subsection (a). The Commander, Multi-National Forces-Iraq and the United States Ambassador to Iraq shall submit a subsequent joint report to Congress on such matters on September 15, 2007.

(c) REQUESTS FOR FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEARS AFTER FISCAL YEAR 2008.—(1) Any request for funds for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2008 for ongoing military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq should be included in the annual budget of the President for such fiscal year as submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

(2) Any request for funds for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2008 for ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan should provide an estimate of all funds required in that fiscal year for such operations.

(3) Any funds provided for ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan should be provided in appropriations Acts for such fiscal year through appropriations to specific accounts set forth in such appropriations Acts.

(d) LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN FUNDS.—(1) Notwithstanding any other pro-

vision of law and except as provided in paragraph (2), of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, or by any other Act that remain available for obligation as of the date of the enactment of this Act, for assistance for Iraq under the headings “ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND” and “INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT”, an amount equal to 75 percent of such amounts may not be obligated until the President certifies to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that the Government of Iraq is making substantial progress towards meeting each of the benchmarks set forth in subsection (a).

(2) The requirement to withhold funds from obligation pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to funds appropriated or otherwise made available under the heading “ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND” for continued support for—

(A) the Community Action Program and the Community Stabilization Program in Iraq administered by the United States Agency for International Development; or

(B) programs and activities to promote democracy and human rights in Iraq.

SA 1142. Mr. BOND (for himself and Mrs. McCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2206, making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 110, line 14, strike “\$153,300,000” and insert “\$173,300,000”.

On page 110, line 20, insert after “division” the following: “; *Provided further*, That not less than \$20,000,000 of the amount made available under this heading shall be used for Corps of Engineers projects to support emergency operations, repairs, and other activities in the Midwest in response to storm damage in that region that occurred during May 2007”.

SA 1143. Mr. STEVENS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2206, making emergency supplemental appropriations and additional supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of chapter 6 of title V of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 5613. TREATMENT OF LIABILITY FOR CERTAIN MULTIPLE EMPLOYER PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an applicable pension plan—

(1) if an eligible employer elects the application of subsection (b), any liability of the employer with respect to the applicable pension plan shall be determined under subsection (b), and

(2) if an eligible employer does not make such election, any liability of the employer with respect to the applicable pension plan shall be determined under subsection (c).

(b) ELECTION TO SPIN OFF LIABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an eligible employer elects, within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to have this subsection apply, the applicable pension plan shall be treated as having, effective January

1, 2006, spun off such employer's allocable portion of the plan's assets and liabilities to an eligible spinoff plan and the employer's liability with respect to the applicable pension plan shall be determined by reference to the eligible spinoff plan in the manner provided under paragraph (2). The employer's liability, as so determined, shall be in lieu of any other liability to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation or to the applicable pension plan with respect to the applicable pension plan.

(2) LIABILITY OF EMPLOYERS ELECTING SPIN-OFF.—

(A) ONGOING FUNDING LIABILITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an eligible spinoff plan, the amendments made by section 401, and subtitles A and B of title I, of the Pension Protection Act of 2006 shall not apply to plan years beginning before the first plan year for which the plan ceases to be an eligible spinoff plan (or, if earlier, January 1, 2017), and except as provided in clause (ii), the employer maintaining such plan shall be liable for ongoing contributions to the eligible spinoff plan on the same terms and subject to the same conditions as under the provisions of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as in effect before such amendments. Such liability shall be in lieu of any other liability to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation or to the applicable pension plan with respect to the applicable pension plan.

(ii) INTEREST RATE.—In applying section 302(b)(5)(B) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and section 412(b)(5)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect before the amendments made by subtitles A and B of title I of the Pension Protection Act of 2006) and in applying section 4006(a)(3)(E)(iii) of such Act (as in effect before the amendments made by section 401 of such Act) to an eligible spinoff plan for plan years beginning after December 31, 2007, and before the first plan year to which such amendments apply, the third segment rate determined under section 303(h)(2)(C)(iii) of such Act and section 430(h)(2)(C)(iii) of such Code (as added by such amendments) shall be used in lieu of the interest rate otherwise used.

(B) TERMINATION LIABILITY.—If an eligible spinoff plan terminates under title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 on or before December 31, 2010, the liability of the employer maintaining such plan resulting from such termination under section 4062 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 shall be determined in accordance with the assumptions and methods described in subsection (c)(2)(A). The employer's liability, as so determined, shall be in lieu of any other liability to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation or to the applicable pension plan with respect to the applicable pension plan.

(C) LIABILITY OF EMPLOYERS NOT ELECTING SPINOFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an applicable pension plan is terminated under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, an eligible employer which does not make the election described in subsection (b) shall be liable to the corporation with respect to the applicable pension plan (in lieu of any other liability to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation or to the applicable pension plan with respect to the applicable pension plan) in an amount equal to the fractional portion of the adjusted unfunded benefit liabilities of such plan as of December 31, 2005, determined without regard to any adjusted unfunded benefit liabilities to be transferred to an eligible spinoff plan pursuant to subsection (b).

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) ADJUSTED UNFUNDED BENEFIT LIABILITIES.—The term “adjusted unfunded benefit liabilities” means the amount of unfunded benefit liabilities (as defined in section 4001(a)(18) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974), except that the interest assumption shall be the rate of interest under section 302(b) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and section 412(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect before the amendments made by the Pension Protection Act of 2006, for the most recent plan year for which such rate exists.

(B) FRACTIONAL PORTION.—The term “fractional portion” means a fraction, the numerator of which is the amount required to be contributed to the applicable pension plan for the 5 plan years ending before December 31, 2005, by such employer, and the denominator of which is the amount required to be contributed to such plan for such plan years by all employers which do not make the election described in subsection (b).

(d) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) APPLICABLE PENSION PLAN.—The term “applicable pension plan” means a single employer plan which—

(A) was established in the State of Alaska on March 18, 1967, and

(B) as of January 1, 2005, had 2 or more contributing sponsors at least 2 of which were not under common control.

(2) ALLOCABLE PORTION.—The term “allocable portion” means, with respect to any eligible employer making an election under subsection (b), the portion of an applicable pension plan's liabilities and assets which bears the same ratio to all such liabilities and assets as such employer's share (determined under subsection (c) as if no eligible employer made an election under subsection (b)) of the excess (if any) of—

(A) the liabilities of the plan, valued in accordance with subsection (c), over

(B) the assets of the plan, bears to the total amount of such excess.

(3) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.—An “eligible employer” is an employer which participated in an eligible multiple employer plan on or after January 1, 2000.

SA 1144. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1495, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3. RATHBUN LAKE, IOWA.

(a) RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL.—The Secretary shall provide, in accordance with the recommendations in the Rathbun Lake Reallocation Report approved by the Chief of Engineers on July 22, 1985, the Rathbun Regional Water Association with the right of first refusal to contract for or purchase any increment of the remaining allocation (8,320 acre-feet) of water supply storage in Rathbun Lake, Iowa.

(b) PAYMENT OF COST.—The Rathbun Regional Water Association shall pay the cost of any water supply storage allocation provided under subsection (a).

SA 1145. Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. INHOFE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1065 proposed by Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr.

BAUCUS, and Mr. ISAKSON) to the bill H.R. 1495, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 43, line 13, insert “, subject to section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4183)” before the period at the end.

On page 48, strike lines 22 through 25 and insert the following:

(4) WORKING GROUPS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Task Force may establish such working groups as the Task Force determines to be necessary to assist the Task Force in carrying out this subsection.

(B) INTEGRATION TEAM.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Task Force shall establish, for the purposes described in clause (ii), an integration team comprised of—

(I) independent experts with experience relating to—

- (aa) coastal estuaries;
- (bb) diversions;
- (cc) coastal restoration;
- (dd) wetlands protection;
- (ee) ecosystem restoration;
- (ff) hurricane protection;
- (gg) storm damage reduction systems; and
- (hh) navigation and ports; and
- (II) representatives of—
- (aa) the State of Louisiana; and
- (bb) local governments in southern Louisiana.

(i) PURPOSES.—The purposes referred to in clause (i) are—

(I) to advise the Task Force and the Secretary regarding opportunities to integrate the planning, engineering, design, implementation, and performance of Corps of Engineers projects for hurricane and storm damage reduction, flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, and navigation in areas of Louisiana declared to be a major disaster as a result of Hurricane Katrina or Rita;

(II) to review reports relating to the performance of, and recommendations relating to the future performance of, the hurricane, coastal, and flood protection systems in southern Louisiana, including the reports issued by the Interagency Performance Evaluation Team, the National Science Foundation, the American Society of Civil Engineers, and Team Louisiana to advise the Task Force and the Secretary on opportunities to improve the performance of the protection systems; and

(III) to carry out such other duties as the Task Force or the Secretary determine to be appropriate.

On page 54, line 6, strike “for participation in” and insert “for the 100-year level of flood protection, in accordance with”.

On page 57, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

(4) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall credit to the non-Federal share of the cost of the project under this subsection any amount otherwise eligible to be credited under section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b) (as amended by section 2001).

Beginning on page 58, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 60, line 3, and insert the following:

(s) MISSISSIPPI RIVER GULF OUTLET.—

(1) DEAUTHORIZATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning on the date of submission of the plan required under subparagraph (C), the navigation channel portion of the project for navigation, Mississippi River Gulf outlet, authorized by the Act of March 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 65, chapter

112;100 Stat. 4177; 110 Stat. 3717), which extends from the Gulf of Mexico to Mile 60 at the southern bank of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, is not authorized.

(B) SCOPE.—Nothing in this paragraph modifies or deauthorizes the Inner Harbor navigation canal replacement project authorized by that Act.

(C) CLOSURE AND RESTORATION PLAN.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a final report on the deauthorization of the Mississippi River Gulf outlet, as described under the heading “INVESTIGATIONS” under chapter 3 of title II of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (Public Law 109-234; 120 Stat. 453).

(ii) INCLUSIONS.—At a minimum, the report under clause (i) shall include—

(I) a comprehensive plan to deauthorize navigation on the Mississippi River Gulf outlet;

(II) a plan to physically modify the Mississippi River Gulf outlet and restore the areas affected by the navigation channel;

(III) a plan to restore natural features of the ecosystem that will reduce or prevent damage from storm surge;

(IV) a plan to prevent the intrusion of saltwater into the waterway;

(V) efforts to integrate the recommendations of this report with the program authorized under subsection (a) and the analysis and design authorized by title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-103; 119 Stat. 2247); and

(VI) consideration of—

(aa) use of native vegetation; and

(bb) diversions of fresh water to restore the Lake Borgne ecosystem.

(D) CONSTRUCTION.—The Secretary shall carry out a plan to close the Mississippi River Gulf outlet and restore and protect the ecosystem substantially in accordance with the plan required under subparagraph (C), if the Secretary determines that the project is cost-effective, environmentally acceptable, and technically feasible.

On page 64, after line 23, insert the following, and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly:

(5) LAWRENCE GATEWAY, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration at the Lawrence Gateway quadrant project along the Merrimack and Spicket Rivers in Lawrence, Massachusetts, in accordance with the general conditions established by the project approval of the Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, including filling abandoned drainage facilities and making improvements to the drainage system on the Lawrence Gateway to prevent continued migration of contaminated sediments into the river systems.

Strike section 3003 and insert the following:

SEC. 3003. BLACK WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, ALABAMA.

Section 111 of title I of division C of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (118 Stat. 2944), is amended by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

“(a) CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FACILITIES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) EXISTING FACILITY.—The term ‘existing facility’ means the administrative and maintenance facility for the project for Black Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama, in existence on the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

“(B) PARCEL.—The term ‘Parcel’ means the land owned by the Federal Government in the City of Tuscaloosa, Alabama, as in existence on the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

“(2) AUTHORIZATION.—In carrying out the project for Black Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama, the Secretary is authorized—

“(A) to purchase land on which the Secretary may construct a new maintenance facility, to be located—

“(i) at a different location from the existing facility; and

“(ii) in the vicinity of the City of Tuscaloosa, Alabama;

“(B) at any time during or after the completion of, and relocation to, the new maintenance facility—

“(i) to demolish the existing facility; and

“(ii) to carry out any necessary environmental clean-up of the Parcel, all at full Federal expense; and

“(C) to construct on the Parcel a new administrative facility.

“(b) ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY.—The Secretary—

“(1) may acquire any real property necessary for the construction of the new maintenance facility under subsection (a)(2)(A); and

“(2) shall convey to the City of Tuscaloosa fee simple title in and to any portion of the Parcel not required for construction of the new administrative facility under subsection (a)(2)(C) through—

“(A) sale at fair market value;

“(B) exchange of other Federal land on an acre-for-acre basis; or

“(C) another form of transfer.”.

At the appropriate place in title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3 . PERRY CREEK, IOWA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On making a determination described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall increase the Federal contribution for the project for flood control, Perry Creek, Iowa, authorized under section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4116; 117 Stat. 1844).

(b) DETERMINATION.—A determination referred to in subsection (a) is a determination that a modification to the project described in that subsection is necessary for the Federal Emergency Management Agency to certify that the project provides flood damage reduction benefits to at least a 100-year level.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$4,000,000.

At the appropriate place in title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3 . RATHBUN LAKE, IOWA.

(a) RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL.—The Secretary shall provide, in accordance with the recommendations in the Rathbun Lake Reallocation Report approved by the Chief of Engineers on July 22, 1985, the Rathbun Regional Water Association with the right of first refusal to contract for or purchase any increment of the remaining allocation (8,320 acre-feet) of water supply storage in Rathbun Lake, Iowa.

(b) PAYMENT OF COST.—The Rathbun Regional Water Association shall pay the cost of any water supply storage allocation provided under subsection (a).

At the appropriate place in title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3 . JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.

(a) MODIFICATION.—Section 331 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 305) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$9,000,000”.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CREDIT.—The credit provided by section 331 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat.

305) (as modified by subsection (a)) shall apply to costs incurred by the Jackson County Board of Supervisors during the period beginning on February 8, 1994, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act for projects authorized by section 219(c)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 110 Stat. 3757; 113 Stat. 334; 113 Stat. 1494; 114 Stat. 2763A-219).

At the appropriate place in title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3 . SANDBRIDGE BEACH, VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA.

The project for beach erosion control and hurricane protection, Sandbridge Beach, Virginia Beach, Virginia, authorized by section 101(22) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4804; 114 Stat. 2612), is modified to authorize the Secretary to review the project to determine whether any additional Federal interest exists with respect to the project, taking into consideration conditions and development levels relating to the project in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

At the appropriate place in title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4 . MOHAWK RIVER, ONEIDA COUNTY, NEW YORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study of the Mohawk River watershed, Oneida County, New York, with a particular emphasis on improving water quality and the environment.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall take into consideration impacts on the Sauquoit Creek Watershed and the economy.

At the appropriate place in title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4 . WALLA WALLA RIVER BASIN, OREGON AND WASHINGTON.

In conducting the study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for ecosystem restoration, Walla Walla River Basin, Oregon and Washington, the Secretary shall—

(1) provide a credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for the cost of any activity carried out by the non-Federal interest before the date of the partnership agreement for the project, if the Secretary determines that the activity is integral to the project; and

(2) allow the non-Federal interest to provide the non-Federal share of the cost of the study in the form of in-kind services and materials.

Strike section 4028 (relating to Jasper County port facility study, South Carolina) and insert the following:

SEC. 4028. PROJECTS FOR IMPROVEMENT, SAVANNAH RIVER, SOUTH CAROLINA AND GEORGIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall determine the feasibility of carrying out projects—

(1) to improve the Savannah River for navigation and related purposes that may be necessary to support the location of container cargo and other port facilities to be located in Jasper County, South Carolina, in the vicinity of Mile 6 of the Savannah Harbor entrance channel; and

(2) to remove from the proposed Jasper County port site the easements used by the Corps of Engineers for placement of dredged fill materials for the Savannah Harbor Federal navigation project.

(b) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In making a determination under subsection (a), the Secretary shall take into consideration—

(1) landside infrastructure;

(2) the provision of any additional dredged material disposal area as a consequence of removing from the proposed Jasper County port site the easements used by the Corps of

Engineers for placement of dredged fill materials for the Savannah Harbor Federal navigation project; and

(3) the results of the proposed bistate compact between the State of Georgia and the State of South Carolina to own, develop, and operate port facilities at the proposed Jasper County port site, as described in the term sheet executed by the Governor of the State of Georgia and the Governor of the State of South Carolina on March 12, 2007.

Strike paragraph (1) of section 5010(a) (relating to the Susquehanna, Delaware, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia) and insert the following:

(1) shall be—

(A) the ex officio United States member under the Susquehanna River Basin Compact and the Delaware River Basin Compact; and
(B) 1 of the 3 members appointed by the President under the Potomac River Basin Compact;

In paragraph (1) of section 5010(e) (relating to the Susquehanna, Delaware, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia), strike “Potomac River Basin Commission” and insert “Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin”.

In section 5011(a) (relating to the Anacostia River, District of Columbia and Maryland), strike “1 year” and insert “2 years”.

At the appropriate place in title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5. COST SHARING PROVISIONS FOR THE TERRITORIES.

Section 1156 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2310) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—A non-Federal interest may use Federal funds to provide the non-Federal share of the costs of a study or project carried out at a location referred to in subsection (a), if the agency or department that provides the Federal funds determines that the funds are eligible to be used for that purpose.”.

At the appropriate place in title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5. INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK PROJECT.

Not later than July 1, 2008, the Secretary shall—

(1) issue a final environmental impact statement relating to the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock project; and

(2) develop and maintain a transportation mitigation program relating to that project in coordination with—

(A) St. Bernard Parish;

(B) Orleans Parish;

(C) the Old Arabi Neighborhood Association; and

(D) other interested parties.

At the appropriate place in title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5. GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION.

(a) DEFINITION OF GREAT LAKES AND CONNECTING CHANNELS.—In this section, the term “Great Lakes and connecting channels” includes—

(1) Lakes Superior, Huron, Michigan, Erie, and Ontario;

(2) any connecting water between or among those lakes that is used for navigation;

(3) any navigation feature in those lakes or water the operation or maintenance of which is a Federal responsibility; and

(4) any area of the Saint Lawrence River that is operated or maintained by the Federal Government for navigation.

(b) NAVIGATION.—Using available funds, the Secretary shall expedite the operation and

maintenance, including dredging to authorized project depths, of the navigation features of the Great Lakes and connecting channels for the purpose of supporting navigation.

At the appropriate place in Title II, insert the following:

SEC. 2. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATION.

Section 1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 597a) is amended as follows:

(1) In the first sentence by striking “two years” and inserting “year”;

(2) In the last sentence by striking “30 months after the date” and inserting “the last date of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which”;

(3) In the last sentence by striking “such 30 month period” and inserting “such period”.

On page 60, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

(u) EMERGENCY PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the President determines that a feature recommended in the analysis and design of comprehensive hurricane protection under title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-103; 119 Stat. 2447), could (1) address an imminent threat to life and property; (2) prevent a dangerous storm surge from reaching a populated area; (3) prevent the loss of coastal areas that reduce the impact of storm surge; (4) benefit national energy security; (5) protect emergency hurricane evacuation routes or shelters; or (6) address inconsistencies in hurricane protection standards, the President may submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate for authorization a legislative proposal relating to the feature, as the President determines to be appropriate.

(2) PRIORITIZATION.—In submitting legislative proposals under paragraph (1), the President shall give highest priority to any project that, as determined by the President, would—

(A) to the maximum extent practicable, reduce the risk—

(i) of loss of human life;

(ii) to public safety; and

(iii) of damage to property; and

(B) minimize costs and environmental impacts.

(3) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning after December 31, 2008, any legislative proposal submitted by the President under paragraph (1) shall be eligible for expedited consideration in accordance with this paragraph.

(B) INTRODUCTION.—As soon as practicable after the date of receipt of a legislative proposal under paragraph (1), the Chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives shall introduce the proposal as a bill, by request, in the Senate or the House of Representatives, as applicable.

(C) REFERRAL.—A bill introduced under subparagraph (B) shall be referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, [as applicable.]

(D) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 legislative days after a bill under subparagraph (B) is referred to a Committee in accordance with subparagraph (C), the Committee shall act on the bill.

(ii) FAILURE TO ACT.—If a Committee fails to act on a bill by the date specified in clause (i), the bill shall be discharged from the Committee and placed on the calendar of

the Senate or the House of Representatives, as applicable.

(E) SENATE FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Floor consideration in the Senate regarding a bill introduced under subparagraph (B) shall be limited to 20 hours, to be equally divided between the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate (or a designee).

(ii) NONGERMANE AMENDMENTS.—An amendment that is nongermane to a bill introduced under subparagraph (B) shall not be in order.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This requirements of, and authorities under, this subsection shall expire on December 31, 2010.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 16, 2007, at 9:30 a.m. to mark up an original bill entitled Foreign Investment and National Security Act of 2007; an original bill to make technical corrections to title III of SAFETEA-LU; H.R. 1675, Preservation Approval Process Improvement Act of 2007; H.R. 1676, Native American Home Ownership Opportunity Act of 2007; S. 254, a bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Constantino Brumidi; an original bill entitled the International Emergency Economic Powers Enforcement Act of 2007; and to vote on the nominations of Mr. David George Nason, of Rhode Island, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Financial Institutions; Mr. Mario Mancuso, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Export Administration; Mr. Michael W. Tankersley, of Texas, to be Inspector General of the Export-Import Bank of the United States; Mr. Robert M. Couch, of Alabama, to be General Counsel of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; Ms. Janis Herschkowitz, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the board of directors of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank; Mr. David George Nason, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the board of directors of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank; and Dr. Nguyen Van Hanh, of California, to be a member of the board of directors of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to hold a business meeting during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 16, 2007, at 2:30 p.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building. The purpose of this meeting will be to consider and approve S. 1300, S. 694, the nomination of David James Gribbin, IV, to be General Counsel of the United States Department of Transportation, and nominations for promotion in the United States Coast Guard.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 16, 2007, at 10 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to hear testimony on "U.S. Preference Programs: How well do they work?"

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to conduct a hearing entitled, "Rogue Online Pharmacies: The Growing Problem of Internet Drug Trafficking" on Wednesday, May 16, 2007 at 10 a.m. in Dirksen Senate Office Building Room 226.

Witness list: Francine H. Haight, Founder of Ryan's Cause, Laguna Niguel, CA; Joseph T. Rannazzisi, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Arlington, VA; Joseph A. Califano, Jr., Chairman and President, National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, Former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, New York, NY; Philip B. Heymann, James Barr Ames Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, Former Deputy U.S. Attorney General, Cambridge, MA; Thomas McClellan, Ph.D., Executive Director, Treatment Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.

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

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate for a markup of S. 1256 "Small Business Lending Reauthorization and Improvements Act of 2007" on Wednesday, May 16, 2007, beginning at 2 p.m. in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 16, 2007, to hold a hearing on the nomination of Dr. Michael J. Kussman to be Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs. The hearing will take place in room 562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building beginning at 10 a.m.

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

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Economic Committee be authorized to con-

duct a hearing entitled, "Are the Explosive Costs of Elder Care Hurting Family Finances and Business Competition?", in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, Wednesday, May 16, 2007, from 9:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet on Wednesday, May 16, 2007, from 10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. in Dirksen 106 for the purpose of conducting a hearing regarding Medicare Advantage, Marketing, and Sales.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 16, 2007, at 10 a.m. in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

Agenda

"The State of Mercury Regulation, Science, and Technology."

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jenny Lee, who is on detail from ICE with me, for the duration of the immigration reform debate, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 79, just received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 79) authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, without intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 79) was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 123, just received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 123) authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, without intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 123) was agreed to.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S HEALTH WEEK

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 204, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 204) expressing the sense of the Senate with regard to the importance of National Women's Health Week, which promotes awareness of diseases that affect women and which encourages women to take preventive measures to ensure good health.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 204) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 204

Whereas women of all backgrounds have the power to greatly reduce their risk of common diseases through preventive measures such as a healthy lifestyle and frequent medical screenings;

Whereas significant disparities exist in the prevalence of disease among women of different backgrounds, including women with disabilities, African American women, Asian and Pacific Islander women, Latinas, and American Indian and Alaska Native women;

Whereas healthy habits should begin at a young age;

Whereas preventive care saves Federal dollars designated for health care;

Whereas it is important to educate women and girls about the significance of awareness of key female health issues;

Whereas it is recognized that the Offices of Women's Health within the Food and Drug Administration, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Office on Women's Health of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Office of Research on Women's Health of the National Institutes of Health, and the Women's Health Program of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality provide critical services in supporting women's health research, education, and other necessary services that benefit women of any age, race, or ethnicity;

Whereas National Women's Health Week begins on Mother's Day annually and celebrates the efforts of national and community organizations working with partners and volunteers to improve awareness of key women's health issues; and

Whereas, in 2007, the week of May 13 through May 19 is dedicated as National Women's Health Week:

Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of preventing diseases that commonly affect women;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Women's Health Week;

(3) calls on the people of the United States to use National Women's Health Week as an opportunity to learn about health issues that face women;

(4) calls on the women of the United States to observe National Women's Check-Up Day by receiving preventive screenings from their health care providers; and

(5) recognizes the importance of federally funded programs that provide research and collect data on common diseases in women.

NATIONAL INTERNET SAFETY MONTH

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 205, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 205) designating June 2007 as "National Internet Safety Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I introduced a resolution designating June 2007 as National Internet Safety Month.

The Internet has become one of the most significant advances in the twentieth century and, as a result, it affects people's lives in a positive manner each day. However, this technology presents dangers that need to be brought to the attention of all Americans. Consider the pervasiveness of Internet access by children and the rapid increase in Internet crime and predatory behavior. Never before have powerful educational solutions—such as Internet safety curricula for grades kindergarten through 12—been more critical and readily at hand.

Mr. President, i-SAFE America is one nonprofit organization that has worked tirelessly to educate our youth and our community on these important issues. Formed in 1998, i-SAFE America educates youth in all 50 states, Washington, DC, and Department of Defense schools worldwide to ensure that they have a safe experience online.

It is imperative that all Americans learn about the Internet safety strategies which will help keep their children safe from victimization. Consider the facts: In the United States, about 35 million school-aged children have Internet access. Eighty percent of middle and high school students are online for at least one hour per week.

An alarming statistic is that 61 percent of middle and high school youths admit to using the Internet unsafely or inappropriately. Furthermore, at least 20 percent of these students have met face-to-face with someone they first met online and 23 percent of these students know of someone who has been bullied online.

Now is the time for America to focus its attention on supporting Internet safety, especially bearing in mind that children will soon be on summer vacation and will spend more time online.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 205) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 205

Whereas there are more than 1,000,000,000 Internet users worldwide;

Whereas, in the United States, 35,000,000 children in kindergarten through grade 12 have Internet access;

Whereas approximately 80 percent of the children of the United States in grades 5 through 12 are online for at least 1 hour per week;

Whereas approximately 41 percent of students in grades 5 through 12 do not share with their parents what they do on the Internet;

Whereas approximately 24 percent of students in grades 5 through 12 have hidden their online activities from their parents;

Whereas approximately 31 percent of the students in grades 5 through 12 have the skill to circumvent Internet filter software;

Whereas 61 percent of the students admit to using the Internet unsafely or inappropriately;

Whereas 20 percent of middle school and high school students have met face-to-face with someone they first met online;

Whereas 23 percent of students know someone who has been bullied online;

Whereas 56 percent of parents feel that online bullying of children is an issue that needs to be addressed;

Whereas 47 percent of parents feel that their ability to monitor and shelter their children from inappropriate material on the Internet is limited; and

Whereas 61 percent of parents want to be more personally involved with Internet safety: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 2007 as "National Internet Safety Month";

(2) recognizes that National Internet Safety Month provides the citizens of the United States with an opportunity to learn more about—

(A) the dangers of the Internet; and

(B) the importance of being safe and responsible online;

(3) commends and recognizes national and community organizations for—

(A) promoting awareness of the dangers of the Internet; and

(B) providing information and training that develops critical thinking and decision-making skills that are needed to use the Internet safely; and

(4) calls on Internet safety organizations, law enforcement, educators, community leaders, parents, and volunteers to increase their efforts to raise the level of awareness for the need for online safety in the United States.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF A NATIONAL CHILDREN AND FAMILIES DAY

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to H. Con. Res. 62.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 62) supporting the goals and ideals of a National Children and Families Day, in order to encourage adults in the United States to support and listen to children and to help children throughout the Nation achieve their hopes and dreams, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 62) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1415

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I understand that S. 1415, introduced earlier today by Senator REID, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1415) to move the United States toward greater energy independence and security, to increase the production of clean renewable fuels, to protect consumers from price gouging, to increase the energy efficiency of products, buildings, and vehicles, to promote research on and deploy greenhouse gas capture and storage options, and to improve the energy performance of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on the Reid-McConnell amendment No. 1123, then all other amendments and motions be withdrawn; the substitute amendment be agreed to; the bill be read a third time and the Senate then immediately vote on final passage; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees; with the preceding all occurring without intervening action or debate.

I further ask unanimous consent that upon the disposition of H.R. 2206, the Senate begin debating the conference report on the budget resolution, notwithstanding the receipt of papers; that the time until 3 p.m. be equally divided between Senators CONRAD and GREGG or their designees; that at 3 p.m., the Senate vote on passage of the conference report, notwithstanding the receipt of papers; provided the House has adopted the conference report by that time. If the House has not acted by that time, the Senate vote be delayed until the House has adopted the conference report. I further ask unanimous consent that if the House does not act on Thursday, May 17, then there remain 1 hour each for the chairman and ranking member to use prior to the vote on the conference report whenever the Senate does consider the conference report and that it be in order to consider it notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION WITHDRAWN—
H.R. 2206

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion on H.R. 2206 be withdrawn.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 17,
2007

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 9:30 a.m. Thursday, May 17; that on Thursday, following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day; that the Senate begin consideration of H.R. 2206, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, as provided for under a previous order, with the time provided under that order equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

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

CONGRATULATING SENATORS BOXER AND INHOFE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, let me take this moment as in morning business to salute Senators BARBARA BOXER and INHOFE of Oklahoma for passage of the Water Resources Development Act. If I am not mistaken, it has been 6 years that we have been trying to do this—maybe longer—and this important infrastructure legislation is an example of bipartisan cooperation.

Many people from time to time ask why we spend so much time arguing on the floor of the Senate. I hope they paid close attention to the proceedings of the last week, when Senator BOXER and Senator INHOFE, on a bipartisan basis, managed to pass a critically important bill for the United States of America. I salute them. It is an important bill for my State, the Midwest, and the Nation.

ACTION VITIATED—S. 1415

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the action on S. 1415 be vitiated.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:45 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 17, 2007, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 16, 2007:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

ELIZABETH A. DUKE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 1998, VICE SUSAN SCHMIDT BIES, RESIGNED.

LARRY ALLAN KLANE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 1998, VICE MARK W. OLSON, RESIGNED.

RANDALL S. KROSZNER, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2008. (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

RONALD SPOEHEL, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, VICE GWENDOLYN BROWN, RESIGNED.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

ANDREW G. BIGGS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2013, VICE JAMES B. LOCKHART III, TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE.

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

LORNE W. CRANER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS. (NEW POSITION)

ALAN J. PATRICOFF, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS. (NEW POSITION)

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

MIGUEL CAMPANERIA, OF PUERTO RICO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2012, VICE GERARD SCHWARZ, TERM EXPIRED.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

CAROL WALLER POPE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2009. (REAPPOINTMENT), TO WHICH POSITION SHE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

SUSAN E. DUDLEY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, VICE JOHN D. GRAHAM, RESIGNED, TO WHICH POSITION SHE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE.