United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 2006 No. 81

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

Father Luke Palumbis, St. Basil Greek Orthodox Church, Stockton, CA, offered the following prayer:

Lord, have mercy. Heavenly Father, through Your love for all of Your creation and Your consummatory divine plan, You have established a natural, communal existence which symbiotically maintains fairness, serenity, shared support, concern for holistic well-being, and license from imposed control.

We thank You, Loving Master, that in accordance with this perfect model of Your creation, our Founding Fathers established a foundation for the formation of what they termed a more perfect Union through the establishment of justice, the ensuring of domestic tranquility, the providing for common defense, the promoting of general welfare, and the securing of the blessings of liberty.

We beseech You, All Holy One, to strengthen our civic leaders and our entire population of America with the virtues of humility, courage, and perseverance so that today we may actualize the poetic words of our Constitution not only as United States, but as united individual Americans, living in the union of God's creation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GINGREY 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.

DEMOCRATS STILL NEED TO DECIDE WHERE THEY STAND ON WAR ON TERROR

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week the House voted to pass a resolution declaring that the United States will prevail in the global war on terror. The House spent 10 hours debating the measure, which came on the heels of two victories, the formation of the Iraqi Government and the death of Abu Musab al Zarqawi.

House Republicans made clear that we are determined to prevail in protecting our freedoms from the terrorists, but House Democrats couldn't even develop a unified message to let the American people know where they stand on the global war on terror. While House Republicans stood firmly in support behind our troops, House Democrats were all over the place. The San Diego Union Tribune reported on this confusion by saying, ''Some Democrats stand with the White House, some change their views day to day, some incredibly don't believe Iraq has much to do with the war on terrorism. They seem to want Iraq to collapse in civil war rather than have any sort of resolution that can be seen as vindication of U.S. foreign policy.''

Mr. Speaker, the American people have a clear choice: House Republicans are committed to winning this global war on terror, while House Democrats seem to want to give up and concede defeat.

BLACK ROBE DISEASE

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, judicial injustice has struck again. That is what has happened in Ohio.

After 6 years of waiting to face the man who raped her and tell her horror at his hands so he would be off the streets, a teen saw her chances for justice smashed with one swoop of a rogue judge's gavel. It was nothing the victim did; it wasn't even anything the defendant did. Judge Eileen Gallagher dismissed the girl's case, get this, because the prosecutor was late to court. Furious he hadn't been on time when she herself was 45 minutes late to her own court, Judge Gallagher called the prosecutor unprofessional, so she took it out on the victim.

Judge Gallagher suffers from ''black robe disease,'' an incurable ailment, arrogant, hypocritical incompetence some judges get.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a judge in Texas for 22 years, and a lawyer was late to court, hold the lawyer in contempt, put him in jail. Don't let the defendant out of jail. Don't punish the victim.

The teen victim was raped by the defendant, then raped by her right to justice by Judge Gallagher. Hopefully the people of Ohio will hold this judge in contempt and dismiss her from the bench.

That's just the way it is.

A CALL FOR A NEW DIPLOMACY

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, if you had a friend who anytime he took the car out for a drive got in a wreck, if you really cared about your friend and others, you would take away the car

Printed on recycled paper.

keys. Nearly every time this administration takes the U.S. for a drive out in the world, it crashes the car. Look at Iraq: no diplomacy, confrontation, attack, occupation. Iran: no diplomacy, confrontation. North Korea: no diplomacy, threats, confrontation, even when they are preparing a missile test.

Instead of a national missile defense system which doesn't work protecting us against a North Korea missile of dubious accuracy, we should look at talking with them. North Korea wants direct talks. Well, talk to them. Don't crash the car.

America must be able to negotiate in a complex world without confrontation and creating enemies. You are either with us or against us or bring it on? That is not a path towards successful diplomacy.

There is a basic flaw in America's world view and this administration's world view. This, then, is a call for a new diplomacy, policies where we look at potential adversaries as potential allies, and then acting upon that vision.

IMMIGRATION AND BORDER SECURITY

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, the more people learn about TED KENNEDY's immigration bill, the less they like it. Let me give you four examples.

First, before we build a border security fence on our own U.S. property, we must first consult with the Mexican Government to make sure it is okay with them.

Second, using a fake Social Security card is a felony in this country. If an American citizen does it, he goes to jail. If an illegal alien does it, he gets to collect Social Security benefits based on past illegal conduct, and even gets a chance at citizenship.

Third, when it comes to in-state college tuition, illegal aliens get it, but U.S. citizens from out of State pay higher tuition rates.

Fourth, illegals who become so-called guest workers would get the higher union-level prevailing wage on private construction contracts, something even U.S. citizens don't get.

Mr. Speaker, we should first secure our borders and enforce the law, not appease the liberal constituency of TED KENNEDY by accepting his pathetic bill.

DEMOCRATS REFUSE TO IGNORE THE NEEDS OF LOW-INCOME AMERICANS

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, this week was supposed to finally have a vote on increasing the minimum wage for more than 7 million Americans. Unfortunately, it appears the Republican leadership is willing to delay a vote on the must-pass Labor-HHS appropriations bill rather than actually have a real floor debate and a vote on the minimum wage.

This is a real disservice to every American. An increase in the minimum wage does not only benefit the minimum-wage workers, it also helps millions of middle-class workers who would also see their hourly wages increase as a result of a higher minimum wage.

But this is also a question of fairness. It has been 9 years since the minimum-wage workers last received a pay raise. Does that sound fair? Today the minimum wage is its lowest level if you take into account inflation. Do my Republican colleagues really believe that we should continue to force more than 7 million Americans to live on less than $11,000 a year? That may have been a liveable wage 10 years ago, but it surely isn't now. We should do the right thing and expand economic opportunity to millions of Americans who are just trying to make a living wage.

MS–13 AND IMMIGRATION

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, crime by illegal immigrant members of criminal street gangs is exploding. Immigration and Custom Enforcement has stated, ''The victims of gang crime are not limited to rival gang members. Entire neighborhoods are held hostage by and subjected to the violence of street gangs.''

Currently alien members of criminal street gangs are not deportable. Many of the U.S. members of one of the international criminal gangs are present here under temporary protective status. MS–13 originated in El Salvador, complicating detention and deportation. A 1988 Ninth Circuit Federal Court injunction prevents expedited removal of Salvadorans due to a vicious civil war in this country. That civil war ended in 1992, and the injunction still remains. As a result, captured El Salvadorans are immediately released. In 2005, 40,000 Salvadoran illegals were apprehended. However, we currently estimated that for each individual caught, five cross our borders successfully.

SLOGANS DO NOT REPLACE SOLUTIONS

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing we have learned from the Republican Congress in the last 6 years, it is that slogans do not replace solutions. On America's most pressing issues, they have failed to act, and on others they demonstrated an uncanny Midas touch.

Take the $800 billion prescription drug benefit. Rather than reducing costs for seniors, it is nothing more than an ATM machine for HMOs and drug companies. Two studies released yesterday show that the prices of medicines used by seniors are rising twice the rate of inflation. Consider the energy bill. In June 2005, a month before the bill passed, gas was $2.07; today, it is more than $3.

On immigration, the House Republicans have sent up a white flag, an issue which they have ignored for 6 years. They offer more talk, less action. They won't pass a bill. They want a single-issue election on something they haven't done a single thing on.

Even yesterday's conviction of the Bush administration chief procurement officer for influence peddling won't shame them into passing real lobbying or ethics reform. They deny an increase in the minimum wage and a vote on that legislation.

Mr. Speaker, one thing is clear: When it comes to addressing the issues important to American families, the Republican Congress is all hat and no cattle. It is time for a new direction. It is time for a change.

DEM AGENDA

(Mr. MCHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCHENRY. Doomsday. That is what the Democrats have to offer. But, actually, we have been waiting for weeks, months, actually over a year now for the Democrats to offer an agenda, and they did that last week, although agenda may be a little too strong of a word. It should be more appropriately called the Cliff Notes for Liberal Lunacy.

Case in point. They say they need to require fiscal discipline. Is this some kind of joke coming from the Dems? This is the same party that has proposed $45 billion in new spending on this House floor to appropriations bills over and above what we as Republicans want to fund.

Where do Democrats propose eliminating the deficit, by cutting the size of growth? Do they do that? No. They actually just want to go back to raising your taxes for all hardworking Americans.

The Democrats are calling from the same old playbook: Promise, tax, spend. Promise, tax, spend. And what we have with their agenda is more of the same.

□ 1015

LINE ITEM VETO IS NOTHING BUT DIVERSION

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are going to try to demonstrate that they are serious about reversing the record deficits that they have created. What is their plan?

They want to give President Bush a line item veto. Incredible.

If the President was really interested in curbing Federal expenditures, he could have vetoed any number of appropriations bills over the last 5 years. To this date, Mr. Speaker, the President has not vetoed one bill that has come out of this Republican Congress, not one. President Bush is the longest sitting President since Thomas Jefferson not to exercise the veto.

So one might ask, why does the President need a line item veto when he refuses to use the veto? The fact is, Mr. Speaker, this is nothing more than a smokescreen invented by the Republicans to show that they are serious about deficit reduction.

They are trying to divert attention away from the fact that under their control record surpluses have turned into record deficits. If President Bush really wanted to exercise discipline, he would have vetoed other legislation.

IRAQ

(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the impressive work our troops are doing to fight and win the global war on terror.

Last week, we debated a resolution pledging our commitment to victory in Iraq. I was troubled by some of the rhetoric I heard coming from other side of the aisle. Many Democrats are still advocating a withdrawal policy, and that is a policy that is sure to fail.

Mr. Speaker, we are making significant strides toward a secure Iraq and a more stable Middle East. At that critical moment, it would be a tremendous mistake for us to set a hard deadline for troop withdrawal. A deadline only serves to embolden the terrorists because they know they only have to hold out for a few more weeks or months, or 6 months.

Instead, the House last week sent a resounding message to al Qaeda that we will withdraw when the Iraqi security forces are ready and able to defeat the terrorists and their brutal tactics. This, and not some arbitrary deadline, is our true measure of success.

Mr. Speaker, once again, we have assured our troops that we will support them and will allow them to finish this critical mission.

REPUBLICANS STALL BILL THAT WOULD BOOST SALARIES

(Mr. FILNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, workers across this Nation are increasingly being asked to do more with less. As prices rise at the gas pump, at pharmacies, on college loans, the millions of Americans who work full-time and make minimum wage are slipping further and further into poverty.

The minimum wage in this country has not been raised since 1997 and is now at its lowest level in 50 years, when adjusted for inflation. Making only $5.15 an hour, a full-time, minimum wage employee will earn only $10,700 annually. This is far from enough to make ends meet, especially for the 75 percent or so who are responsible for at least half of their family's income. Raising children on a middle-class income is hard enough. Imagine trying to do it on less than a third of that.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats believe that the minimum wage should be a living wage. No American who works full-time, all year, should live in poverty, unable to support their family. Last week at the committee level, Democrats were successful in inserting a minimum wage increase into an appropriations bill. But now, the Republican leadership says they will not permit a vote on the minimum wage. They will not permit a vote in this full House.

It is time for real action to move hardworking Americans out of poverty. Seven million Americans deserve a raise today.

WHERE IS THE OUTRAGE?

(Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, where is the outrage? We hear stories today of two of our soldiers having suffered unspeakable tortures and left in a nearly unrecognizable condition, yet where are the cries of outrage against this brutality?

Instead, we hear today of the EU leadership focused on closing Gitmo and Members of this body rushing to judgment on national TV before the facts are known about what our troops in the field have done.

Yes, we should hold our troops to the highest ethical standards, but we must be outraged by acts against our troops. Our troops deserve our full support, and we must recognize the intensity of evil that we face, the lengths they will go to harm America and undermine our values, and the need to make sure we win this war on terror to keep our families safe at home.

HONORING ALBERT HILL ODOM

(Mr. BOYD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and pay tribute to Mr. Albert Hill Odom, a good friend and a loving husband and father, who passed away on June 6, 2006, at the age of 87.

Mr. Odom was a great man who positively impacted many young lives, including my own. Mr. Odom was a 4–H extension agent for 30 years in Jefferson County, Florida. He taught me and many others so much, not only about the principles of 4–H, but also how to conduct ourselves in a respectful and professional way. We were all young farm boys whom he carried to places we had never been before.

I am often asked who the most influential people in my life have been, and my answer is always, first, my father, then Albert Odom, my 4–H agent. A lifelong mentor and role model, Albert Odom was a wonderful man who left the world a better place than he found it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Albert Odom for his many achievements in life and the legacy that he leaves. I extend my deepest sympathy to the Odom family, including his wife, Dot, and his children, Carol and Martha. He will be greatly missed by his family and all who knew him.

STATE CHAMPS—LASSITER AND BLESSED TRINITY

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly rise to honor and congratulate some spectacular student athletes from Georgia's Sixth District. This month, two of our hometown high schools won a State baseball championship.

Marietta's Lassiter High School and Roswell's Blessed Trinity High both took home their respective class' State championship in dominating fashion. These skilled young men showed what is possible with hard work and unending determination.

Lassiter took home the school's second State title after beating another Sixth District team, Kell High School. The Trojans ended their season with 19 straight wins, sweeping every round of the playoffs.

Blessed Trinity amazed everyone with their ascendancy to the State title in only 6 years of existence. Similar to Lassiter, the Titans went through the playoffs losing only one game and sweeping four out of five series.

These student athletes will forever cherish the memory of this season. The players, their families, and their classmates who cheered them on will always look back at the 2006 season as a source of pride, accomplishment and satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, congratulations to all from Lassiter and Blessed Trinity High Schools.

A PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT THAT PUTS SENIORS FIRST

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, House Democrats continue the fight for a real prescription drug benefit that puts America's seniors first. There is no doubt that the current prescription drug program could be improved.

Today, the Department of Veterans Affairs is saving millions of dollars a year simply by negotiating drug prices on behalf of our country's veterans. Just imagine how much more affordable drugs would be if the Federal Government could negotiate for lower prices on behalf of our country's 40 million seniors.

Seniors who need help affording their monthly prescription drug bills deserve to be heard.

House Democrats not only support requiring Medicare to negotiate lower prices with the drug companies, we also favor allowing for the safe reimportation of less expensive drugs from abroad. These are real solutions. Let us finally put our seniors first and help them afford their prescription drugs.

HELPING AMERICAN SENIORS MAINTAIN INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Census Bureau estimates that more than 36 million Americans are over the age of 65, making them members of the fastest growing age group in our country. Under the able leadership of Chairman BUCK MCKEON, House Republicans are working to ensure the quality and effectiveness of Federal programs designed to help America's elderly.

Today, I am proud to speak in support of the Senior Independence Act of 2006, which proposes several necessary reforms to help older individuals avoid institutional care, improve their health services, and have access to employment-based training programs. By reviewing and modernizing programs established over 50 years ago, we are helping to ensure that America's government programs actually address the needs of today's seniors.

This bill will help ensure America's seniors live healthier and happier lives.

In conclusion, our sympathies are with the families of Private Thomas Tucker and Private Kristian Menchaca. God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

WE NEED A LIVABLE WAGE

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, somebody asked me the other day how do you strengthen the economy, and I said to them that you strengthen it by putting additional money into the hands and the pockets of those at the economic bottom. If they get an additional dollar or two, what are they going to do with it? They are going to buy milk, Cream of Wheat, oatmeal, pay the utility bill, maybe some gasoline for an automobile, if they still have one. They will put it right back into the economy.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we need a livable wage. Money to the economy is like blood to the body. If too much of it is on one side, you will have a stroke. Our economy has a stroke because too much of the money is in the hands of too few people. We need a livable wage.

WE MADE THE RIGHT DECISION

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, for decades, America and free countries in Europe, Africa and Southeast Asia have been the targets of terrorism, terrorism that originated in the Middle East and has been if not openly supported by countries there then at the very least overlooked by these nations.

On September 11, we decided that periodic attacks like the bombing of the Pan Am Flight 103, the USS *Cole*, Khobar Towers, the first World Trade Center bombing, we decided that that had to stop. We decided the only way to end these attacks was going into the Middle East and let it be known that we would no longer tolerate regimes that encouraged terrorism and shunned the rules most in the civilized world choose to abide by.

That was the right decision then. It remains the right decision today.

DEMOCRATS WORKING TO EXPAND OPPORTUNITY TO MINIMUM WAGE WORKERS

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Democrats want to give minimum-wage workers their first pay raise in 9 years. Can you imagine working 9 years and never have a pay raise? Gas went up, milk went up, housing went up, electricity went up, and the House Republicans are doing everything they can to avoid the issue.

Last week, seven Republicans on the House Appropriations Committee voted with Democrats to increase the minimum wage from $5.15 to $7.25 as part of the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, but now the leaders of the Republican Party refuse to bring this bill to the floor, hoping they can skirt the issue until after election.

Can you imagine if you had to wait till after an election to get some more money to buy that gas that is $3 a gallon?

The Republican leaders must have done a lot of arm twisting over the weekend because when Democrats called for an increase in the minimum wage on another appropriations bill yesterday, not one of those seven who were with us last week, who had the guts to be with us last week, were with us yesterday.

I just cannot understand why the House Republicans refuse to allow a floor vote on minimum wage. They will not do it because they know the American people will not vote for them if they do not increase the rate.

SENIOR INDEPENDENCE ACT

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to commend Chairman MCKEON of the Energy and Workforce Committee and Congressman TIBERI, who chairs the relevant subcommittee of that committee.

Today, we are going to discuss on suspension a bill that they have created, the Senior Independence Act, which is the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act. They have done excellent work, and I also want to thank Congressman DANNY DAVIS, who has worked with me and I have worked with him to make certain that we also address mental health issues in this bill.

Last winter, I had the pleasure of meeting Suzann Ogland-Hand, who is one of my constituents, and whom I nominated for the White House Conference on Aging. She is a mental health expert, and she helps large numbers of elderly people deal with their mental health problems.

Clearly, this is an issue whose time has come, and I am very pleased that the bill we will be taking up today under suspension includes provisions that will take care of the mental health needs of so many Americans, large and small, and deal with all the different issues that the elderly face.

I commend, again, Mr. MCKEON for bringing this bill to the floor.

□ 1030

WHAT A DIFFERENCE A WEEK MAKES

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of my favorite scriptures is, ''Let the work I have done speak for me.'' Mr. Speaker, what a difference a week makes. Last week seven House Republicans joined Democrats in supporting an increase in the minimum wage. Yesterday, when the measure came up in another appropriation bill, they certainly changed their minds and joined the rest of the Republicans in ignoring the needs of 7 million hard-working minimum-wage workers, which begs the question: What exactly happened over the last 7 days to make those seven Republicans change their minds?

They certainly didn't spend any time with minimum-wage workers, otherwise they would have heard how the

workers can barely make ends meet, considering that those who work have to work an entire 8-hour shift just to fill up their gas tank, if they are lucky enough to have a car. In the wealthiest country in the world, this is not acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, House Democrats want to expand economic opportunities for 7 million Americans. Let the work we do make a difference for the working men and women in this country.

DEMOCRATS ATTEMPTING TO INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, over the past 5 years, average, hardworking Americans have been ignored by the Republicans in Washington. While House Republicans have been showering their corporate interest friends with tons of tax breaks, they have refused for 9 years, for 9 years, to bring to the floor a vote to increase the minimum wage. It is time that this Congress gave 7 million people across the United States a raise.

Last week the Democrats were successful in adding a minimum wage to the labor appropriation bill, and it was supposed to be on the floor this week, but the House leadership refuses to bring it up. They want to bring it up after the elections. Why would that be? They are afraid if they vote against it, which they need to vote against the minimum wage, the rest of you Americans won't vote for them. So they are going to wait until after the election.

The American people should know that House Democrats are not running away from this issue. In fact, increasing the minimum wage is one of our top priorities.

LINE ITEM VETO WON'T BALANCE BUDGET

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, over the next couple of days we are going to hear a lot from House Republicans about how they are finally being fiscally responsible by giving the President a line item veto. The House Republicans are kidding themselves if they believe this will reverse the fiscal collapse they have presided over the last 5 years.

If House Republicans were really interested in restoring fiscal discipline here in Washington, they would have adopted a 2007 budget that actually balanced the budget in the coming years. Instead, the House Republican budget actually makes the deficit worse, offers no plan to bring the budget back in balance, and adds to the growing burden of the national debt. Thanks to these Republican budgets, the five largest deficits in history will have occurred in these last 5 consecutive years.

Giving President Bush a line item veto will not change the course. Instead, we need to go in a new direction. House Democrats offered an alternative that balanced the Federal budget by 2012. Our proposal also restored pay-as-you-go rules that were so successful in turning deficits into surpluses in the 1990s. Democrats offered a fiscally sound plan, but Republicans rejected it.

So much for Republican fiscal discipline.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

AMENDING FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5060) to amend the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 to require data with respect to Federal financial assistance to be available for public access in a searchable and user friendly form, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5060

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

SECTION 1. DATA WITH RESPECT TO FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE REQUIRED TO BE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC ACCESS IN SEARCHABLE AND USER-FRIENDLY FORM.

(a) DATA REQUIREMENTS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall, as part of the implementation of the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–107; 31 U.S.C. 6101 note), work with the Administrator of General Services and other agencies to make available data with respect to Federal financial assistance in accordance with this section and section 204 of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–347; 44 U.S.C. 3501 note).

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The Director shall ensure that the data required under subsection (a), at a minimum—

(1) are available on the Internet, from a single website database, at no cost to the public;

(2) contain—

(A) all information and types of information (in this section referred to as ''data fields'') collected through the Federal Assistance Award Data System, Grants.gov, or any other existing Federal database; and

(B) additional information about each Federal financial assistance award, including program source or funding authority, statutory or regulatory authority, renewability, number of applicants and recipients, type of activity being performed, required measurable outcomes, and any other relevant information;

(3) are in a form that allows for full searching and aggregation of all data fields across all agencies;

(4) include information about Federal financial assistance awards within 30 days after award of the assistance;

(5) identify the Federal financial assistance that a recipient has received during the preceding 10-year period, including an itemized breakdown of that assistance by agency and program source;

(6) include lists of Federal financial assistance awards and the dates and amounts of Federal fund disbursements; and

(7) identify subgrantees that are non-Federal entities.

(c) DOWNLOAD ABILITY.—The Director also shall ensure that the website containing the data allows for the public to download—

(1) results of searches; and

(2) the entire database on a quarterly basis.

(d) PERIOD COVERED.—For purposes of subsection (b)(5), the first 10-year period to be covered shall begin with the year 2006.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) The term ''Federal financial assistance'' has the same meaning as defined in section 7501(a)(5) of title 31, United States Code, except that, in applying such definition, the term ''non-Federal entity'' has the meaning provided in paragraph (2).

(2) The term ''non-Federal entity'' means a State, local government, nonprofit organization, corporation, association, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, or any other legal business entity.

(f) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENT.—The website database made available pursuant to this section shall not be considered in compliance with this section if it only provides electronic links to the Federal Assistance Award Data System, Grants.gov, or other existing websites and databases, unless each of those sites has information from all agencies and meets the requirements of subsections (b) and (c).

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The data shall be available for public use not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Majority Whip ROY BLUNT and I introduced H.R. 5060, which would amend the Federal Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 to require data with respect to Federal financial assistance to be

available for public access in a searchable and user-friendly form. The bill would require the Office of Management and Budget to create a Web site for all grant awards to be displayed in a format that would be easily accessible and free of charge. Each award would be required to be listed on the Web site within 30 days of its enactment.

No such real-time disclosure is required today of grant awards, and available data is often untimely. Currently there is no central database of all entities receiving Federal funds, including the nearly 30,000 organizations that are awarded nearly $300 billion in Federal grants each year. In fact, several agencies have taken different approaches to making public information about grantees, and often little or no information is available on line.

Our bill would put the framework in place for increased sunshine on the Federal grant process, allowing anyone with access to the Internet to review and search Federal assistance awards, thus providing greater transparency to the grant-making process.

I congratulate my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, for recognizing the importance of this issue and working so hard to bring this measure forward. I also want to thank my ranking member Mr. WAXMAN for working to move this legislation forward in a bipartisan way. This bill adds much-needed transparency to the Federal grant process. I also want to thank Mr. DAVIS, too, my colleague from Illinois, for his assistance in this.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the chairman of the Government Reform Committee, Chairman DAVIS, in consideration of H.R. 5060, which calls for the creation of a new searchable database of all Federal grants to be made publicly available on the Internet.

I have always had serious concerns about any decision to bring a bill to the floor without the opportunity for hearings or other committee consideration, but I have been very pleased with Majority Whip BLUNT and Chairman DAVIS' willingness to work together over the past week to address problems with the bill and to make revisions.

As revised, the bill will require the Office of Management and Budget to develop a database that would be useful to individuals and organizations researching Federal grant funding. The database will provide a complete record of Federal grant funding, including information about grantees and the purpose and requirements of each grant. The requirement that the database be fully searchable and available for download is also most important.

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to increase public understanding of Federal spending and public access to information about how taxpayer dollars are spent. Currently the public has access to a data system, the Federal Assistance Award Data System, that provides limited information about domestic grants, but this system is unwieldy and difficult to use. Under this bill public oversight of Federal spending will increase.

The bill is a step in the right direction, but it is missing a key component that is essential to public oversight. I had hoped that the legislation we are considering today would have required that information on Federal contracts be included in the database or in a similar separate database of Federal contracts. As Federal contract spending increases, there is a vital need for the public to be able to track and understand this spending.

As with the Federal Assistance Award Data System for grants, there is a publicly available database of contracts, the Federal Procurement Data System, but it, too, is plagued with problems. This data system is often incomplete, and, like the grant data system, is unwieldy and difficult to use. Currently it is virtually impossible for the public to accurately track Federal contract spending.

I understand that Chairman DAVIS has agreed to work on improving the FPDS with Ranking Member WAXMAN and others in order to make Federal contract information freely and easily accessible to the public. I, quite frankly, look forward to this collaboration, and I hope that when the new database of Federal grants is made available on a Web site for the public to search and download at no charge, there will also be a new FPDS system or other new contracts database made available that is just as accessible and usable as the new grants database that we are dealing with.

I want to again commend the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and its ranking member, Mr. WAXMAN, for the tremendous leadership that they both provide in a very bipartisan way. I think that is one of the reasons that you see us down here so often with bills that have come through that committee ready for passage on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his kind words and also thank him for his many, many contributions to the committee and the bipartisan approach we have taken to issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the majority whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), who is the chief author of this legislation.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the chairman for yielding, Mr. Speaker, and I also thank Mr. DAVIS for his generous comments and his hard work on this bill.

Over the past several months, Mr. Speaker, we have had good discussions in the House about earmarks and earmark reform. The House has committed to pass and will pass earmark reform to increase sunshine on the earmark process, yet there is another process in the Federal Government that, despite spending over $300 billion a year, has almost no disclosure. That is really the purpose of this bill.

Each year the Federal Government gives out thousands of grants to various organizations and entities. All told, about 30,000 organizations a year receive grants, yet there is no central system available to the public or even to the Congress to determine who is receiving these taxpayer funds and how they are being spent.

Chairman DAVIS and I have introduced H.R. 5060, the bill we are considering today, to correct this. This legislation requires the Office of Management and Budget to establish a searchable public Web site listing all recipients of Federal financial assistance, such as grants and loans. Within 30 days of a grant award, the following information would be available to the public through this single site on the Internet and should be and would be required by law to be easily searchable:

There would be the name of the grantee and the subgrantees who have received the award; an itemized breakdown of that assistance by agency and program source; and all of the grants that the grantee has received in the past 10 years.

This database will serve as an invaluable tool enabling Congress, the public, and the media to easily determine who is receiving taxpayer funds. This information will be critical in uncovering wasteful spending and ensuring compliance with existing Federal laws, including the 1995 Lobbying Disclosure Act.

There are numerous examples of wasteful government grants, such as millions of dollars spent by the National Institute of Mental Health to study what makes a meaningful day for college students or to study how college students decorate their dorm rooms.

□ 1045

I was a college president for 4 years, and I will tell you that is a study that is not only not worth having, but something that nobody wants to know about.

Often such waste has been uncovered by the inspector general from the various agencies, such as an effort made by the inspector general in 2003 that resulted in an EPA grant from the 1990s, where $700,000 was spent, was granted, without any knowledge of what work the recipient was going to perform. Under this law, that information will become publicly and quickly available.

This bill will empower everybody with access to the Internet to begin reviewing Federal grants and other forms of taxpayer assistance to look for such waste, fraud and abuse. This, in turn, will help us become better stewards of taxpayer funds.

This legislation will also help to ensure that Federal laws are adhered to by those receiving Federal funds. Frequently, Federal law imposes various restrictions or requirements on Federal grantees. For example, Congress has required that entities receiving funds under our global AIDS programs have a firm policy opposing prostitution and sex trafficking. Yet last year, the Government Reform Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources uncovered that a USAID grantee was subgranting taxpayer funds to an organization that was pro-prostitution. This bill requires grantees to also disclose their subgrantees, thus making it easier to ensure compliance with important Federal policies like those that would be applicable to this and other funds.

This legislation will also ensure compliance with existing lobbying restrictions. The 1995 Lobbying Disclosure Act prohibits organizations that receive Federal grants from lobbying, even with their own funds. The restriction has been difficult to enforce. This access to information about who gets grants makes it easier to see that the lobbying bill itself is enforced.

It is my belief that this bill will provide important information to all Americans and serve as a powerful to tool to improve how the government spends precious taxpayer funds.

I want to thank Chairman DAVIS and ranking member WAXMAN for their assistance in moving this legislation forward. And in particular, I want to thank the staff of the Committee on Government Reform, particularly Ellen Brown, Mason Alinger, and Ed Puccarella for their tremendous efforts to help my staff with this bill and to improve the bill as it moved through the committee. I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend from Branson for yielding, and I rise in strong support of this legislation.

As my colleague knows, we have been focusing on the issue of accountability, transparency and greater disclosure as we look at the challenge of trying to put into place lobby and ethics reform which passed in this House with bipartisan support. We are still working with the Senate on that.

And the notion of oversight is something that is a very important constitutional responsibility that we have. This measure that the distinguished majority whip has pursued is, I believe, very important in recognizing that greater transparency and disclosure is important.

I do appreciate his commitment to ensure that as information comes forward, and his experience for 4 years as a college president demonstrates, that we will not, in fact, have to have a greater degree of transparency on what will be disclosed as to what is existing on the walls of those college dormitories. But I do believe that the American people should have an opportunity to gain access to as much information as possible when it deals with the awarding of these grants.

I thank Chairman DAVIS and Mr. DAVIS and Mr. WAXMAN and all who have been involved in this and believe that it very importantly gets right at our core constitutional responsibility. I think this is a very, very helpful measure, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for his comments, his support of the bill and his clear understanding that as we bring transparency to the process of spending, that to not have transparency where most of the money is really spent would be a huge, huge gap in our efforts to make it easier to see how government money is spent, to see that it is more accountable and that we have a real way to access that, and the public as well as the Congress has a way to access that.

I thank the chairman and Mr. WAXMAN for the great work they have done to advance this bill.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. And as we shed more light and sunshine on congressional earmarks, grants are essentially executive earmarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

(Mr. SOUDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank Chairman DAVIS and our majority whip, Congressman BLUNT, for their leadership on this important legislation. I particularly want to thank the whip for making sure that this gets to the floor.

Our chairman knows and is regularly hearing our frustrations at the subcommittee level in Government Reform and Oversight because it has been so hard to get information from this administration. It was not easy from the last administration, either; and this is basic information that is necessary to do oversight.

So I rise in support of this bill and I thank the chairman for being persistent in backing up the subcommittee chairman in trying to receive this grant information in a searchable and user-friendly form.

Let me illustrate why H.R. 5060 is necessary.

We battled this with multiple agencies, whether it is the faith-based category as they give grants, National Parks, we have battled it in all kinds of narcotics oversight, but let me illustrate the specifics and detail in one of the most frustrating processes that I have ever dealt with that our majority whip just referred to in his statement.

In my capacity as chairman of the Committee on Government Reform Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources on October 6, 2005, I sent a letter to USAID seeking information about its funding of the pro-prostitution nongovernmental organization called SANGRAM in violation of Public Law 108–25, the United States Leadership Against HIV–DS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003.

According to an unclassified State Department memorandum obtained by subcommittee staff, Restore International, an anti-trafficking NGO that works with law enforcement agencies in India, was confronted by an USAID-funded NGO, SANGRAM, while the former attempted to rescue and provide long-term care for child victims of sex trafficking. The confrontation led to the release of 17 minor girls, victims of trafficking, into the hands of traffickers and trafficking accomplices. Now get this, a tax-funded organization in violation of Federal law forced the release of girls who were being rescued from sex trafficking. They were victims of trafficking and they turned them back to the traffickers and trafficking accomplices.

According to this memorandum, SANGRAM ''allowed a brothel keeper into a shelter to pressure the girls not to cooperate with counselors. The girls are now back in the brothels, being subjected to rape for profit.''

On November 16, 2005, a USAID briefer asserted to the Government Reform Committee staff that USAID had ''nothing to do with'' the grant to the pro-prostitution SANGRAM, and that the committee's inquiries were ''destructive.'' The subcommittee is now in possession of documents that demonstrate that USAID must provide a revised briefing to Congress on its true role.

These documents prove that USAID money financed the pro-prostitution SANGRAM through a second organization named Avert, which was established with the assistance of four USAID employees as a pass-through entity. USAID has held the ex-officio vice chairmanship of Avert since inception.

According to these documents, the USAID board member of Avert voted twice to award funding to SANGRAM, once on July 27, 2002, and again on December 3, 2004, the last time being some 18 months after the provisions of Public Law 108–25 prohibited taxpayer funding of pro-prostitution like SANGRAM.

That SANGRAM was a high-risk candidate for not complying with Public Law 108–25 should have been no surprise to USAID. SANGRAM was a cosigner, along with many other high-risk candidates, of a May 18, 2005, letter to President Bush opposing the anti-prostitution pledge.

Subcommittee staff found posted on a USAID-sponsored Web site a 5-year-old report from SANGRAM that states: ''We believe that when involuntary initiation into prostitution occurs, a process of socialization within the institution of prostitution exists, whereby the involuntary nature of the business changes increasingly into one of

active acceptance, not necessarily with resignation. This is not a coercive process.''

I agree with President Bush that ''it takes a special kind of depravity to exploit and hurt the most vulnerable members of society. Human traffickers rob children of their innocence; they expose them to the worst of life before they have seen much of life. Traffickers tear families apart. They treat their victims as nothing more than goods and commodities for sale to the highest bidder.''

It is inconceivable that an organization like SANGRAM could have received funding from the American taxpayer had USAID put in place an adequate management system to carry out Public Law 108–25.

On December 13, 2005, a large briefing team from the State Department and USAID met with staff from my subcommittee in order to demonstrate ownership of the problem and lay out corrective measures being taken. To my dismay and astonishment, the briefers were not prepared to discuss and exhibited little knowledge of the pass-through entity known as Avert that USAID has established and which served as the mechanism whereby NGOs in India were monitored and financed with American tax dollars.

Subcommittee staff knew more than the State Department USAID briefing team about this matter, thanks to Google searches on the Web for critical documents that had not been provided to the subcommittee by the administration.

At that meeting, USAID was requested by the subcommittee staff to establish an electronic registry for grantees and subgrantees to facilitate oversight by USAID Washington as well as by Congress and ensure compliance with the Federal law. That request has not been honored.

In the months since that December 13 appeal was made for an electronic registry, the subcommittee request has inspired two pieces of legislation: First in the other body, and the second we are debating here today. This scandal of financing pro-prostitution groups by USAID was highlighted by the authors in both Chambers as illustrating the need for this legislation.

On April 7, I asked USAID in writing to provide legal advice to make certain that all USAID grantees and subgrantees would be captured by H.R. 5060. That request, too, has not been honored.

I, for one, am out of patience having to wait months for agencies to reluctantly produce documents to shed light on how questionable projects are funded.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 5060 and begin the process of bringing sunshine on the processes of unelected bureaucrats doling out grants to questionable organizations.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I again thank Mr. WAXMAN and his staff and Mr. DAVIS for being here, and all of the staff on the Government Reform Committee on the minority side, Anna Luitin, Christopher Davis, Robin Appleberry, and Brian Cohen for their contributions to this legislation as well. We thank you for working with us.

I would just add that I would urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 5060, as amended.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5060 requires the Office of Management and Budget to create a web-based database of Federal grants.

I want to thank Majority Whip BLUNT and Chairman DAVIS for working with us to make changes to the bill as originally drafted. Based on these revisions, I am supporting the bill.

As modified, H.R. 5060 will create a robust, fully searchable database of all Federal grants that is free for members of the public to use. The database will contain a significant amount of information about each grant awarded—including details about the grantee, the process under which the grant was awarded, as well as the purpose and requirements of the grant.

Currently, there is an existing grants data system that is available to Members of Congress. The database that will be created under H.R. 5060 is an improvement over this existing system in two key ways: it will include more information and it will be available to the public, not just Members of Congress. As a result, this database will serve as a useful tool for individuals and organizations hoping to understand how the Federal Government distributes funds.

There is also an urgent need to improve the existing database of Federal contracts. Earlier this week, I released a report finding that the ''shadow government'' of private companies working under Federal contract has exploded in size over the past 5 years. Far more taxpayer dollars now go to contracts than to grants.

I had hoped that we would be able to add language improving the current contracts database, the Federal Procurement Data System, to this bill. The FPDS can be hard to use and is not fully accurate. Although it contains a significant amount of information about Federal contracts, it is not easily or freely searchable by members of the public. It must be fixed in order to provide the public with the ability to truly understand the role of contracts in the Federal Government.

We were not able to reach agreement on language to add a contracts database to this legislation. But Chairman DAVIS has pledged to work with me to address this issue in separate legislation.

Again, I want to thank the Majority Whip and the Chairman for working with us to amend H.R. 5060, and look forward to continuing this collaboration as we address the problems with the existing database of Federal contracts.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5060, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND HIGHER EDUCATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2006

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5603) to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5603

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 ''Second Higher Education Extension Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.

Section 2(a) of the Higher Education Extension Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–81; 20 U.S.C. 1001 note) is amended by striking ''June 30, 2006'' and inserting ''September 30, 2006''.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or in the Higher Education Extension Act of 2005 as amended by this Act, shall be construed to limit or otherwise alter the authorizations of appropriations for, or the durations of, programs contained in the amendments made by the Higher Education Reconciliation Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–171) to the provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Taxpayer-Teacher Protection Act of 2004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5603.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5603, the Second Higher Education Extension Act of 2006. This bill will provide a clean extension of the Higher Education Act for 3 months. This bill enjoys bipartisan support and is cosponsored by the chairman and ranking members of the full Education Committee and the Higher Education Subcommittee.

On March 30, 2006, the House of Representatives completed its work and passed the College Access and Opportunity Act to fully reauthorize the Higher Education Act. We strengthened Pell Grants, improved the Perkins Loan program, and expanded access for millions of American students.

However, the Senate has not yet acted to reauthorize the Higher Education Act. The Senate should soon act to pass the reauthorization bill so we

can have these important higher education reforms signed into law during this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this is a clean extension that will allow the important programs of the Higher Education Act to continue past their current June 30, 2006, expiration date until September 30, 2006. Programs like Pell Grants and Perkins Loans are the passports out of poverty for millions of American students. We must not break our commitment to higher education.

□ 1100

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 5603.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 5603, a 3-month extension of the Higher Education Act. I have enjoyed working with the new chairman of the subcommittee Mr. KELLER on this bill.

This bill, in essence, temporarily extends the last portions of the Higher Education Act not reauthorized in the reconciliation package.

During the 1998 reauthorization, I had the opportunity to work closely with Chairman MCKEON, now chairman of the full committee, in crafting a bipartisan bill. Our reauthorization attempts this Congress have been a little more rocky than in 1998. Most of the hard-hitting changes to the Higher Education Act and student aid have already been passed in reconciliation, which I opposed. That action forever removed nearly $12 billion from student aid programs and missed an opportunity to reinvest in students who are already struggling to pay for college.

In response, along with Representative MILLER, I recently introduced a bill called the Reverse the Raid on Student Aid Act, H.R. 5150. This bill would have cut interest rates in half for students and parents taking out subsidized loans, the borrowers most in need. This bill would save the average borrower already saddled with $17,500 in debt $6,600 over the life of their loan.

The consideration and passage of the Reverse the Raid on Student Aid Act is a critical investment in our global competitiveness and would offer real relief to students and families in need.

Let's set the record straight on Pell. Today we will hear about Republican support of Pell Grants. Yes, overall, spending on Pell Grants is on the rise, but Pell Grants are semientitlement programs, which means that if eligible students apply for Federal financial aid, they automatically get a Pell Grant. The increased spending they referred to is not because we are doing more to help individual students struggling to pay for college; this is because more students qualify, and more students are going to college. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have more poor students that need our help.

In reality, the individual Pell Grant has seen no meaningful increase in the last 5 years. In fact, Pell Grants today are worth $900 less in inflation-adjusted terms than they were in the 1975–1976 school year.

Until the appropriators restore the actual buying power of the Pell Grant to the $5,100 level promised by our President 6 years ago, we have not done anything meaningful in helping the students and families struggling to pay for college.

As we worked towards reauthorizing the remainder of the higher education through H.R. 609 in March, I had hoped we could change the tone of debate and act in the interest of the students that the Higher Education Act was intended to help. Unfortunately, in the end, my concerns in the bill still far outweighed any benefit. The bill that was considered was not something I considered comfortable to support, and, for that reason, opposed it.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman KELLER and Chairman MCKEON for offering H.R. 5603, the 3-month extension of the Higher Education Act. And because we still have time to work on this, and hopefully things can change, we can achieve some repair work, repair of the reconciliation act. I will support this and have cosponsored the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California, the chairman of the full Education and Workforce Committee, Mr. MCKEON.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the subcommittee chairman for his works on bringing this bill to the floor, and thank Mr. KILDEE for his work in supporting the bill.

It is important that we extend this act and give the Senate time to act on the bill, so I would encourage all of our colleagues to support the bill to help our young people get the education they need to realize the American dream.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5603, the Second Higher Education Extension Act of 2006. I thank the Chairman of the 21st Century Competitiveness Subcommittee, Mr. KELLER, for his work on this bill, as well as his consistent efforts on behalf of our Nation's college students and their families.

Discretionary programs under the Higher Education Act will expire on June 30, 2006, and this legislation before us simply extends the programs for an additional three months.

Earlier this year, when the Deficit Reduction Act was signed into law, we authorized the Act's mandatory spending programs. In the process, we reduced lender subsidies; increased loan limits for students; simplified the financial aid process; and provided additional resources for needy students studying math, science, and critical foreign languages in college. And we managed to achieve all that while also making certain that student aid programs operate more efficiently, saving U.S. taxpayers billions of dollars.

In March, the House backed H.R. 609, the College Access & Opportunity Act, which would reauthorize the remaining programs under the Higher Education Act. This bill would strengthen the Pell Grant program, empower parents and students through ''sunshine'' and transparency in college costs and accreditation, improve college access programs, and much more. I am hopeful that our friends on the other side of the Capitol will act on these reforms soon so these extensions will become a thing of the past.

In the meantime, however, Congress again must act to extend the Higher Education Act, which we have done previously on several occasions and with bipartisan support. The Second Higher Education Extension Act will ensure that vital Federal college access and student aid programs continue to serve those students who depend upon them. At the same time, the bill also gives our Senate colleagues additional time to complete a renewal of the Higher Education Act.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing new realities in an increasingly competitive global economy. U.S. workers of today are no longer just competing with one another for jobs, but also against counterparts across the globe. One avenue we have for tackling today's new climate is through education in general, but more significantly through higher education. That's why the Federal investment in the Higher Education Act is so vital. Our Nation has millions of low and middle income students aspiring to go to college. They not only deserve an opportunity to educate themselves, but we personally depend on their having that opportunity.

I encourage my colleagues to support the bill before us today and continue to work toward a fundamental reform package so that we can better serve American students pursuing the dream of a college education.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, almost 3 months to the day, I stood here in support of the third extension to the Higher Education Act with the hope that it would be the last short-term measure we needed to pass before we finally produced an improved bipartisan and long overdue reauthorization bill that reflects the best interest of America's college students.

I now rise in support of H.R. 5603 with a different hope, that the pending version of the Higher Education Act that the House passed in late March does not advance in the Senate, and that during the next session of Congress, under a new majority, we start over by making this legislation truly about increasing access and affordability.

On July 1, student borrowers will be burdened with a higher interest rate on their loans as a result of the administration's fiscal irresponsibility. Student loan interest rates are based on the 91-day T-bill, which is directly tied to the status of our economy. Based on today's current T-bill, interest rates for student borrowers who do not consolidate by July 1 will jump from 5.3 percent to 7.14 percent, which is a 34 percent increase in the rate.

Record-breaking budget deficits, tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, and an economic policy flawed by fiscal

irresponsibility have resulted in higher interest rates and our Nation's students having to pay for the mistakes of this administration and this Congress.

Last year the House leadership chose to cut student loans to the tune of $12 billion through the Deficit Reduction Act. With those cuts in the budget reconciliation bill, and now with higher interest rates on student loans, we are sending a message to America's students and their families that they are no longer among this Nation's top priorities.

As high school graduates and their proud parents calculate how they can squeeze college costs into their budget, they are discovering that it is an uphill climb for most families, made tougher by new higher interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I support this extension that we are considering here today, but I do not support the direction and actions of this Congress as it relates to higher education. We must do more to ensure that every qualified student has the chance to go to college.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the last couple of weeks and months have been times of mixed emotions for a lot of American families. Many people got the thick envelope in the mail that told them they were accepted to the school they really want to get into. And then it became time to figure out how to pay for it.

Now, a few families were fortunate enough, very few families were fortunate enough, they have enough income to meet the tuition payment. Others immediately went down to the bank and made a home equity loan application to figure out a way to borrow enough money to send their son or daughter to school. Others weren't so fortunate and had to decide some other course, maybe including not going to school at all. And then others who are themselves already parents who are raising children and working full time just can't figure out a way to do it without putting themselves so far in debt that it makes no sense to get an education.

This bill is a missed opportunity to address that problem. There were significant savings generated in the student loan programs that were thrown away by the reconciliation bill, the budget-cutting bill passed by this Congress late in 2005. Money that could have been used to raise loan limits, eliminate origination fees, expand programs where people can pay back their loan as a function of their income, money that could have been used to increase Pell Grants was instead put into the economic priorities of this majority: tax cuts for the very wealthy, subsidies for corporate America and misadventures around the world. So here we are feebly extending existing terms of this bill, while millions of American families struggle with the very real problem of how to pay for a higher education.

This is a missed opportunity. It calls for a radical change in the country's priorities away from tax breaks for the wealthy, away from welfare for corporate America, away from misadventures around the world, toward educating and investing in the people of this country. Those changes in priorities are coming.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I also yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5603.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4755

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor from the bill, H.R. 4755.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SENIOR INDEPENDENCE ACT OF 2006

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5293) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2007 through 2011, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5293

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Senior Independence Act of 2006''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.
Sec. 3. Establishment of Administration on Aging.
Sec. 4. Functions of the Assistant Secretary.
Sec. 5. Federal agency consultation.
Sec. 6. Administration.
Sec. 7. Evaluation.
Sec. 8. Reports.
Sec. 9. Contractual, commercial and private pay relationships; appropriate use of Act funds.
Sec. 10. Nutrition education.
Sec. 11. Pension counseling and information programs.
Sec. 12. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 13. Purpose; administration.
Sec. 14. Authorization of appropriations; uses of funds.
Sec. 15. Organization.
Sec. 16. Area plans.
Sec. 17. State plans.
Sec. 18. Payments.
Sec. 19. Nutrition services incentive program.
Sec. 20. Consumer contributions.
Sec. 21. Supportive services and senior centers program.
Sec. 22. Nutrition service.
Sec. 23. Congregate nutrition program.
Sec. 24. Home delivered nutrition services.
Sec. 25. Criteria.
Sec. 26. Nutrition.
Sec. 27. Evaluation of nutrition projects.
Sec. 28. Improving indoor air quality to buildings where seniors congregate.
Sec. 29. Caregiver support program definitions.
Sec. 30. Caregiver support program.
Sec. 31. Activities of national significance.
Sec. 32. Title IV grant programs.
Sec. 33. Career preparation for the field of aging.
Sec. 34. Health care service demonstration projects in rural areas.
Sec. 35. Demonstration projects for multigenerational activities.
Sec. 36. Native American programs.
Sec. 37. Multidiciplinary centers.
Sec. 38. Responsibilities of Assistant Secretary.
Sec. 39. Community service employment-based training for older Americans.
Sec. 40. Native Americans caregiver support program.
Sec. 41. Vulnerable elder rights protection activities.
Sec. 42. Native American organization provisions.
Sec. 43. Elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation prevention.
Sec. 44. Technical amendments.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 102 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3002) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (10) to read as follows:

''(10) The terms 'assistive device', 'assistive technology', and 'assistive technology service' have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 3002).'',

(2) by amending paragraph (12)(D) to read as follows:

''(D) evidence-based health promotion programs, including programs related to the prevention and mitigation of the effects of chronic disease (including osteoporosis, hypertension, obesity, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease), alcohol and substance abuse reduction, smoking cessation, weight loss and control, stress management, falls prevention, physical activity, and improved nutrition through the consumption of a healthful diet and multivitamin-mineral supplementation;'',

(3) in paragraph (29)(E)—

(A) in clause (i) by striking ''and'' at the end,

(B) in clause (ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'' , and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) older individuals at risk for institutional placement.'',

(4) by amending paragraph (24) to read as follows:

''(24) The term 'exploitation' means the fraudulent or otherwise illegal, unauthorized, or improper act or process of an individual that uses the resources of an older individual for monetary or personal benefit, profit, or gain, or that results in depriving an older individual of rightful access to, or use of, benefits, resources, belongings, or assets.'',

(5) by amending paragraph (34) to read as follows:

''(34) The term 'neglect' means—

''(A) the failure of a caregiver or fiduciary to provide goods or services that are necessary to maintain the health or safety of an elder; or

''(B) self neglect.'',

(6) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (43) as paragraphs (43), (7), (48), (37), (25), (26), (52), (13), (46), (8), (28), (12), (1), (2), (3), (5), (6), (10), (24), (35), (11), (14), (15), (17), (19), (20), (21), (22), (27), (29), (30), (32) (33), (36), (38), (39), (40), (41), (42), (49), (51), (18), and (47), respectively,

(7) by transferring such paragraphs so as to arrange them in numerical order as so redesignated,

(8) by inserting after paragraph (3), as so redesignated the following:

''(4) The term 'Aging and Disability Resource Center' means a program established by a State as part of the State's system of long-term care, to provide a coordinated system for providing—

''(A) comprehensive information on available public and private long-term care programs, options, and resources;

''(B) personal counseling to assist individuals in assessing their existing or anticipated long-term care needs, and developing and implementing a plan for long-term care designed to meet their specific needs and circumstances; and

''(C) consumer access to the range of publicly-supported long-term care programs for which they may be eligible, by serving as a convenient point of entry for such programs.'',

(9) by inserting after paragraph (8), as so redesignated, the following:

''(9) The term 'at risk for institutional placement' means, with respect to an older individual, that such individual is unable to perform at least two activities of daily living without substantial human assistance (including verbal reminding, physical cuing, or supervision) and is determined by the State to be in need of placement in a long-term care facility.'',

(10) by inserting after paragraph (15), as so redesignated, the following:

''(16) The term 'elder justice' means efforts to prevent, detect, treat, intervene in, and respond to elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation and to protect elders with diminished capacity while maximizing their autonomy.'',

(11) by inserting after paragraph (22), as so redesignated, the following:

''(23) The term 'Hispanic serving institution' has the meaning as defined in section 502 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101A).'',

(12) by inserting after paragraph (30), as so redesignated, the following:

''(31) The term 'long-term care' means any services, care, or items (including assistive devices), including disease prevention and health promotion services, in-home services, and case management service—

''(A) intended to assist individuals in coping with, and to the extent practicable compensate for, functional impairments in carrying out activities of daily living;

''(B) furnished at home, in a community care setting (including a small community care setting as defined in subsection (g)(1), and a large community care setting as defined in subsection (h)(1), of section 1929 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396t)), or in a long-term care facility; and

''(C) not furnished to prevent, diagnose, treat, or cure a medical disease or condition.'',

(13) by inserting after paragraph (33), as so redesignated, the following:

''(34) The term 'multivitamin-mineral supplement' means a dietary supplement that provides at least two-third's of the essential vitamins and minerals at 100 percent of the daily value levels as determined by the Food and Drug Administration.'',

(14) by inserting after paragraph (43), as so redesignated, the following:

''(44) The term 'self-directed care' means an approach to providing services (including programs, benefits, supports, and technology) under this Act intended to an older individual to assist such individual with activities of daily living, in which

''(A) such services (including the amount, duration, scope, provider, and location of such services) are planned, budgeted, and purchased under the direction and control of such individual;

''(B) such individual is provided with such information and assistance as necessary and appropriate to enable such individual to make informed decisions about his or her care options;

''(C) the needs, capabilities, and preferences of such individual with respect to such services, and such individual's ability to direct and control his or her receipt of such services, are assessed by the area agency on aging (or other agency designated by the area agency on aging);

''(D) based on the assessment made under subparagraph (C), the area agency on aging (or other agency designated by the area agency on aging) develops together with such individual and his or her family, caregiver, or legal representative—

''(i) a plan of services for such individual that specifies which services such individual will be responsible for directing;

''(ii) a determination of the role of family members (and others whose participation is sought by such individual) in providing services under such plan; and

''(iii) a budget for such services; and

''(E) the area agency on aging or State agency provides for oversight of such individual's self-directed receipt of services, including steps to ensure the quality of services provided and the appropriate use of funds under this Act.

''(45) The term 'self-neglect' means an adult's inability, due to physical or mental impairment or diminished capacity, to perform essential self-care tasks including—

''(A) obtaining essential food, clothing, shelter, and medical care;

''(B) obtaining goods and services necessary to maintain physical health, mental health, or general safety; or

''(C) managing one's own financial affairs.'', and

(15) by inserting after paragraph (49), as so redesignated, the following:

''(50) The term 'State system of long-term care' means the Federal, State, and local programs and activities administered by a State that provide, support, or facilitate access to long-term care to individuals in such State.''.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF ADMINISTRATION ON AGING.

Section 201 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3011) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e)(1) The Assistant Secretary may designate within the Administration responsibility for elder abuse prevention and services.

''(2) It shall be the duty of the assistant secretary, acting through the person designated with responsibility for elder abuse prevention and services, to develop objectives, priorities, policy, and a long-term plan for—

''(A) carrying out elder justice programs and activities relating to—

''(i) elder abuse prevention, detection, treatment, and intervention, and response;

''(ii) training of individuals regarding the matters described in clause (i); and

''(iii) the improvement of the elder justice system in the United States;

''(B) collecting and disseminating data relating to the abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older individuals;

''(C) disseminating information concerning best practices regarding, and providing training on, carrying out activities related to abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older individuals;

''(D) conducting research related to abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older individuals;

''(E) providing technical assistance to States and other eligible entities under title VII;

''(F) assisting States and other eligible entities under title VII to develop strategic plans to better coordinate elder justice activities, research, and training; and

''(G) promoting collaborative efforts and diminishing duplicative efforts in the development and carrying out of elder justice programs at the Federal, State, and local levels.

''(f)(1) The Assistant Secretary may designate an officer or employee who shall be responsible for the administration of mental health services authorized under this Act;

''(2) It shall be the duty of the Assistant Secretary, acting through the individual designated in paragraph (1), to develop objectives, priorities, and a long-term plan for supporting State and local efforts involving education, prevention, detection, and treatment of mental disorders, including age-related dementia, depression, and Alzheimer's disease and related neurological disorders.''.

SEC. 4. FUNCTIONS OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

Section 202 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (5) by inserting ''assistive technology,'' after ''housing,'',

(B) in paragraph (12)—

(i) by striking ''(12)'' and inserting the following:

''(12)(A) consult and coordinate activities with the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and other federal entities to implement and build awareness of programs providing benefits affecting older individuals; and

''(B)'',

(C) in paragraph (20)—

(i) by striking ''and area agencies on aging'' and inserting '', area agencies on aging, and service providers'',

(ii) by striking ''and benefits'' and inserting ''benefits'',

(iii) by inserting ''benefits under any other applicable Federal program, or any other service (including technology and internet-based decision support tools) to assist consumers to learn about, to receive benefits under, and to participate in programs for which they may be eligible'' after ''(7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.),'',

(iv) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(20)'', and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) provide technical assistance and support for benefits enrollment assistance and outreach to support efforts to inform and enroll low-income older individuals who may be eligible to participate, but who are not participating, in Federal and State programs for which they are eligible, and may in cooperation with Federal partners, make grants or contracts to establish a National Center on Senior Benefits Outreach and Enrollment, which shall—

''(i) maintain and update web-based decision supports and enrollment tools and integrated, person-centered systems designed to inform older individuals about the full range of benefits for which they may be eligible;

''(ii) utilize cost-effective strategies to find and enroll those with greatest economic need;

''(iii) create and support efforts for Aging and Disability Resource Centers, and other public and private State and community-based organizations and coalitions, including faith-based organizations, to serve as enrollment benefit centers;

''(iv) develop and maintain an information clearinghouse on best practices and cost-effective methods for identifying and enrolling limited income older Americans in benefits for which they are eligible; and

''(v) provide, in collaboration with Federal partners administering programs, training and technical assistance on effective outreach, screening, enrollment and follow-up strategies.'',

(D) in paragraph (26)—

(i) in subsection (D)—

(I) by striking ''gaps in'', and

(II) by inserting ''(including services that would permit such individuals to receive long-term care in home and community-based settings)'' after ''individuals'', and

(ii) in subsection (E) by striking ''and'' at the end,

(E) in paragraph (27)—

(i) in subparagraph (B) by adding ''and'' at the end,

(ii) in subparagraph (C) by striking the semicolon and inserting a period, and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (D), and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

''(28) make available to States, area agencies on aging, and service providers information and technical assistance to support the provision of evidence-based disease prevention and health promotion services.'', and

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c), and inserting the following:

''(b) To promote the development and implementation of comprehensive, coordinated systems at Federal, State, and local levels for providing long-term care in home and community-based settings, in a manner responsive to the needs and preferences of older individuals and their family caregivers, the Assistant Secretary shall, consistent with the applicable provisions of this title—

''(1) collaborate, coordinate, and consult with other Federal agencies and departments responsible for formulating and implementing programs, benefits, and services related to providing long-term care, and may make grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements with funds received from other Federal entities;

''(2) conduct research and demonstration projects to identify innovative, cost-effective strategies for modifying State systems of long-term care to—

''(A) respond to the needs and preferences of older individuals and family caregivers; and

''(B) target services to individuals at risk for institutional placement, to permit such individuals to remain in home and community-based care settings;

''(3) establish criteria and promote the implementation (through area agencies on aging, service providers, and such other entities as the Assistant Secretary determines to be appropriate) of evidence-based programs to assist older individuals and their family caregivers in learning about and making behavioral changes intended to reduce the risk of injury, disease, and disability among older individuals;

''(4) facilitate, in coordination with the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, the Cash and Counseling National Program Office, and other Federal entities as appropriate, the provision of long-term care in home and community-based settings, including the provision of self-directed care models that—

''(A) provide for the assessment of the needs and preferences of an individual at risk for institutional placement to help such individual avoid unnecessary nursing home placement and depletion of income and assets to qualify for Medicaid eligibility;

''(B) respond to the needs and preferences of such individual and provide the option for the individual (or representative, as appropriate) to direct and control the receipt of support services provided;

''(C) assist an older individual (or a representative, as appropriate) develop a plan for long-term support, including the selecting, budgeting, and purchasing of home and community-based long-term care and supportive services;

(for purposes of this paragraph, the term 'representative' means a person appointed by the eligible individual, or legally acting on the individual's behalf, to represent or advise the individual in financial or service coordination matters);

''(5) provide for the Administration to play a lead role with respect to issues concerning home and community-based long-term care, including—

''(A) directing (as the Secretary or the President determines to be appropriate) or otherwise participating in departmental and interdepartmental activities concerning long-term care;

''(B) reviewing and commenting on departmental rules, regulations, and policies related to providing long-term care; and

''(C) making recommendations to the Secretary with respect to home and community-based long-term care, including recommendations based on findings made through projects conducted under paragraph (2);

''(6) promote, in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies, enhanced awareness by the public of the importance of planning in advance for long-term care and the availability of information and resources to assist in such planning;

''(7) implement in all States Aging and Disability Resource Centers—

''(A) to serve as visible and trusted sources of information on the full range of long-term care options that are available in the community, including both institutional and home and community-based care;

''(B) to provide personalized and consumer friendly assistance to empower people to make informed decisions about their care options;

''(C) to provide coordinated and streamlined access to all publicly supported long-term care options so that consumers can obtain the care they need though a single intake, assessment and eligibility determination process;

''(D) to help people to plan ahead for their future long-term care needs; and

''(E) to assist, in coordination with the State Health Insurance Assistance Program, Medicare beneficiaries in understanding and accessing the Prescription Drug Coverage and preventative health benefits available under the Medicare Modernization Act;

''(8) establish, either directly or through grants or contracts, national technical assistance programs to assist State agencies, area agencies on aging, and community-based service providers funded under this Act in implementing—

''(A) such home and community-based long-term care systems, including evidence-based programs; and

''(B) such evidence-based health promotion and disease prevention programs;

''(9) develop, in collaboration with the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, performance standards and measures for use by States to determine the extent to which their systems of long-term care fulfill the objectives described in this subsection; and

''(10) conduct such other activities as the Assistant Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(c) The Assistant Secretary, in consultation with the Corporation for National and Community Service, shall—

''(1) encourage and permit voluntary groups active in supportive services and civic engagement, including youth organizations active at the secondary or postsecondary levels, to participate and be involved individually or through representative groups, in such programs or activities to the maximum extent feasible;

''(2) develop a comprehensive strategy for utilizing older individuals to address critical local needs of national concern, including the engagement of older individuals in the activities of public and nonprofit organizations such as community-based and faith-based organizations; and

''(3) encourage other community capacity building initiatives involving older individuals, with particular attention to initiatives that demonstrate the effectiveness and cost savings in meeting critical needs.''.

SEC. 5. FEDERAL AGENCY CONSULTATION.

Section 203 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3013) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)(A) by striking ''(with particular attention to low-income minority older individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas)'' and inserting ''(with particular attention to low-income older individuals, including low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas)'', and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (17) by striking ''and'' at the end,

(B) in paragraph (18) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'', and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(19) sections 4 and 5 of the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 3003–3004).''.

SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATION.

Section 205 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3016) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (C) by adding ''and'' at the end,

(ii) in subparagraph (D) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period, and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (E), and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by amending clause (i) to read as follows:

''(i) designing, implementing, and evaluating evidence-based programs to support improved nutrition and regular physical activity for older individuals;'',

(II) by amending clause (iii) to read as follows:

''(iii) conducting outreach and disseminating evidence-based information to nutrition service providers about the benefits of healthful diets and regular physical activity, including information about the most current Dietary Guidelines for Americans published under section 301 of the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5341), the Food Guide Pyramid published jointly by the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, and advances in nutrition science;'',

(III) in clause (vii) by striking ''and'' at the end, and

(IV) by striking clause (viii) and inserting the following:

''(viii) disseminating guidance that describes strategies for improving the nutritional quality of meals provided under title III, particularly strategies for increasing the consumption of whole grains, lowfat dairy products, fruits and vegetables;

''(ix) developing and disseminating guidelines for conducting nutrient analyses of meals provided in subparts 1 and 2 of part C, including guidelines for averaging key nutrients over an appropriate period of time; and

''(x) providing technical assistance to the regional offices of the Administration with respect to each duty described in clauses (i) through (viii).'', and

(ii) by amending subparagraph (C)(i) to read as follows:

''(i) have expertise in nutrition, energy balance, and meal planning; and''.

SEC. 7. EVALUATION.

The 1st sentence of section 206(g) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3017(g)) is amended to read as follows:

''From the total amount appropriated for each fiscal year to carry out title III, the Secretary may use such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed ½ of 1 percent of such amount, for purposes of conducting evaluations under this section, either directly or through grants or contracts.''.

SEC. 8. REPORTS.

Section 207(b)(2) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3018(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''Labor'' and inserting ''the Workforce'', and

(2) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''Labor and Human Resources'' and inserting ''Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions''.

SEC. 9. CONTRACTUAL, COMMERCIAL AND PRIVATE PAY RELATIONSHIPS; APPROPRIATE USE OF ACT FUNDS.

(a) PRIVATE PAY RELATIONSHIPS; APPROPRIATE USE OF ACT FUNDS.—Section 212 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3020c) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 212. CONTRACTING AND GRANT AUTHORITY; PRIVATE PAY RELATIONSHIPS; APPROPRIATE USE OF FUNDS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), this Act shall not be construed to prevent a recipient of a grant or a contract from entering into an agreement—

''(1) with a profitmaking organization;

''(2) under which funds provided under such grant or contract are used to pay part or all of a cost (including an administrative cost) incurred by such recipient to carry out a contract or commercial relationship for the benefit of older individuals or their family caregivers, whether such relationship is carried out to implement a provision of this Act or to conduct activities inherently associated with implementing such provision; or

''(3) under which any individual, regardless of age or income (including the family caregiver of such individual), who seeks to receive 1 or more services pays, at their own private expense, to receive such services based on the fair market value of such services.

''(b) ENSURING APPROPRIATE USE OF FUNDS.—An agreement described under subsection (a) may not—

''(1) be made without the prior approval of the State agency (or, in the case of a grantee under title VI, without the prior recommendation of the Director of the Office for American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Aging and the prior approval of the Assistant Secretary);

''(2) directly or indirectly provide for, or have the effect of, paying, reimbursing, or otherwise compensating an entity under such agreement in an amount that exceeds the fair market value of the goods or services furnished by such entity under such agreement;

''(3) result in the displacement of services otherwise available to an older individual with the greatest social need, an older individual with greatest economic need, or an older individual who is at risk for institutional placement; or

''(4) in any other way compromise, undermine, or be inconsistent with the objective of serving the needs of older individuals, as determined by the Assistant Secretary.''.

SEC. 10. NUTRITION EDUCATION.

Section 214 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3020e) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 214. NUTRITION EDUCATION.

''The Assistant Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall conduct outreach and provide technical assistance to agencies and organizations that serve older individuals to assist such agencies and organizations to carry out integrated health promotion and disease prevention programs that are designed for older individuals and that include nutrition education, physical activity, and other activities to modify behavior and to improve health literacy (including information on optimal nutrient intake) through education and counseling in accordance with section 339(2)(J).''.

SEC. 11. PENSION COUNSELING AND INFORMATION PROGRAMS.

Section 215 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3020e–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(1)(J) by striking ''and low-income retirees'' and inserting '', low income retirees, and older individuals with limited English proficiency'',

(2) in subsection (f) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) The ability of the entity to perform effective outreach to affected populations, particularly populations with limited English proficiency and other populations that are identified in need of special outreach.'', and

(3) in subsection (h)(2) by inserting ''(including individuals with limited English proficiency)'' after ''individuals''.

SEC. 12. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 216 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3020f) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking ''2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005'' and inserting ''2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.'', and

(2) in subsections (b) and (c) by striking ''year'' and all that follows through ''years'', and inserting ''years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011''.

SEC. 13. PURPOSE; ADMINISTRATION.

Section 301(a)(2) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3021(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D) by striking ''and'' at the end,

(2) in subparagraph (E) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'', and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(F) organizations with experience in providing senior volunteer services, such as Federal volunteer programs administered by the Corporation for National and Community Service designed to provide training, placement, and stipends for volunteers in community service settings.''.

SEC. 14. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; USES OF FUNDS.

Section 303 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3023) is amended—

(1) in subsections (a)(1), (b), and (d) by striking ''year 2001'' and all that follows through ''years'' each place it appears, and inserting ''years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011'', and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1),

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''(2)'' and inserting ''(1)'', and

(ii) by striking ''each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years'' and inserting ''for fiscal years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011'', and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''(3)'' and inserting ''(2)'', and

(ii) by striking ''paragraphs (1) and (2)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)''.

SEC. 15. ORGANIZATION.

Section 305(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3025(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(E) by striking ''(with particular attention to low-income minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(with particular attention to low-income older individuals, including low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas)'',

(2) in paragraph (2)(E) by striking ''with particular attention to low-income minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas'' and inserting ''with particular attention to low-income older individuals, including low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas'', and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) the State agency shall, consistent with this section, promote the development and implementation of a comprehensive, coordinated system in such State for providing long-term care in home and community-based settings, in a manner responsive to the needs and preferences of older individuals and their family caregivers, by—

''(A) collaborating, coordinating, and consulting with other agencies in such State responsible for formulating, implementing, and administering programs, benefits, and services related to providing long-term care;

''(B) participating in any State government activities concerning long-term care, including reviewing and commenting on any State rules, regulations, and policies related thereto;

''(C) conducting analyses and making recommendations, and implementing programs and strategies to modify the State's system of long-term care to better—

''(i) respond to the needs and preferences of older individuals and family caregivers;

''(ii) facilitate the provision of long-term care in home and community-based settings through service providers; and

''(iii) target services to individuals at risk for institutional placement, to permit such individuals to remain in home and community-based care settings;

''(D) implement (through area agencies on aging, service providers, and such other entities as the State determines to be appropriate) evidence-based programs to assist older individuals and their family caregivers in learning about and making behavioral changes intended to reduce the risk of injury, disease, and disability among older individuals; and

''(E) providing for the availability and distribution (through public education campaigns, aging and disability resource centers, area agencies on aging, and other appropriate means) of information relating to—

''(i) the need to plan in advance for long-term care; and

''(ii) the range of available public and private long-term care programs, options, and resources.''.

SEC. 16. AREA PLANS.

Section 306 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3026) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''(with particular attention to low-income minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(with particular attention to low-income older individuals, low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas)'', and

(ii) by inserting ''the number of older individuals at risk for institutional placement residing in such area,'' after ''individuals) residing in such area,'',

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by amending clause (i) to read as follows:

''(i) provide assurances that the area agency on aging will—

''(I) set specific objectives, consistent with State policy, for providing services to older individuals with greatest economic need, older individuals with greatest social need, and older individuals at risk for institutional placement;

''(II) include in the area plan specific objectives for providing services to low-income minority older individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas; and

''(III) include in the area plan proposed methods to achieve such objectives;'', and

(II) in clause (ii) by inserting ''(including older individuals with limited English proficiency)'' after ''low income minority individuals'' each place it appears; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by moving the left margin of each of subparagraph (B), clauses (i) and (ii), and subclauses (I) through (VI) of clause (i), 2 ems to the left,

(II) in clause (i)—

(aa) in subclause (V) by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(bb) by adding at the end the following:

''(VI) older individuals at risk for institutional placement; and'', and

(III) by striking ''(VI)'' and inserting ''(VII)'',

(C) in paragraph (5) by inserting ''and individuals at risk for institutional placement'' after ''severe disabilities'',

(D) in paragraph (6)—

(i) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in clause (i) by striking ''and'' at the end,

(II) in clause (ii) by adding ''and'' at the end, and

(III) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

''(iii) make use of trained volunteers in providing direct services delivered to elderly and disabled individuals needing such care and, if possible, work in coordination with volunteer programs (including programs administered by the Corporation for National Service) designed

to provide training, placement, and stipends for volunteers in community service settings.'',

(ii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by inserting ''family caregivers of such individuals,'' after ''Act,'', and

(II) by inserting ''service providers, the business community,'' after ''individuals,'', and

(iii) by amending subparagraph (F) to read as follows:

''(F) in coordination with the State unit on aging and the State agency responsible for mental health services, increase public awareness of mental health disorders, remove barriers to diagnosis and treatment, and coordinate mental health services provided (including mental health screenings) with funds expended by the area agency on aging with mental health services provided by community health centers and by other public agencies and nonprofit private organizations;'',

(E) by amending paragraph (7) to read as follows:

''(7) provide that the area agency on aging shall, consistent with this section, facilitate the area-wide development and implementation of a comprehensive, coordinated system for providing long-term care in home and community-based settings, in a manner responsive to the needs and preferences of older individuals and their family caregivers, by—

''(A) collaborating, coordinating, and consulting with other local public and private agencies and organizations responsible for administering programs, benefits, and services related to providing long-term care;

''(B) conducting analyses, making recommendations, and implementing programs with respect to strategies for modifying the local system of long-term care to better—

''(i) respond to the needs and preferences of older individuals and family caregivers;

''(ii) facilitate the provision, through service providers, of long-term care in home and community-based settings; and

''(iii) target services to older individuals at risk for institutional placement, to permit such individuals to remain in home and community-based care settings;

''(C) implement, through the agency or service providers, evidence-based programs to assist older individuals and their family caregivers in learning about and making behavioral changes intended to reduce the risk of injury, disease, and disability among older individuals; and

''(D) provide for the availability and distribution (through public education campaigns, aging and disability resource centers, and other appropriate means) of information relating to—

''(i) the need to plan in advance for long-term care; and

''(ii) the range of available public and private long-term care programs, options, and resources;'',

(F) by striking paragraph (14) and the 2 paragraphs (15),

(G) by redesignating paragraph (16) as paragraph (14), and

(I) by adding at the end the following:

''(15) provide assurances that funds received under this title will be used—

''(A) in a manner, consistent with paragraph (4), that gives priority in furnishing benefits and services to older individuals with greatest economic need, older individuals with greatest social need, and older individuals at risk for institutional placement; and

''(B) in compliance with the assurances specified in paragraph (13) and the limitations specified in section 212(b); and

''(16) provide, to the maximum extent feasible, for the furnishing of services under this Act consistent with self-directed care.'',

(2) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f), and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b)(1) An area agency on aging may include in the area plan an assessment of how prepared the planning and service area is for any anticipated change in the number of older individual during the 10-year period following the fiscal year for which the plan is submitted. Such assessment may include—

''(A) the projected change in the number of older individuals in the planning and service area;

''(B) an analysis of how such change may affect such individuals, including such individuals with low incomes, such individuals with greatest economic need, minority older individuals, older individuals residing in rural areas, and older individuals with limited English proficiency;

''(C) an analysis of how the programs, policies, and services provided in the planning and service area can be improved, and how resource levels can be adjusted, to meet the needs of the changing population of older individuals in such area; and

''(D) an analysis of how the change in the number of individuals 85 years of age and older is expected to affect the need for supportive services.

''(2) An area agency on aging, in cooperation with government officials, State agencies, tribal organizations, or local entities, may make recommendations to government officials in the planning and service area and the State, on actions determined by the area agency to build the capacity in the planning and service area to meet the needs of older individuals for—

''(A) health and human services;

''(B) land use;

''(C) housing;

''(D) transportation;

''(E) public safety;

''(F) workforce and economic development;

''(G) recreation;

''(H) education;

''(I) civic engagement; and

''(J) any other service as determined by such agency.''.

SEC. 17. STATE PLANS.

Section 307(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3027(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4) by striking ''with particular attention to low-income minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas'' and inserting ''low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas'',

(2) by striking paragraph (15),

(3) by redesignating paragraph (14) as paragraph (15),

(4) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following:

''(14) The plan shall, with respect to the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which such plan is prepared—

''(A) identify the number of low-income minority older individuals in the State, including the number of low-income older individuals with limited English proficiency; and

''(B) describe the methods used to satisfy the service needs of such minority older individuals, including the plan to service the needs of older individuals with limited English proficiency.'',

(5) in clauses (ii) and (iii) of paragraph (16)(A) by striking ''(with particular attention to low-income minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(with particular attention to low-income older individuals, low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas)'', and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(27) The plan shall provide assurances that area agencies on aging will, to the maximum extent feasible, provide for the furnishing of services under this Act consistent with self-directed care.

''(28)(A) The plan shall include, at the election of the State, an assessment of how prepared the State is, under the State's statewide service delivery model, for a change in the number of older individuals during the 10-year period following the fiscal year for which the plan is submitted.

''(B) Such assessment may include—

''(i) the projected change in the number of older individuals in the State;

''(ii) an analysis of how such change may affect such individuals, including individuals with low incomes, individuals with great economic need, minority older individuals, older individuals residing in rural areas, and older individuals with limited English proficiency;

''(iii) an analysis of how the programs, policies, and services provided by the State can be improved, including coordinating with area agencies on aging, and how resource levels can be adjusted to meet the needs of the changing population of older individuals in the State; and

''(iv) an analysis of how the change in the number of individuals 85 years of age and older in the State is expected to affect the need for supportive services.''.

SEC. 18. PAYMENTS.

Section 309(b)(2) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3029(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''the non-Federal share required prior to fiscal year 1981'' and inserting ''10 percent of the cost of the services specified in such section 304(d)(1)(D)''.

SEC. 19. NUTRITION SERVICES INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) CASH ONLY PROGRAM; AUTHORITY TO USE PROGRAM FUNDS TO PURCHASE FOOD THROUGH SCHOOL FOOD AUTHORITIES.—Section 311 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) Each State agency shall promptly and equitably disburse amounts received under this subsection to recipients of grants and contracts.'',

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by inserting ''(including bonus commodities)'' after ''commodities'',

(B) in paragraph (2) by inserting ''(including bonus commodities)'' after ''commodities'',

(C) in paragraph (3) by inserting ''(including bonus commodities)'' after ''products'', and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) Among the commodities delivered under this subsection, the Secretary of Agriculture shall give special emphasis to high protein foods. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary, is authorized to prescribe the terms and conditions respecting the donation of commodities under this subsection.'',

(3) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

''(d)(1) Amounts provided under subsection (b) to State grantees and contractors, and to title VI grantees, shall be available only for the purchase by such entities of United States agricultural commodities and other foods for their respective nutrition projects, subject to paragraph (2).

''(2) Part or all of the amounts received by an entity specified in paragraph (1) may be used to pay a school food authority (as referred to under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C.1751 et seq.) to obtain United States agricultural commodities for such entity's nutrition projects, in accordance with an agreement between the entity and the school food authority, under which such payments—

''(A) shall cover the cost of such commodities; and

''(B) may cover related expenses incurred by the school food authority, including the cost of transporting, distributing, processing, storing, and handling such commodities.'',

(4) in subsection (e) by striking ''2001'' and inserting ''2007'',

(5) in subsection (f)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services'' and inserting ''the Assistant Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture'', and

(B) by amending paragraphs (1) and (2) to read as follows:

''(1) school food authorities participating in programs authorized under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act within the geographic area served by each such State agency; and

''(2) the donated foods available to such State agencies, area agencies on aging, and providers under subsection (c).''.

SEC. 20. CONSUMER CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 315 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030c–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking ''provided that'' and inserting '', and such contributions shall be encouraged for individuals whose self-declared income is at or above 125 percent of the poverty line and may be requested at contribution levels based on the actual cost of services, if'', and

(B) in paragraph (4)(E) by inserting ''and to supplement (not supplant) funds received under this Act'' after ''given'',

(2) in subsection (c)(2) by striking ''(with particular attention to low-income minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas)'' and inserting ''(with particular attention to low-income older individuals, including low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas)'', and

(3) in subsection (d) by striking ''with particular attention to low-income and minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas'' and inserting '', with particular attention to low-income older individuals, including low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas''.

SEC. 21. SUPPORTIVE SERVICES AND SENIOR CENTERS PROGRAM.

Section 321(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030d(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8) by inserting ''(including mental health screening)'' after ''screening'',

(2) in paragraph (11) by inserting ''(including assistive technology devices and assistive technology services)'' after ''services'',

(3) in paragraph (14)(B) by inserting ''(including mental health)'' after ''health'',

(4) in paragraph (21)—

(A) by striking ''school-age children'' and inserting ''students'', and

(B) by inserting ''services to older individuals with limited English proficiency and'' after ''including'',

(5) in paragraph (22) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon,

(6) by redesignating paragraph (23) as paragraph (25), and

(7) by inserting after paragraph (22) the following:

''(23) services designed to support States, area agencies on aging, and local service providers carry out and coordinate, with respect to mental health services, activities including outreach, education, screening, and referral for treatment of older individuals;

(24) activities to promote and disseminate information about life-long learning programs, including opportunities for distance teaching; and''.

SEC. 22. NUTRITION SERVICE.

After the heading of part C of title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030e–3030g–22), insert the following:

''SEC. 330. PURPOSE.

''It is the purpose of this part to promote socialization and the health and well-being of older individuals by assisting such individuals to gain access to disease prevention and health promotion services (including information, nutrition services, and programs of physical activity) to delay the onset of health conditions resulting from poor nutritional health or sedentary behavior.''.

SEC. 23. CONGREGATE NUTRITION PROGRAM.

Section 331 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030e) is amended—

(1) by striking ''projects—'' and inserting ''projects that—'',

(2) in paragraph (1) by striking ''which,'',

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''which'' the last place it appears, and

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end, and

(4) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) provide nutrition education, nutrition counseling, and other nutrition services, as appropriate, based on the needs of meal participants; and

''(4) may provide along with a meal described in (1), a multivitamin-mineral supplement as an addition to such meal.''.

SEC. 24. HOME DELIVERED NUTRITION SERVICES.

Section 336 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030f) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 336. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

''The Assistant Secretary shall establish and carry out a program to make grants to States under State plans approved under section 307 for the establishment and operation of nutrition projects for older individuals which provide, on 5 or more days a week (except in a rural area where such frequency is not feasible (as defined by the Assistant Secretary by rule) and a lesser frequency is approved by the State agency)—

''(1) at least 1 home delivered meal per day consisting of hot, cold, frozen, dried, canned, fresh, or supplemental foods and any additional meals that the recipient of a grant or contract under this subpart elects to provide; and

''(2) nutrition education, nutrition counseling, and other nutrition services as appropriate, based on the needs of meal recipients.''.

SEC. 25. CRITERIA.

Section 337 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030g) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 337. CRITERIA.

''The Assistant Secretary, in consultation with experts in the field of nutrition science, dietetics, meal planning and food service management, and aging, shall develop minimum criteria of efficiency and quality for the furnishing of home delivered meal services for projects described in section 336.''.

SEC. 26. NUTRITION.

Section 339 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030g–21) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) solicit the expertise of a dietitian or other individual with equivalent education and training in nutrition science, or if such an individual is not available, an individual with comparable expertise in the planning of nutritional services, and'', and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by amending clause (i) to read as follows:

''(i) comply with the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans, published by the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, and'', and

(ii) in clause (ii) by striking ''daily recommended dietary allowances as'' and inserting ''dietary reference intakes'',

(B) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by inserting ''joint'' after ''encourages'', and

(ii) by inserting ''shared'' after ''promote'',

(C) by amending subparagraph (G) to read as follows:

''(G) ensures that local meal providers solicit the advice and expertise of—

''(i) a dietitian or, if a dietitian is not available, an individual with comparable expertise in the planning of nutrition and food services,

''(ii) meal participants, and

''(iii) other individuals knowledgeable with regard to the needs of older individuals,'',

(D) in subparagraph (H) by striking ''and accompany'',

(E) by amending subparagraph (J) to read as follows:

''(J) provides for nutrition screening and nutrition education, and nutrition assessment and counseling if appropriate, and'', and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

''(K) encourages professionals who distribute nutrition assistance under subpart 2 to provide information to homebound seniors on how to get an influenza vaccination in their local areas.''.

SEC. 27. EVALUATION OF NUTRITION PROJECTS.

(a) STUDY.—The Assistant Secretary for Aging shall use funds allocated in section 206(g) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 to enter into a contract with the Food and Nutrition Board of the Institute of Medicine, for the purpose of establishing an independent panel of experts that will conduct an evidence-based evaluation of the nutrition projects authorized in such Act. Such study shall, to the extent data are available, include—

(1) an evaluation of the effect of nutrition projects authorized by such Act on—

(A) health status of participants, including nutritional status,

(B) prevention of participant hunger and food insecurity, and

(C) ability of participants to remain living independently,

(2) a cost-benefit analysis of nutrition projects authorized by such Act, including the potential to affect costs of Federal programs under title XIX of the Social Security Act, and

(3) recommendations for how nutrition projects authorized by such Act may be modified to improve the outcomes described in paragraph (1), including recommendations for improving the nutritional quality of meals and other potential strategies to improve the nutritional status of participants, including vitamin-mineral supplementation.

(b) TIMING.—The Institute of Medicine shall establish an independent panel of experts not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The panel shall submit to the Assistant Secretary the report described in subsection (a) not later than 24 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. The Assistant Secretary shall submit a report on the findings of the evidence-based study described in such subsection to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate.

SEC. 28. IMPROVING INDOOR AIR QUALITY IN BUILDINGS WHERE SENIORS CONGREGATE.

Section 361 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030m) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) The Assistant Secretary shall work in consultation with qualified experts to provide information on methods of improving indoor air quality in buildings where seniors congregate.''.

SEC. 29. CAREGIVER SUPPORT PROGRAM DEFINITIONS.

Section 372 of the National Family Caregiver Support Act (42 U.S.C. 3030s) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by inserting ''or who is an individual with a disability'' after ''age'',

(2) in paragraph (2) by inserting ''or an individual with Alzheimer's disease or a related disorder with neurological and organic brain dysfunction'' before the period at the end, and

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking ''60'' and inserting ''55''.

SEC. 30. CAREGIVER SUPPORT PROGRAM.

Section 373 of the National Family Caregiver Support Act (42 U.S.C. 3030s–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3) by striking ''caregivers to assist'' and all that follows through the end and inserting the following: ''assist the caregivers in addressing caregiver issues related to

the areas of health, nutrition, and financial literacy, and in making decisions and solving problems relating to their caregiving roles;'',

(2) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

''(d) USE OF VOLUNTEERS.—In carrying out this subpart, each area agency on aging shall encourage the use of trained volunteers to expand the available services described in subsection (b) and shall, if possible, coordinate with volunteer programs (including programs administered by the Corporation for National Service) designed to provide training, placement, and stipends for volunteers in community service settings.'',

(3) in subsection (e)(3) by adding at the end the following: ''The reports shall describe any mechanisms used in the State to provide family caregivers of an older individual and relative caregivers of a child or an adult child with a disability, information about and access to various services so that caregivers can better carry out their care responsibilities.'',

(4) in subsection (f)(1) by striking ''2001 through 2005'' and inserting ''2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011'', and

(5) in subsection (g)(2)(C) by inserting ''of a child who is not more than 18 years of age'' before the period at the end.

SEC. 31. ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

Section 376 of the National Family Caregiver Support Act (42 U.S.C. 3030s–12) is repealed.

SEC. 32. TITLE IV GRANT PROGRAMS.

Section 411 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3032) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (8) by striking ''and'' at the end,

(B) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (13), and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

''(9) planning activities to prepare communities for the aging of the population, which include—

''(A) efforts to assess the aging population;

''(B) activities to coordinate State and local agencies in order to meet the needs of older individuals; and

''(C) training and technical assistance to support States, area agencies on aging, and tribal organizations receiving a grant under title VI, engage in community planning activities; and

''(10) the development, implementation, and assessment of technology-based service models and best practices, to support the use of health monitoring and assessment technologies, communication devices, assistive technologies, and other technologies that may remotely connect family and professional caregivers to frail elderly residing in home- and community-based settings or rural areas;

''(11) conducting activities of national significance to promote quality and continuous improvement in the support provided to family and other informal caregivers of older individuals through activities that include program evaluation, training, technical assistance, and research, including—

''(A) intergenerational programs—

''(i) providing support to grandparents and other older relatives raising children (such as kinship navigator programs); and

''(ii) involving senior volunteers who provide support and information to families who have a child with a disability or chronic illness, or other families in need of such family support;

''(B) programs addressing unique issues faced by rural caregivers;

''(C) programs focusing on the needs of older individuals with cognitive impairment such as Alzheimer's disease and other dementias, and their caregivers;

''(D) programs supporting caregivers in the role they play in health promotion and disease prevention;

''(12)(A) building public awareness of cognitive impairment such as Alzheimer's disease and related disorders with neurological and organic brain dysfunction, depression, and mental disorders; and

''(B) developing and enhancing multidisciplinary systems for the delivery of mental health screening and treatment referral services to improve access to community-based mental health services for older individuals; and'', and

(2) in subsection (b) by striking ''year'' and all that follows through ''years'', and inserting ''years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011''.

SEC. 33. CAREER PREPARATION FOR THE FIELD OF AGING.

Section 412(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3032a(a)) is amended by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) GRANTS.—The Assistant Secretary shall make grants to institutions of higher education, including historically Black colleges or universities, Hispanic serving institutions, and Hispanic Centers of Excellence in Applied Gerontology, to provide education and training that prepares students for careers in the field of aging.''.

SEC. 34. HEALTH CARE SERVICE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS IN RURAL AREAS.

Section 414 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3032d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting ''mental health services,'' after ''care,'', and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(B)(i) by inserting ''mental health,'' after ''health,''.

SEC. 35. DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS FOR MULTIGENERATIONAL ACTIVITIES.

Section 417(c)(2) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3032f(c)(2)) is amended by striking ''(with particular attention to low-income minority individuals and older individuals residing in rural areas)'' and inserting ''(with particular attention to low-income older individuals, including low-income minority older individuals, older individuals with limited English proficiency, and older individuals residing in rural areas)''.

SEC. 36. NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS.

Section 418(a)(2)(B)(i) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3032g(a)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by inserting ''(including mental health)'' after ''problems''.

SEC. 37. MULTIDISCIPLINARY CENTERS.

Section 419 of the Older Americans Act of 1995 (42 U.S.C. 3032h) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting ''diverse populations of older individuals residing in urban communities,'' after ''minority populations,'', and

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (E) by inserting '', including information about best practices in long-term care service delivery, housing, and transportation'' before the semicolon at the end,

(B) in subparagraph (F)—

(i) by striking ''consultation and'',

(ii) by inserting ''and other technical assistance'' after ''information'', and

(iii) by striking ''and'' at the end,

(C) in subparagraph (G) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'', and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) provide training and technical assistance to support the provision of community-based mental health services for older individuals.''.

SEC. 38. RESPONSIBILITIES OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

Section 432(c)(2)(B) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3033a(c)(2)(B)) is amended by inserting '', including preparing an analysis of such services, projects, and programs, and of how the evaluation relates to improvements in such services, projects, and programs and in the strategic plan of the Administration'' before the period at the end.

SEC. 39. COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT-BASED TRAINING FOR OLDER AMERICANS.

Title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

''TITLE V—COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT-BASED TRAINING FOR OLDER AMERICANS

''SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

''This title may be cited as the 'Older American Community Service Employment-Based Training Act'.

''SEC. 502. OLDER AMERICAN COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT-BASED TRAINING PROGRAM.

''(a) To foster individual economic self-sufficiency and to increase the number of individuals who may enjoy the benefits of unsubsidized employment in both the public and private sectors, the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the 'Secretary') may establish an older American community service employment-based training program to foster and promote useful part-time public and private-sector employment-based training opportunities for unemployed low-income eligible individuals who have poor employment prospects and to provide vital social and human services to communities by providing work experience to eligible individuals in public agencies, community-based and faith-based organizations.

''(b)(1) To carry out this title, the Secretary may make grants to public and nonprofit agencies and organizations, agencies of a State, and tribal organizations to carry out the program established under subsection (a). Such grants may provide for the payment of costs, as provided in subsection (c), of projects developed by such organizations and agencies in cooperation with the Secretary in order to make such program effective or to supplement such program. No payment shall be made by the Secretary toward the cost of any project established or administered by any organization or agency unless the Secretary determines that such project—

''(A) shall provide authorized activities only for eligible individuals, and that not less than 50 percent of hours worked (in the aggregate) shall be in community service employment-based training provided by a grantee in a program year;

''(B)(i) shall provide authorized activities for eligible individuals in the community in which such individuals reside, or in nearby communities, and that not less than 50 percent of hours worked (in the aggregate) shall be in community service employment-based training provided by a grantee in a program year; or

''(ii) if such project is carried out by a tribal organization that receives a grant under this subsection or receives assistance from a State that receives a grant under this subsection, will provide authorized activities, including community service employment-based training for such individuals, including those who are Indians residing on an Indian reservation, as defined in section 2601(2) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3501(2));

''(C) together with all the projects carried out under this title in each program year by a grantee, will not provide for participation under this title by eligible individuals (in the aggregate) for an average period per capita that exceeds 24 months (whether or not consecutive) during the period including the program year for which the determination under this subparagraph is made and the previous program years in which such grantee carried out projects under this title;

''(D) will provide employment-based training to eligible individuals in service related to publicly owned and operated facilities and projects, or projects sponsored by profitmaking or nonprofit organizations (excluding political parties exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), but excluding projects involving the construction, operation, or maintenance of any facility used or to

be used as a place for sectarian religious instruction or worship;

''(E) will contribute to the general welfare of the community, which may include support for children, youth, and families;

''(F) is intended to result in unsubsidized employment for eligible individuals after completion of such program;

''(G)(i) will not reduce the number of job opportunities or vacancies that would otherwise be available to individuals not participating in such program;

''(ii) will not displace currently employed workers (including partial displacement, such as a reduction in the hours of non-overtime work, wages, or employment benefits);

''(iii) will not impair existing contracts or result in the substitution of Federal funds for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed; and

''(iv) will not place an eligible individual in employment-based training to perform work the same or substantially the same work as that performed by any other individual who is on layoff;

''(H) will coordinate with training and other services provided under title I of the Workforce Investment Act, including utilizing the One-Stop delivery system to recruit eligible individuals to ensure that the maximum number of eligible individuals will have an opportunity to participate in the project;

''(I) will include such training (such as community service employment-based training, work experience, on-the-job training, and classroom training) as may be necessary to make the most effective use of the skills and talents of those individuals who are participating;

''(J) will ensure that safe and healthy conditions of the employment-based training facility or other training facility will be provided, and will ensure that individuals employed in community service and other jobs assisted under this title shall be paid wages that shall not be lower than whichever is the highest of—

''(i) the minimum wage that would be applicable to the employee under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, if section 6(a)(1) of such Act applied to the participant and if the participant were not exempt under section 13 thereof;

''(ii) the State or local minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered employment; or

''(iii) the prevailing rates of pay for individuals employed in similar occupations by the same employer;

''(K) will be established or administered with the advice of persons competent in the field of service in which job training is being provided, and of persons who are knowledgeable about the needs of older individuals;

''(L) will authorize payment for necessary supportive services costs, (including transportation costs) of eligible individuals that may be incurred in training in any project funded under this title, in accordance with rules issued by the Secretary;

''(M) will ensure that, to the extent feasible, such project will serve the needs of minority, limited English-speaking, and Indian eligible individuals, and eligible individuals who have the greatest economic need, at least in proportion to their numbers in the State and take into consideration their rates of poverty and unemployment;

''(N)(i) will prepare an assessment of the participants' skills and talents and their needs for services, except to the extent such project has, for the participant involved, recently prepared an assessment of such skills and talents, and such needs, pursuant to another employment or training program (such as a program under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.), the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.), or part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.));

''(ii) will provide training and employment counseling to eligible individuals based on strategies that identify appropriate employment objectives and the need for supportive services, developed as a result of the assessment and service strategy provided for in clause (i), and provide other appropriate information regarding such program; and

''(iii) will provide counseling to participants on their progress in meeting such objectives and satisfying their need for supportive services;

''(O) will provide appropriate services for participants through the One-Stop delivery system as established under section 134(c) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864(c)), and will be involved in the planning and operations of such system pursuant to a memorandum of understanding with the local workforce investment board in accordance with section 121(c) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2841(c));

''(P) will post in such project workplace a notice, and will make available to each person associated with such project a written explanation—

''(i) clarifying the law with respect to political activities allowable and unallowable under chapter 15 of title 5, United States Code, applicable to the project and to each category of individuals associated with such project; and

''(ii) containing the address and telephone number of the Inspector General of the Department of Labor, to whom questions regarding the application of such chapter may be addressed;

''(Q) will provide to the Secretary the description and information described in—

''(i) paragraph (8), relating to coordination with other Federal programs, of section 112(b) of the Workforce and Investment Act of 1998; and

''(ii) paragraph (14), relating to implementation of One-Stop delivery systems, of section 112(b) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998; and

''(R) will ensure that entities that carry out activities under the project (including State agencies, local entities, subgrantees, subcontractors) and affiliates of such entities receive an amount of the administrative cost allocation determined by the Secretary to be sufficient.

''(2) The Secretary may establish, issue, and amend such regulations as may be necessary to effectively carry out this title.

''(3)(A) An assessment and service strategy required by paragraph (1) to be prepared for an eligible individual shall satisfy any condition for an assessment and service strategy or individual employment plan for an adult participant under subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.), in order to determine whether such eligible individual also qualifies for intensive or training services described in section 134(d) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2864(d)).

''(B) An assessment and service strategy or individual employment plan prepared under subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.) for an eligible individual may be used to comply with the requirement specified in subparagraph (A).

''(c)(1) The Secretary may pay a share not to exceed 90 percent of the cost of any project for which a grant is made under subsection (b), except that the Secretary may pay all of such cost if such project is—

''(A) an emergency or disaster project; or

''(B) a project located in an economically depressed area, as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

''(2) The non-Federal share shall be in cash or in kind. In determining the amount of the non-Federal share, the Secretary may attribute fair market value to services and facilities contributed from non-Federal sources.

''(3) Of the amount to be paid under this subsection by the Secretary for a project, not to exceed 13.5 percent shall be available for any fiscal year to pay the administrative costs of such project, except that—

''(A) the Secretary may increase the amount available to pay administrative costs to an amount not to exceed 15 percent of the cost of such project if the Secretary determines, based on information submitted by the grantee under subsection (b), that such increase is necessary to carry out such project; and

''(B) if the grantee under subsection (b) demonstrates to the Secretary that—

''(i) major administrative cost increases are being incurred in necessary program components, including liability insurance, payments for workers' compensation, costs associated with achieving unsubsidized placement goals, and other operation requirements imposed by the Secretary;

''(ii) the number of positions in the project or the number of minority eligible individuals participating in the project will decline if the amount available to pay administrative costs is not increased; or

''(iii) the size of the project is so small that the amount of administrative costs incurred to carry out the project necessarily exceeds 13.5 percent of the cost of such project;

the Secretary shall increase the amount available for such fiscal year to pay administrative costs to an amount not to exceed 15 percent of the cost of such project.

''(4) Administrative costs are the costs, both personnel and non-personnel and both direct and indirect, associated with the following:

''(A) The costs of performing general administrative functions and of providing for the coordination of functions, such as—

''(i) accounting, budgeting, financial, cash management and related data processing;

''(ii) quality assurance;

''(iii) preparing program plans;

''(iv) procurement and purchasing;

''(v) property management;

''(vi) personnel management, including personnel administration, administration of affirmative action plans, and training and staff development;

''(vii) administrative salaries, including clerical and other support staff salaries;

''(viii) payroll functions;

''(ix) coordinating the resolution of findings arising from audits, reviews, investigations, and incident reports;

''(x) audit;

''(xi) general legal services;

''(xii) developing systems and procedures, including information systems, required for administrative functions;

''(xiii) preparing reports; and

''(xiv) other activities necessary for the general administration of government funds and associated programs.

''(B) The costs of performing oversight and monitoring responsibilities.

''(C) The costs of goods and services required for administrative functions of such program, including goods and services such as rental or purchase of equipment, utilities, office supplies, postage, and rental and maintenance of office space.

''(D) The travel costs incurred for official business in carrying out such program, excluding travel costs related to providing services.

''(E) The costs of information systems related to personnel, procurement, purchasing, property management, accounting, and payroll systems), including the purchase, systems development, and operating costs of such systems.

''(F) The costs of technical assistance, professional organization membership dues, removal of architectural barriers, operating and maintaining assistive technology, and evaluating program results against stated objectives.

''(5) To the extent practicable, an entity that carries out a project under this title shall provide for the payment of the expenses described in paragraph (4) from non-Federal sources.

''(6)(A) Amounts made available for a project under this title that are not used to pay for the administrative costs shall be used to pay for the costs of programmatic activities, including—

''(i) participant wages, such benefits as are required by law (such as workers compensation or

unemployment compensation), the costs of physical examinations, compensation for scheduled work hours during which an employer is closed for a Federal holiday, and necessary sick leave that is not part of an accumulated sick leave program, except that no amounts provided under this title may be used to pay the cost of pension benefits, annual leave, accumulated sick leave, or bonuses;

''(ii) participant training (including the payment of reasonable costs of instructors, classroom rental, training supplies, materials, equipment, and tuition) which may be provided prior to or subsequent to placement and which may be provided on the job, in a classroom setting or pursuant to other appropriate arrangements;

''(iii) job placement assistance, including job development and job search assistance;

''(iv) participant supportive services to enable a participant to successfully participate in a project under this title, which may include the payment of reasonable costs of transportation, special job-related or personal counseling, incidentals (such as work shoes, badges, uniforms, eyeglasses, and tools), child and adult care, temporary shelter, and follow-up services; and

''(v) outreach, recruitment, and selection, intake, orientation, and assessments.

''(B) Not less than 65 percent of the funds made available under a grant made under this title (excluding a grant made under subsection (d)) shall be used to pay wages and benefits for eligible individuals who are employed under projects carried out under this title.

''(d) PILOT, DEMONSTRATION, AND EVALUATION PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall use funds reserved under section 506(a)(1) to carry out demonstration projects, pilot projects, and evaluation projects, for the purpose of developing and implementing techniques and approaches, and demonstrating the effectiveness of the specialized methods, in addressing the employment and training needs of eligible individuals. Such projects may include—

''(1) activities linking businesses and eligible individuals, including assistance to participants transitioning from subsidized activities to private-sector employment; and

''(2) demonstration projects and pilot projects designed to—

''(A) attract more eligible individuals into the labor force;

''(B) improve the provision of services to eligible individuals under the One-Stop delivery system established in accordance with title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998;

''(C) enhance the technological skills of eligible individuals; and

''(D) provide incentives to grantees under this title for exemplary performance and incentives to businesses to promote their participation in the program under this title;

''(3) demonstration projects and pilot projects, as described in paragraph (2), for older workers only if such demonstration projects and pilot projects are designed to assist in developing and implementing techniques and approaches in addressing the employment and training needs of eligible individuals;

''(4) training and technical assistance to support any project funded under this title;

''(5) dissemination of best practices; and

''(6) evaluation of the activities authorized under this title.

"SEC. 503. ADMINISTRATION.

''(a) STATE PLAN.—

''(1) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER SUBMITS PLAN.—For a State to be eligible to receive an allotment under section, 506, the chief executive officer of the State shall submit to the Secretary for consideration and approval, a single State plan (referred to in this title as the 'State plan') that outlines a 3-year strategy for the statewide provision of training and related activities for eligible individuals under this title. The plan shall contain such provisions as the Secretary may require, consistent with this title, including a description of the process used to ensure the participation of individuals described in paragraph (2).

''(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In developing the State plan prior to its submission to the Secretary, the chief executive officer of the State shall seek the advice and recommendations of—

''(A) individuals representing the State agency and the area agencies on aging in the State, and the State and local workforce investment boards established under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.);

''(B) individuals representing public and nonprofit private agencies and organizations providing employment services, including each grantee operating a project under this title in the State; and

''(C) individuals representing social service organizations providing services to older individuals, grantees under title III of this Act, affected communities, unemployed older individuals, community-based organizations serving the needs of older individuals, business organizations, and labor organizations.

''(3) COMMENTS.—Any State plan submitted by the chief executive officer in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be accompanied by copies of public comments relating to the plan received pursuant to paragraph (4) and a summary thereof.

''(4) PLAN PROVISIONS.—The State plan shall identify and address—

''(A) the relationship that the number of eligible individuals in each area bears to the total number of eligible individuals, respectively, in the State;

''(B) the relative distribution of eligible individuals residing in rural and urban areas in the State; and

''(C) the relative distribution of—

''(i) eligible individuals who are individuals with greatest economic need;

''(ii) eligible individuals who are minority individuals, including individuals who are limited English proficient; and

''(iii) eligible individuals who are individuals with greatest social need;

''(D) the current and projected employment opportunities in the State, by occupation, and the type of skills possessed by local eligible individuals;

''(E) the localities and populations for which projects of the type authorized by this title are most needed; and

''(F) plans for facilitating the coordination of activities of grantees in the State under this title with activities carried out in the State under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998.

''(5) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON GRANT PROPOSALS.—Before a proposal for a grant under this title for any fiscal year is submitted to the Secretary, the chief executive officer of each State in which projects are proposed to be conducted under such grant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to submit recommendations to the Secretary—

''(A) regarding the anticipated effect of each such proposal upon the overall distribution of enrollment positions under this title in the State (including such distribution among urban and rural areas), taking into account the total number of positions to be provided by all grantees in the State;

''(B) any recommendations for redistribution of positions to under served areas as vacancies occur in previously encumbered positions in other areas; and

''(C) in the case of any increase in funding that may be available for use in the State under this title for any fiscal year, any recommendations for distribution of newly available positions in excess of those available during the preceding year to underserved areas.

''(6) DISRUPTIONS.—In developing plans and considering recommendations under this subsection, disruptions in the provision of services for current participants shall be avoided to the greatest possible extent.

''(7) DETERMINATION; REVIEW.—

''(A) DETERMINATION.—In order to effectively carry out this title, each State shall make the State plan available for public comment. The Secretary, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary, shall review the plan and make a written determination with findings and a decision regarding the plan.

''(B) REVIEW.—The Secretary may review, on the Secretary's own initiative or at the request of any public or private agency or organization or of any agency of the State, the distribution of projects and services under this title in the State including the distribution between urban and rural areas in the State. For each proposed reallocation of projects or services in a State, the Secretary shall give notice and opportunity for public comment.

''(8) EXEMPTION.—The grantees that serve eligible individuals who are older Indians with funds reserved under section 506(a)(3) may not be required to participate in the State planning processes described in this section but will collaborate with the Secretary to develop a plan for projects and services to eligible individuals who are Indians.

''(b) COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS.—

''(1) The Secretary and the Assistant Secretary shall coordinate the program carried out under this title with programs carried out under other titles of this Act, to increase job opportunities available to older individuals.

''(2) The Secretary shall coordinate programs carried out under this title with the program carried out under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, the Community Services Block Grant Act, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.), the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12501 et seq.), and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4950 et seq.). The Secretary shall coordinate the administration of this title with the administration of other titles of this Act by the Assistant Secretary to increase the likelihood that eligible individuals for whom employment opportunities under this title are available and who need services under such titles receive such services. Funds appropriated to carry out this title may not be used to carry out any program under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, the Community Services Block Grant Act, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998, the National and Community Service Act of 1990, or the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973. The preceding sentence shall not be construed to prohibit carrying out projects under this title jointly with programs, projects, or activities under any Act specified in such sentence, or from carrying out section 512.

''(3) The Secretary shall distribute to grantees under this title, for distribution to program participants, and at no cost to grantees or participants, informational materials developed and supplied by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and other appropriate Federal agencies that the Secretary determines are designed to help participants identify age discrimination and to understand their rights under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967.

''(c) In carrying out this title, the Secretary may use, with their consent, the services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of Federal and other agencies with or without reimbursement, and on a similar basis to cooperate with other public and private agencies and instrumentalities in the use of services, equipment, and facilities.

''(d) Payments under this title may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Secretary may determine.

''(e) The Secretary shall not delegate any function of the Secretary under this title to any other Federal officer or entity.

''(f)(1) The Secretary shall monitor projects for which grants are made under this title to determine whether the grantees are complying with rules and regulations issued to carry out this title (including the statewide planning, consultation, and coordination requirements of this title).

''(2) Each grantee that receives funds under this title shall comply with the applicable uniform cost principles and appropriate administrative requirements for grants and contracts that are applicable to the type of entity that receives funds, as issued as circulars or rules of the Office of Management and Budget.

''(3) Each grantee described in paragraph (2) shall prepare and submit a report in such manner and containing such information as the Secretary may require regarding activities carried out under this title.

''(4) Each grantee described in paragraph (2) shall keep records that—

''(A) are sufficient to permit the preparation of reports required by this title;

''(B) are sufficient to permit the tracing of funds to a level of expenditure adequate to ensure that the funds have not been spent unlawfully; and

''(C) contain any other information that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(g) The Secretary shall establish by rule and implement a process to evaluate, in accordance with section 513, the performance of projects and services carried out under this title. The Secretary shall report to the Congress, and make available to the public, the results of each such evaluation and shall use such evaluation to improve services delivered by, or the operation of, projects carried out under this title.

''SEC. 504. PARTICIPANTS NOT FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

''(a) Eligible individuals who are participants in authorized activities in any project funded under this title shall not be considered to be Federal employees as a result of such participation and shall not be subject to part III of title 5, United States Code.

''(b) No grant, subgrant, contract or subcontract shall be entered into under this title with an entity who is, or whose employees are, under State law, exempted from operation of the State workers' compensation law, generally applicable to employees unless the entity shall undertake to provide either through insurance by a recognized carrier or by self-insurance, as authorized by State law, that the persons employed under the grant, contract, subgrant, or subcontract shall enjoy workers' compensation coverage equal to that provided by law for covered employment.

''SEC. 505. INTERAGENCY COOPERATION.

''(a) The Secretary shall consult with and obtain the written views of the Assistant Secretary before issuing rules and before establishing general policy in the administration of this title.

''(b) The Secretary shall consult and cooperate with the Director of the Office of Community Services, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the heads of other Federal agencies that carry out related programs, in order to achieve optimal coordination with such other programs. In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall promote programs or projects of a similar nature. Each Federal agency shall cooperate with the Secretary in disseminating information relating to the availability of assistance under this title and in promoting the identification and interests of individuals eligible for employment in projects assisted under this title.

''(c)(1) The Secretary shall promote and coordinate carrying out projects under this title jointly with programs, projects, or activities carried out under other Acts, especially activities provided under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.), including activities provided through One-Stop delivery systems established under section 134(c)) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2864(c)), that provide training and employment opportunities to eligible individuals.

''(2) The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Education to promote and coordinate carrying out projects under this title jointly with workforce investment activities in which eligible individuals may participate that are carried out under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998.

''SEC. 506. DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE.

''(a) RESERVATIONS.—

''(1) RESERVATION FOR NATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Of the funds appropriated to carry out this title for each fiscal year, the Secretary may first reserve up to 1.5 percent to carry out demonstration projects, pilot projects, and evaluation projects under section 502(d).

''(2) RESERVATION FOR TERRITORIES.—Of the funds appropriated to carry out this title for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve up to 0.75 percent, of which—

''(A) Guam, American Samoa, and the United States Virgin Islands shall each receive 30 percent of the funds so reserved; and

''(B) the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands shall receive 10 percent of the funds so reserved.

''(3) RESERVATION FOR ORGANIZATIONS.—Of the funds appropriated to carry out this title for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve such amount as may be necessary to make national grants to public or nonprofit national Indian aging organizations with the ability to provide authorized activities for eligible individuals who are Indians and to national public or nonprofit Pacific Island and Asian American aging organizations with the ability to provide authorized activities for eligible individuals who are Pacific Island and Asian Americans.

''(b) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—The allotment for each State shall be the sum of the amounts allotted for national grants in such State under subsection (d) and for the grant to such State under subsection (e).

''(c) DIVISION BETWEEN NATIONAL GRANTS AND GRANTS TO STATES.—The funds appropriated to carry out this title for any fiscal year that remain after amounts are reserved under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a), shall be divided by the Secretary between national grants and grants to States as follows:

''(1) RESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006 LEVEL OF ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) The Secretary shall reserve the amount of funds necessary to maintain the fiscal year 2006 level of activities supported by grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary, and the fiscal year 2006 level of activities supported by State grantees under this title, in proportion to their respective fiscal year 2006 levels of activities.

''(B) If in any fiscal year for which the funds appropriated to carry out this title are insufficient to satisfy the requirement specified in subparagraph (A), then the amount described in subparagraph (A) shall be reduced proportionally.

''(2) FUNDING IN EXCESS OF FISCAL YEAR 2006 LEVEL OF ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) UP TO $35,000,000.—The amount of funds remaining after the application of paragraph (1), but not to exceed $35,000,000, shall be divided so that 75 percent shall be provided to State grantees and 25 percent shall be provided to grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary.

''(B) OVER $35,000,000.—The amount of funds remaining (if any) after the application of subparagraph (A) shall be divided so that 50 percent shall be provided to State grantees and 50 percent shall be provided to grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary.

''(d) ALLOTMENTS FOR NATIONAL GRANTS.—From funds available under subsection (c) for national grants, the Secretary shall allot for public and nonprofit private agency and organization grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary in each State, an amount that bears the same ratio to such funds as the product of the number of individuals 55 years of age or older in the State and the allotment percentage of such State bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all States, except as follows:

''(1) MINIMUM ALLOTMENT.—No State shall be provided an amount under this subsection that is less than ½ of 1 percent of the amount provided under subsection (c) for public and nonprofit private agency and organization grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary in all of the States.

''(2) HOLD HARMLESS.—If the amount provided under subsection (c) is—

''(A) equal to or less than the amount necessary to maintain the fiscal year 2006 level of activities, allotments for grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary in each State shall be proportional to their fiscal year 2006 level of activities; or

''(B) greater than the amount necessary to maintain the fiscal year 2006 level of activities, no State shall be provided a percentage increase above the fiscal year 2006 level of activities for grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary in the State that is less than 30 percent of such percentage increase above the fiscal year 2006 level of activities for public and nonprofit private agency and organization grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary in all of the States.

''(3) REDUCTION.—Allotments for States not affected by paragraphs (1) and (2)(B) of this subsection shall be reduced proportionally to satisfy the conditions in such paragraphs.

''(e) ALLOTMENTS FOR GRANTS TO STATES.—From the amount provided for grants to States under subsection (c), the Secretary shall allot for the State grantee in each State an amount that bears the same ratio to such amount as the product of the number of individuals 55 years of age or older in the State and the allotment percentage of such State bears to the sum of the corresponding product for all States, except as follows:

''(1) MINIMUM ALLOTMENT.—No State shall be provided an amount under this subsection that is less than ½ of 1 percent of the amount provided under subsection (c) for State grantees in all of the States.

''(2) HOLD HARMLESS.—If the amount provided under subsection (c) is—

''(A) equal to or less than the amount necessary to maintain the fiscal year 2006 level of activities, allotments for State grantees in each State shall be proportional to their fiscal year 2006 level of activities; or

''(B) greater than the amount necessary to maintain the fiscal year 2006 level of activities, no State shall be provided a percentage increase above the fiscal year 2006 level of activities for State grantees in the State that is less than 30 percent of such percentage increase above the fiscal year 2006 level of activities for State grantees in all of the States.

''(3) REDUCTION.—Allotments for States not affected by paragraphs (1) and (2)(B) of this subsection shall be reduced proportionally to satisfy the conditions in such paragraphs.

''(f) ALLOTMENT PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of subsections (d) and (e)—

''(1) the allotment percentage of each State shall be 100 percent less that percentage that bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the United States, except that—

''(A) the allotment percentage shall be not more than 75 percent and not less than 33 percent; and

''(B) the allotment percentage for the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be 75 percent;

''(2) the number of individuals 55 years of age or older in any State and in all States, and the per capita income in any State and in all States, shall be determined by the Secretary on the

basis of the most satisfactory data available to the Secretary; and

''(3) for the purpose of determining the allotment percentage, the term 'United States' means the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

''(1) COST PER AUTHORIZED POSITION.—The term 'cost per authorized position' means the sum of—

''(A) the hourly minimum wage rate specified in section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)), multiplied by the number of hours equal to the product of 21 hours and 52 weeks;

''(B) an amount equal to 11 percent of the amount specified under subparagraph (A), for the purpose of covering Federal payments for fringe benefits; and

''(C) an amount determined by the Secretary, for the purpose of covering Federal payments for the remainder of all other program and administrative costs.

''(2) FISCAL YEAR 2006 LEVEL OF ACTIVITIES.—The term 'fiscal year 2006 level of activities' means—

''(A) with respect to public and nonprofit private agency and organization grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary, their level of activities for fiscal year 2006; and

''(B) with respect to State grantees, their level of activities for fiscal year 2006.

''(3) GRANTS TO STATES.—The term 'grants to States' means grants made under this title by the Secretary to the States.

''(4) LEVEL OF ACTIVITIES.—The term 'level of activities' means the number of authorized positions multiplied by the cost per authorized position.

''(5) NATIONAL GRANTS.—The term 'national grants' means grants made under this title by the Secretary to public and nonprofit private agency and organization grantees that operate under this title under national grants from the Secretary.

''(6) STATE.—The term 'State' does not include Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands.

"SEC. 507. EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.

''(a) INTERSTATE ALLOCATION.—In making grants under section 506, the Secretary shall ensure, to the extent feasible, an equitable distribution of activities under such grants, in the aggregate, among the States, taking into account the needs of underserved States.

''(b) INTRASTATE ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated for projects within each State under section 506 shall be allocated among areas in the State in an equitable manner, taking into consideration the State priorities set out in the State plan in effect under section 503(a).

"SEC. 508. REPORT.

''To carry out the Secretary's responsibilities for reporting in section 503(g), the Secretary shall require the State agency for each State that receives funds under this title to prepare and submit a report at the beginning of each fiscal year on such State's compliance with section 507(b). Such report shall include the names and geographic location of all projects assisted under this title and carried out in the State and the amount allocated to each such project under section 506.

"SEC. 509. EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE AND FEDERAL HOUSING AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS.

''Funds received by eligible individuals from projects carried out under the program established in this title shall not be considered to be income of such individuals for purposes of determining the eligibility of such individuals, or of any other individuals, to participate in any housing program for which Federal funds may be available or for any income determination under the Food Stamp Act of 1977.

"SEC. 510. ELIGIBILITY FOR WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES.

''Eligible individuals under this title may be considered by local workforce investment boards established under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to satisfy the requirements for receiving services under such title I that are applicable to adults.

"SEC. 511. TREATMENT OF ASSISTANCE.

''Assistance provided under this title shall not be considered to be financial assistance described in section 245A(h)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255A(h)(1)(A)).

"SEC. 512. COORDINATION WITH THE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT OF 1998.

''(a) PARTNERS.—Grantees under this title shall be One-Stop partners as described in subparagraphs (A) and (B)(vi) of section 121(b)(1) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2841(b)(1)) in the One-Stop delivery system established under section 134(c)) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2864(c))) for the appropriate local workforce investment areas, and shall carry out the responsibilities relating to such partners.

''(b) COORDINATION.—In local workforce investment areas where more than 1 grantee under this title provides services, the grantees shall—

''(1) coordinate their activities related to the One-Stop delivery system; and

''(2) shall be signatories of the memorandum of understanding established under section 121(c) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2841(c)).

"SEC. 513. PERFORMANCE.

''(a) MEASURES.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF MEASURES.—The Secretary shall establish, in consultation with grantees, subgrantees, and host agencies under this title, States, older individuals, area agencies on aging, and other organizations serving older individuals, performance measures for each grantee for projects and services carried out under this title.

''(2) CONTENT.—

''(A) COMPOSITION OF MEASURES.—The performance measures established by the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (1) shall consist of—

''(i) core indicators of performance specified in subsection (b)(1) and the expected levels of performance applicable to each core indicator of performance, and

''(ii) additional indicators of performance specified in subsection (b)(2).

''(B) CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT.—The measures described in subparagraph (A)(i) shall be designed to promote continuous improvement in performance.

''(C) EXPECTED LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE.—The Secretary and each grantee shall reach agreement on the expected levels of performance for each program year for each of the core indicators of performance specified in subsection (b)(1). The agreement shall take into account the factors described in subparagraphs (B) and (D) and other appropriate factors as determined by the Secretary, and shall be consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (E). Funds under the grant may not be awarded until such agreement is reached.

''(D) ADJUSTMENT.—The expected levels of performance described in subparagraph (C) applicable to a grantee shall be adjusted after the agreement under subparagraph (C) has been reached only with respect to the following factors:

''(i) High rates of unemployment or of poverty or welfare participation, in the areas served by a grantee, relative to other areas of the State or Nation.

''(ii) Significant downturns in the areas served by the grantee or in the national economy.

''(iii) Significant numbers or proportions of participants with 1 or more barriers to employment served by a grantee relative to grantees serving other areas of the State or Nation.

''(iv) Changes in Federal, State, or local minimum wage requirements.

''(E) PLACEMENT.—

''(i) LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE.—For all grantees, the Secretary shall establish a level of performance of not less than the percentage specified in clause (ii) (adjusted in accordance with subparagraph (D)) for the entry into unsubsidized employment core indicator of performance described in subsection (b)(1)(A). If a grantee achieved a level of performance less than the percentage specified in such clause for the preceding fiscal year for which results are available before the enactment of the Senior Independence Act of 2006, the Secretary shall provide technical assistance to assist such grantee to achieve the applicable percentage specified in such clause.

''(ii) REQUIRED PLACEMENT PERCENTAGES.—The minimum percentage for the entry into unsubsidized employment described in subsection (b)(1)(A) is—

''(I) 22 percent in fiscal year 2007;

''(II) 24 percent in fiscal year 2008;

''(III) 26 percent in fiscal year 2009;

''(IV) 28 percent in fiscal year 2010; and

''(V) 30 percent in fiscal year 2011.

''(3) PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF GRANTEES.—The Secretary shall annually establish national performance measures for each grantee under this title, which shall be applicable to the grantee without regard to whether such grantee operates such program directly or through contracts, grants, or agreements with other entities. The measures shall include the core indicators of performance and expected level of performance for each such indicator, and the additional indicators of performance. In addition, the Secretary shall annually publish the actual performance of each grantee with respect to—

''(A) the levels achieved for each of the core indicators of performance, compared to expected levels of performance under paragraph (2)(C) (including any adjustments to such levels made in accordance with to paragraph (2)(D)); and

''(B) the levels achieved for each of the additional indicators of performance.

''(4) LIMITATION.—An agreement to be evaluated on the performance measures shall be a requirement for application for, and a condition of, all grants authorized by this title.

''(b) INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.—

''(1) CORE INDICATORS.—The core indicators of performance described in subsection (a)(2)(A)(i) shall consist of—

''(A) entry into unsubsidized employment;

''(B) retention in unsubsidized employment for 6 months;

''(C) earnings; and

''(D) hours (in the aggregate) of community service employment-based training pursuant to subparagraphs (A) and (B)(I) of section 502(b)(1).

''(2) ADDITIONAL INDICATORS.—The additional indicators of performance described in subsection (a)(2)(A)(ii) shall consist of—

''(A) retention in unsubsidized employment for 1 year;

''(B) the number of eligible individuals served, including the number of participating individuals described in section 516(2)(A)(ii), and

''(C) any other indicators of performance that the Secretary determines to be appropriate to evaluate services and performance.

''(c) DEFINITIONS OF INDICATORS.—The Secretary, after consultation with national and State grantees, representatives of business and labor organizations, and providers of services, shall issue rules that define the indicators of performance described in subsection (b).

''(d) CORRECTIVE EFFORTS.—

''(1) NATIONAL GRANTEES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the end of each program year, the Secretary shall determine if a national grantee awarded a grant under section 514 has met the expected levels of performance established under subsection (a)(2)(c) (including any adjustments

to such levels made in accordance with to subsection (a)(2)(D)) for the core indicators of performance described in subsection (b)(1).

''(B) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that a grantee fails to meet the expected levels of performance described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide technical assistance and require such grantee to submit a corrective action plan not later than 160 days after the end of the program year.

''(ii) CONTENT.—The plan submitted under subparagraph (A) shall detail the steps the grantee will take to meet the national performance measures in the next program year.

''(2) STATE GRANTEES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the end of the program year, the Secretary shall determine if a State grantee allotted funds under section 506(e) has met the expected levels of performance established under subsection (a)(2)(C) (including any adjustments to such levels made in accordance with to subsection (a)(2)(D)) for the core indicators of performance described in subsection (b)(1).

''(B) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN.—If a State fails to meet the levels of performance described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide technical assistance and require the State to submit a corrective action plan not later than 160 days after the end of the program year.

''(C) CONTENT.—The plan described in subparagraph (B) shall detail the steps the State will take to meet the standards.

''(D) FAILURE TO MEET PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR THE THIRD YEAR.—If the State fails to meet the levels of performance described in subparagraph (A) for a third consecutive program year, the Secretary shall provide for the conduct by the State of a competition to award the funds allocated to the State for the first full program year following the Secretary's determination that the State has not met the performance measures.

"SEC. 514. COMPETITIVE REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO GRANT AWARDS.

''(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

''(1) INITIAL APPROVAL OF GRANT APPLICATIONS.—From the funds available for national grants under section 506(d), the Secretary shall award grants to eligible applicants to carry out projects under this title for a period of 3 years through a competitive process except as provided in paragraph (2).

''(2) CONTINUATION OF APPROVAL BASED ON PERFORMANCE.—If the recipient of a grant made under paragraph (1) satisfies the requirements of section 513 during such 3-year period (and the succeeding 1-year period for which any grant is made under this paragraph) with respect to a project, the Secretary may award grants to such recipient to continue such project beyond such 3-year period for not to exceed 2 successive 1-year periods without regard to such process.

''(b) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—An applicant shall be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a) in accordance with section 502(b)(1), and subsections (c) and (d).

''(c) CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall select the eligible applicants to receive grants under subsection (a) based on the following:

''(1) The applicant's ability to administer a program that serves the greatest number of eligible individuals, giving particular consideration to individuals with greatest economic need, greatest social need, poor employment history or prospects, and over the age of 65.

''(2) The applicant's ability to administer a program that provides employment for eligible individuals in the communities in which such individuals reside, or in nearby communities, that will contribute to the general welfare of the community.

''(3) The applicant's ability to administer a program that moves eligible individuals into unsubsidized employment.

''(4) The applicant's prior performance, if any, in meeting performance measures under this title and under other Federal or State programs.

''(5) The applicant's ability to move individuals with multiple barriers to employment into unsubsidized employment.

''(6) The applicant's ability to coordinate with other organizations at the State and local level.

''(7) The applicant's plan for fiscal management of the program to be administered with funds received under this section.

''(8) Any additional criteria that the Secretary considers to be appropriate in order to minimize disruption for current participants.

''(d) RESPONSIBILITY TESTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Before final selection of a grantee, the Secretary shall conduct a review of available records to assess the applicant's overall responsibility to administer Federal funds.

''(2) REVIEW.—As part of the review described in paragraph (1), the Secretary may consider any information, including the organization's history with regard to the management of other grants.

''(3) FAILURE TO SATISFY TEST.—The failure to satisfy any 1 responsibility test that is listed in paragraph (4), excluding those listed in subparagraphs (A) and (B), does not establish that the organization is not responsible unless such failure is substantial or persists for 2 or more consecutive years.

''(4) TEST.—The responsibility tests include review of the following factors:

''(A) Unsuccessful efforts by the organization to recover debts, after 3 demand letters have been sent, that are established by final agency action, or a failure to comply with an approved repayment plan.

''(B) Established fraud or criminal activity of a significant nature within the organization.

''(C) Serious administrative deficiencies identified by the Secretary, such as failure to maintain a financial management system as required by Federal rules or regulations.

''(D) Willful obstruction of the audit process.

''(E) Failure to provide services to applicants as agreed to in a current or recent grant or to meet applicable performance measures.

''(F) Failure to correct deficiencies brought to the grantee's attention in writing as a result of monitoring activities, reviews, assessments, or other activities.

''(G) Failure to return a grant closeout package or outstanding advances within 90 days of the grant expiration date or receipt of closeout package, whichever is later, unless an extension has been requested and granted.

''(H) Failure to submit required reports.

''(I) Failure to properly report and dispose of Government property as instructed by the Secretary.

''(J) Failure to have maintained effective cash management or cost controls resulting in excess cash on hand.

''(K) Failure to ensure that a subrecipient complies with its Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133 audit requirements specified at section 667.200(b) of title 20, Code of Federal Regulations.

''(L) Failure to audit a subrecipient within the required period.

''(M) Final disallowed costs in excess of 5 percent of the grant or contract award if, in the judgment of the grant officer, the disallowances are egregious findings.

''(N) Failure to establish a mechanism to resolve a subrecipient's audit in a timely fashion.

''(5) DETERMINATION.—Applicants that are determined to be not responsible shall not be selected as grantees.

''(6) DISALLOWED COSTS.—Interest on disallowed costs shall accrue in accordance with the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996.

"SEC. 515. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.

''(b) Amounts appropriated under this section for any fiscal year shall be available for obligation during the annual period that begins on July 1 of the calendar year immediately following the beginning of such fiscal year and that ends on June 30 of the following calendar year. The Secretary may extend the period during which such amounts may be obligated or expended in the case of a particular organization or agency that receives funds under this title if the Secretary determines that such extension is necessary to ensure the effective use of such funds by such organization or agency.

''(c) At the end of the program year, the Secretary may recapture any unexpended funds for the program year, and reobligate such funds within the 2 succeeding program years for—

''(1) technical assistance; or

''(2) grants or contracts for any other program under this title.

"SEC. 516. DEFINITIONS.

''For purposes of this title:

''(1) COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT-BASED TRAINING.—The term 'community service employment-based training' means work experience that is related to providing social, health, welfare, and educational services (including literacy tutoring), legal and other counseling services and assistance, including tax counseling and assistance and financial counseling, and library, recreational, and other similar services; conservation, maintenance, or restoration of natural resources; community betterment or beautification; antipollution and environmental quality efforts; weatherization activities; economic development; and such other services essential and necessary to the community as the Secretary determines by rule.

''(2) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'eligible individual' means an individual who is 55 years of age or older and who has a low income (including any such individual whose income is not more that 125 percent of the poverty line), excluding any income that is unemployment compensation, benefits received under title XVI of the Social Security Act, veterans payments, or 25 percent of the benefits received under title II of the Social Security Act, but—

''(A) pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary, any such individual who meets one or more of the following criteria shall have priority for the work opportunities provided under this title—

''(i) is 65 years of age or older; or

''(ii) has one or more of the following barriers to employment:

''(I) has a disability;

''(II) has limited English proficiency or low literacy skills;

''(III) resides in a rural area;

''(IV) is a veteran;

''(V) has low employment prospects; or

''(VI) has failed to find employment after utilizing services provided under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998; and

''(B) notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, excludes—

''(i) an individual who has participated in projects under this title for a period of 48 months in the aggregate (whether or not consecutive) after the date of the enactment of the Senior Independence Act of 2006; and

''(ii) an individual who has participated in projects under this title for a period of 24 months in the aggregate (whether or not consecutive) after the date of the enactment of the Senior Independence Act of 2006 if such individual participated more than 24 months in the aggregate (whether or not consecutive) under title V of this Act, as in effect before the date of the enactment of the Senior Independence Act of 2006.

''(3) INCOME.—The term 'income' means income received during the 12-month period (or, at the option of the grantee involved, the 6-month

period that is not multiplied) ending on the date an eligible individual submits an application to participate in the project carried out under this title by such grantee.

''(4) PACIFIC ISLAND AND ASIAN AMERICANS.—The term 'Pacific Island and Asian Americans' means Americans having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands.

''(5) PROGRAM.—The term 'program' means the older American community service employment-based training program established under this title.

''(6) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.—The term 'supportive services' means services such as transportation, child care, dependent care, housing, and needs-related payments, that are necessary to enable an individual to participate in activities authorized under this title, consistent with the provisions of this title.

''(7) UNEMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'unemployed individual' means an individual who is without a job and who wants and is available for work, including an individual who may have occasional employment that does not result in a constant source of income.''.

SEC. 40. NATIVE AMERICANS CAREGIVER SUPPORT PROGRAM.

Section 643 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3057n) is amended by striking ''title—'' and all that follows through the period at the end, and inserting ''title such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.

SEC. 41. VULNERABLE ELDER RIGHTS PROTECTION ACTIVITIES.

Section 702 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3058a) is amended by striking ''2001'' each place it appears and inserting ''2007''.

SEC. 42. NATIVE AMERICAN ORGANIZATION PROVISIONS.

Section 751(d) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3058aa(b)) is amended by striking ''2001'' and inserting ''2007''.

SEC. 43. ELDER ABUSE, NEGLECT, AND EXPLOITATION PREVENTION.

Section 721 (b) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3058i(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) providing for public education and outreach to promote financial literacy and prevent identity theft and financial exploitation of older individuals;''; and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (8) as paragraphs (3) through (9), respectively.

SEC. 44. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 202(e)(1)(A) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period, and

(2) by inserting before section 401 the following:

''TITLE IV—ACTIVITIES FOR HEALTH, INDEPENDENCE AND LONGEVITY''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous information on H.R. 5293.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5293, the Senior Independence Act of 2006, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this critical measure.

Today supporting the needs of older Americans is more important than ever. More than 49 million people in the United States are over the age of 60, making it the fastest-growing age group in the country. By the year 2050, that number will reach nearly 90 million and comprise almost a quarter of our population. This trend requires substantial reforms to ensure the quality and effectiveness of Federal programs aimed at assisting the elderly.

Last month the Education and the Workforce Committee approved the bipartisan bill before us, legislation that will make those additional reforms by reauthorizing and strengthening the Older Americans Act.

Initially established in 1965, the Older Americans Act has transformed into the first stop for seniors to identify home- and community-based long-term care options, as well as other supportive services that can help prevent or delay expensive institutional care and generate significant savings in Federal entitlement programs. And H.R. 5293 builds on that progress.

Specifically, the bipartisan Senior Independence Act will, number one, promote measures such as nutrition programs and health screens that reduce seniors' risk of injury, disease or disability; two, improve access to health care by supporting resource centers in every community where older Americans and their families can go for reliable information about long-term care options, community support services and important health benefits such as Medicare, prescription drug coverage; and number three, encourage States and communities to plan for an increasing number of older Americans.

□ 1115

This bill also reauthorizes the Senior Community Service Employment Program to provide older individuals with temporary employment-based training opportunities. These opportunities can help seniors obtain the skills they need to obtain a full- or part-time unsubsidized job. This program is a means to an end and should not be considered permanent employment. Therefore, this legislation requires national grantees selected through a full and open competition and States to place 30 percent of their participants into unsubsidized employment by the year 2011.

The bill also encourages grantees to establish partnerships with private sector businesses that can provide participants on-the-job training and help individuals achieve their goal of obtaining employment. At the same time, H.R. 5293 does not lose sight of the valuable community services of this program and requires at least half of all subsidized employment-based training to provide a community service.

My colleagues may recall that in the past, reauthorizing the Older Americans Act was often a very partisan process. However, this year that has not been the case. Both Democrats and Republicans on the Education and the Workforce Committee pulled together to make the reforms necessary to meet the challenges of an aging population. In fact, the bill passed our committee without any opposition whatsoever. I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. TIBERI from Ohio; and his ranking member, Mr. HINOJOSA from Texas; and Mr. GEORGE MILLER, the ranking member of the full committee for their great work and leadership in helping to craft this bill in such a thoughtful, bipartisan manner. During this political season that is quite a rare feat.

I close by thanking all Americans who work or volunteer to support our country's aging network. This strong and vital network is made possible because of a cadre of selfless volunteers who deliver meals to homebound seniors, offer companionship, assist with activities of daily living, and provide many other necessary supports that help older Americans remain healthy and fulfilled. This legislation is designed to support you, and I hope it is a positive reflection of your good work.

Mr. Speaker, Senior Independence Act aims to make the most of the Federal investment in programs to assist older Americans. It is a good bill worthy of our support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 5293, the Senior Independence Act. I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON, Subcommittee Chairman TIBERI, Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER, and all of the members of the Education and the Workforce Committee who have rolled up their sleeves to produce a bipartisan bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act.

I would also like to take a moment to commend the outstanding staff on both sides of the aisle for their excellent work. The chairman set up an open process, a process that aimed to engage all of the stakeholders. That kind of process is only successful when you have staff members who are dedicated to getting the job done and able to synthesize the recommendations and build the consensus necessary to move forward. I would especially like to recognize the work of Kate Houston and Lucy House and Angela Klemack on the majority staff, as well as Cheryl Johnson, Ricardo Martinez, and Moira Lenehan on our side of the aisle. They made a sometimes difficult and complicated process go smoothly, and I thank them and appreciate their good and effective service.

Aging is a fact of life. However, through the establishment of Social Security, Medicare, and the enactment of the Older Americans Act, living in

poverty to most Americans no longer is a fact of aging. From 1959 to 2002, the percentage of older people living in poverty fell from 35 percent to only 10 percent.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 is the landmark legislation that articulated our core values as a Nation. The act begins with a declaration of objectives which includes the following: ''Retirement in health, honor, dignity, after years of contribution to the economy.'' This is a statement of our national obligation to older Americans. The Older Americans Act represents our commitment to meeting that obligation. This law provides for supportive services such as transportation, housekeeping, and personal care. It provides nutrition services both in the home and in community settings. It provides preventative health services and supports family caregivers. Finally, it protects the rights of vulnerable older Americans by combating consumer fraud and protecting seniors from abuse.

The legislation before us today, H.R. 5293, the Senior Independence Act, truly represents our good faith effort to respond to the community's will, as expressed at the White House Conference on Aging where the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act was declared the top priority.

The bill before us reauthorizes all of the core programs in the Older Americans Act. It promotes greater access to services for individuals who are more comfortable in a language other than English. It maintains the structure of the Senior Community Service Employment Program that reaffirms the dual purpose of the programs, employment and community service. It strengthens the very successful Family Caregiver Program. It promotes greater choices and health nutrition education so that our seniors can remain at home and in their communities. It promotes financial literacy for family caregivers and seniors so that older Americans' physical and mental health are not jeopardized by poor financial health. It strengthens our system of protecting older Americans from abuse. Finally, it recognizes that seniors are a growing resource for the aging network and for our communities in general. We must continue to look for ways to leverage our older citizens' talents and desires to continue to make a difference.

It is incumbent upon us all to step up and invest in these programs. It is one sure way to help control the cost of our growing entitlement programs. It is the right thing to do. We know that every dollar spent providing a meal or supporting seniors so that they can remain at home and in their communities not only improves their quality of life but saves entitlement spending on long-term care. That is the genius of the Older Americans Act. Yet we know that the Older Americans Act's purchasing power per individual has dropped by 50 percent since 1980.

As we have worked in a bipartisan manner to craft a reauthorization bill, I was pleased that we were able to advocate together for an increase in the nutrition and support services programs in the Older Americans Act in the Labor, HHS, and Education appropriations bill. I hope that as we move forward with the appropriations process, we will restore the funding that was cut for the Senior Community Service Employment Program and that we will continue to look for ways to increase our investment in all of the critical programs under this Older Americans Act.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I look forward to continuing to work with the chairman and all of the members of the committee to move this legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield at this time 1½ minutes to Mr. KELLER, the chairman of the 21st Century Subcommittee.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5293, the Senior Independence Act of 2006. This bipartisan legislation would renew the Older Americans Act, which is our Nation's primary Federal program overseeing the delivery of services to our Nation's elderly.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness, I am particularly supportive of the assistance the act provides to our seniors seeking employment. This act includes the Senior Community Service Employment Program, a community-oriented employment-based training program for low-income older Americans. It provides work experience and training opportunities to older individuals to help them prepare for unsubsidized employment. Program participants receive experience through job placements in a wide variety of occupations and industries.

In a nutshell, this legislation helps seniors to help themselves by providing them with valuable job training and placement assistance to get jobs.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 5293.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to an outstanding individual from the great State of Illinois, the ranking member of the Government Reform Subcommittee and a distinguished member of the Select Education Committee, Congressman DANNY DAVIS.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have been told that you can measure the greatness of a society by how well it treats its young, how well it treats its old, and how well it treats those who have difficulty caring for themselves. So I rise in strong support of this bill, which reauthorizes the Older Americans Act.

At the outset, I want to commend and thank Chairman MCKEON; Ranking Member MILLER; Subcommittee Chairman TIBERI; and the subcommittee ranking member and my colleague from Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, for an excellent bipartisan bill. I also want to extend my sincerest appreciation to the staff persons on both the majority and on the minority sides.

Mr. Speaker, I have a Seniors and Eldercare Task Force composed of a wonderful group of experts who advise me on key issues regarding seniors in my district back in the great city of Chicago. This act advances many areas of concern to my district. Foremost, it expands access of younger grandparents to the National Family Caregiver Support Program, and it encourages States to adopt Kinship Navigator programs for relative caregivers. My district has over 10,000 grandparent-headed households. So the bill aids these caregivers with services that help in their caregiving responsibilities. Further, the bill promotes community-based services via self-directed models of care. This bill will reduce instances of abuse and neglect and improve data collection on the subject, building on the ideas promoted by my colleague from Illinois, Mr. EMANUEL.

I am also happy that the bill emphasizes the importance of mental health in many ways, drawing on the spirit of the Positive Aging Act, sponsored by Mr. KENNEDY. And I want to commend Mr. EHLERS for his efforts to make sure that the mental health component of this legislation is strong.

Mr. Speaker, Hubert Humphrey once said that the moral test of government is how it treats those in the dawn of life, the children, and those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly. The Senior Independence Act of 2006 ensures that our senior citizens would have a greater opportunity for a happy, meaningful, and productive life. I commend the Education and the Workforce Committee for a tremendous piece of legislation.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), the subcommittee chairman who has provided the leadership to get this bill to the floor.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I always tell constituents back home when they ask me what the most important part of my job is, I tell them it is about helping people. This legislation today is really all about helping people, especially our senior citizens.

This bill renews our commitment to the vital programs our older Americans use every day in our communities, in our neighborhoods, and especially in their homes. The Committee on Education and the Workforce voted unanimously to favorably report out the Senior Independence Act of 2006 to the floor today. It is the product of months of hard work to reauthorize and make meaningful amendments to the Older Americans Act. We have heard from

national, from State, from local stakeholders and advocates, those involved directly in the output of services under this act.

□ 1130

We heard from constituents, seniors themselves, those on the receiving end of services, as the subcommittee went into the field and held field hearings in Edinburg, Texas, in Congressman RUBÉN HINOJOSA's district, and in Westerville, Ohio, in my district.

The vast aging network contributed greatly to the reauthorization process. My gratitude goes out to all of them for their commitment to our seniors and to the mission of the act itself. It has been an open and a bipartisan process from the very beginning, and I believe we have a better product and a better bill because of that process, a bill that all Members of this House can support, and a bill that older Americans can support as well.

I want to acknowledge the valuable contribution of the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. HINOJOSA from Texas, and his staff, particularly Ricardo Martinez and Moira Lenehan, for their outstanding contribution to this process. Thank you so much. Mr. HINOJOSA has been a devoted partner from the beginning of this process, and I am so grateful for his work on this legislation.

I also want to acknowledge the leadership, the friendship through the entire process that my friend Chairman MCKEON has provided as well. Thank you for your tireless work and the tireless work of your staff. Kate Houston, Stephanie Milburn, Lucy House and Angela Klemack have all been great champions in this work that we have before us today.

I sincerely appreciate the support from the cosponsors of the legislation and all the members of the committee who supported the bill. It is a testament to our sincere efforts to have open and bipartisan process.

The Senior Independence Act builds on the successes of the programs authorized by the Older Americans Act by strengthening services to help individuals avoid institutional care and to improve the quality of life for aging Americans. It promotes the development and implementation of comprehensive, coordinated systems at the Federal, State and local levels to streamline access to programs, benefits and help for individuals to avoid institutional care.

It encourages local area agencies on aging to work with city and county officials, State agencies and other community entities to plan for the aging across multiple areas, including land use, housing, transportation, public safety and recreation.

Among other things, Mr. Speaker, it advances the mission of evidence-based programs to assist older Americans and their family caregivers in learning about and making behavioral changes intended to reduce the risk of injury, disease and disability among seniors.

The bill brings health care monitoring into the 21st century, providing grants specifically for the development of new practices and technologies, allowing physicians and other health care professionals to remotely monitor the health and well-being of our seniors either in the home or in community-based settings. It encourages providers to deliver services in a manner responsive to the needs and preferences of older individuals and their family caregivers.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also expands eligibility for the National Family Caregiver Support Program to grandparents and other relatives age 55 years and older who care for a grandchild or an adult child with a disability.

And this bill gives attention to the rising significance of Alzheimer's disease in our society. Current law allows caregivers to receive support only when they are caring for adults over the age of 60. However, it is estimated that about 300,000, about 7 to 8 percent, of the 4 million Americans diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease are cases, are early onset.

This bill allows caregivers who care for individuals at any age with Alzheimer's disease or other dementia or neurological disorders to receive support from the caregiver support program.

The Senior Independence Act also emphasizes the critical link between nutrition and prevention of chronic disease, and supports efforts to reduce the incidence of obesity, which is a growing problem among all segments of our society, and seniors as well.

It strengthens, finally, Mr. Speaker, the Community Service Employment-Based Training Program for older Americans, promoting business sector partnerships, flexibility to grantees, and recognizing seniors as valuable assets to our communities and to our Nation, promoting activities to harness their services for the greater good of our community and our country.

The Education and Workforce Committee has strived to make the necessary reforms to make the most of the Federal investment in programs to assist older Americans, while ensuring that the growing senior population is served by quality programs established by the 1965 law.

I thank Chairman MCKEON, I thank Ranking Member MILLER and Ranking Member HINOJOSA of my subcommittee for their tireless and great work for this product. The Senior Independence Act of 2006 accomplishes all these goals, and I am a proud sponsor of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, and urge all my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), and ask unanimous consent that he be able to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the presence of and the comments made by Chairman TIBERI from the State of Ohio, and I want to associate myself with many of the comments that he made about the bipartisanship that was seen and experienced as we worked on this legislation. I congratulate him for his leadership and congratulate him for helping us get to this point that we are today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), a friend and colleague who serves on the powerful Appropriations Committee and is recognized for his commitment and passion for education and health care.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for his great leadership on this bill, and applaud Chairman MCKEON for his leadership as well, and also Representative MILLER from California. But I want to begin by paying special tribute to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for his leadership on the issues of mental health in the committee and working to try to get more mental health provisions incorporated into this legislation.

I also want to add a special word about my Fellow in my office, Berre Burch. Our Fellows do enormous work for all of us. They don't get paid for it, but they are very committed and spend long hours. Berre Burch has been instrumental in working on many of these provisions on mental health in this bill, as well as many others.

Mr. Speaker, I know we are in a tight budget year, and often programs are not included in bills such as this because of the expense that they have. But, frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that the mental health needs of our seniors are included in this bill, principally because they do help save us money. Not only do they help save us money in long-term care costs, but they also help save lives as well. Yes, lives.

According to the National Institutes of Health, senior citizens commit suicide at a higher rate than any other age group in our country. Now, understand this. Suicide is already twice the rate of homicide in this country. People don't recognize that. For every murder in this country, two people take their lives.

Now you can see that having senior citizens have the highest suicide rate of all is pretty startling. It runs in the face of our notion of what the golden years of a senior citizen's life should be all about.

We all have been guilty about understanding what it means to be a senior citizen. A lot of us confuse dementia. We say that is part of being old. It doesn't have to be part of what being old is all about. We have proven, effective treatments to intervene with seniors and make sure that the depression

that they may be suffering is something that is treated so that their golden years can actually be golden years, where they can live productive, happy lives.

But what does this country do to our seniors? They put them away. They put them in senior high-rises. They take them away from their families. They don't support them in their communities. They are detached from the social networks in their communities and from the community bonds that keep them uplifted.

Many of them lose their spouse. Many of them lose their independence. They have physical challenges. And all of this leads, very obviously, to anything that we would all acknowledge is depression. Who wouldn't be depressed under these circumstances?

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, they don't have to remain depressed. They can get treatment. We can intervene and help them out of these very same challenges.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that has been looked at over and over and over again. Surgeon General Satcher acknowledges it, the New Freedom Commission on Mental Health by President Bush acknowledges it, the White House Commission on Aging, all of whom say that there are many impediments and obstacles to senior citizens getting the mental health care that they need, none the least of which is stigma and stereotype.

In my generation, mental health is no longer the stigma that it used to be. But for many senior citizens, when they hear mental health, they think that it is something wrong with them. They think it is something morally wrong with them.

We need to tell senior citizens this is part of your health care. The brain is part of your body. When the brain has chemical imbalances, we need to treat those.

But, Mr. Speaker, in our country today, even in this great time of prosperity and advancement in science, we still don't acknowledge the brain as part of the body. When it comes to insurance coverage, we don't have parity for mental health or for Medicare parity, which basically means if you have depression or any other mental illness, you are paying a higher copay for your insurance for mental health treatment, you are paying a higher deductible for your health insurance, you are paying a higher premium, because somehow mental health care is treated as if it is cosmetic surgery. It is treated like it is elective surgery. It is not treated as if it is the real physical health challenge that so many millions of Americans face and, tragically, so many senior citizens face on a daily basis.

But it doesn't have to be this way. I appreciate the fact that many portions of my bill called the Positive Aging Act were included in this legislation. But I will continue to fight for mental health parity so that we can give all Americans access to mental health services, and I will continue to fight for the Positive Aging Act so we get all of the necessary community support systems in place to help treat our seniors with the dignity and the respect that our senior citizens have earned and that we ought to give them.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER), a member of our subcommittee who was a great asset to the development of this legislation.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for H.R. 5293, the Senior Independence Act of 2006.

This important piece of legislation includes two amendments I authored along with my friend and colleague from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) regarding elderly abuse prevention and ''cash and counseling.''

Findings from the National Elder Abuse Incidence Study, which was conducted by the National Center for Elder Abuse, suggests that more than 500,000 Americans age 60 and over were victims of domestic abuse in 1996. As shocking and profound as these numbers are, it is possible that they are on the low end as the problem remains greatly hidden, and cases go unreported.

A few of these cases of neglect and abuse have surfaced in the papers. For example, an 82-year-old East St. Louis man with diabetes who spent 2 weeks at a nursing home had to have his left leg amputated because he did not receive proper care.

In another sickening incident, Chicago paramedics found a 94-year-old man lying in bed unattended for so long that the bones had poked through his skin in several places. His daughter, who was supposedly caring for him in her home, was later charged with two counts of criminal abuse.

Educating seniors, professionals, caregivers and the public on abuse is critical to prevention, and this is obviously a position that warrants the attention of this Congress.

My amendment authorizes the Assistant Secretary on Aging at the Department of Health and Human Services to develop objectives, priorities, policy and a long-term plan for carrying out and coordinating elder justice activities.

In addition, this amendment will help States and local entities coordinate their fragmented activities, and I believe it will ultimately improve elder justice efforts across our great country.

I would like to thank my colleague from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for taking the lead on the cash and counseling amendment. This amendment will support consumer-driven models of home- and community-based care and help prevent high-risk individuals from spending down their savings to receive Medicaid. It does not create a new program. Instead, it revises language in current law that directs the Administration on Aging to develop policy alternatives for long-term care.

Activities such as cash and counseling programs have the potential to generate significant savings to large taxpayer-funded entitlement programs like Medicare and Medicaid. So I think this amendment makes fiscal sense, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Once again, I would like to thank Mr. DAVIS from Illinois for his help on these important amendments, and also thank Representative TIBERI for his work on the underlying legislation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5293.

□ 1145

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to give 3 minutes to a hardworking and a valued member of the Education and Workforce Committee and also a member of the Government Reform Committee, Congressman KUCINICH from Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas who serves ably on the Committee. And it is a good demonstration here of bipartisan support, and I certainly want to add to it by supporting the legislation.

I also think that I can speak for many Members in saying how much we appreciate Representative KENNEDY's role in all of this. He has shown himself to be a very valuable Member of this Congress, and his voice is an important voice in this Congress, and we certainly want to do all we can to not only further his leadership, but encourage his participation.

I want to say, though, to Mr. TIBERI, who has done a very good job on this, there is a gaping hole in this legislation, and we need to address it in conference. I intended to offer an amendment that would help provide for administrations on aging and thousands of volunteers nationwide from being squeezed by the rising cost of gasoline. My amendment would have provided a nonbinding formula for calculating annual increases in fuel cost for the three Older American Act programs that are most heavily dependent on transportation. These programs include the in-home nutrition services, the congregate nutrition services, and the supportive services that provide rides to doctors' appointments, trips to the grocery store and to senior centers, among other services.

These programs help seniors maintain their independence, dignity and health. In 2003, the supportive services gave almost 36 million rides and provided 20 million hours of personal care, homemaker and chore services. In that same year, 248 million meals were served. Each meal required transportation.

According to the Energy Information Administration, the price of gas the week ending on Christmas of the year 2000 was $1.60. The price of gas for the week of May 15, 2006, was $3.15. In other words, since the Older Americans Act was last authorized, gas prices have doubled.

High gas prices heavily impact programs like meal and transportation services. First, programs have to cut back services for all nonessential trips such as family visits, general shopping, trips to the workplace, and other social activities. Second, volunteer drivers, many of whom are retired and on fixed incomes, are quitting because their mileage reimbursement rates can't be updated by the underfunded Administration on Aging. Finally, as gas prices squeeze seniors living at the financial margin, forcing them to lose their independence, they rely more heavily on services like those provided by the Administration on Aging through the Older Americans Act.

At the same time that prices have gone up, funding has gone down. My amendment would have held harmless from rising gasoline prices the congregate and in-home nutrition services as well as the supportive services by authorizing a yearly adjustment to the fuel component of their budget. If the price of crude oil rises year after year, then the agency's fuel budgets would rise a proportionate amount. If oil prices fall, fuel budgets would fall as well.

Although I strongly support the underlying bill, I want to say that it is important that the House address this in conference. We have to do more to make sure our mothers, fathers, siblings, and grandparents are not losing the services they need to help them lead an independent, dignified, healthy life because of high gas prices. Keep it in mind, so many services are dependent on transportation. If the price of transportation goes up, we don't want senior citizens hurt from this. I ask Mr. TIBERI to do everything he can in conference to help our senior citizens meet this. I thank my fellow colleagues.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a contributing member of the Education and Workforce Committee, a veteran member of the committee from Michigan, Mr. EHLERS.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Senior Independence Act. I commend Congressman TIBERI and Chairman MCKEON for their work on this bill. I especially thank Chairman MCKEON, Congressman DANNY DAVIS, and their staff members Kate Houston and Jill Hunter-Williams for their work on adding mental health provisions to the bill.

Last winter I had the pleasure of meeting with Suzanne Ogland-Hand, the director of the Center For Senior Care at Pine Rest Christian Mental Health Services, a very large faith-based psychiatric hospital located in my district. Ms. Ogland-Hand had served as my delegate to the White House Conference on Aging, and provided valuable input to both the conference and to me regarding the need for a focus on seniors' mental health at the Administration on Aging.

Throughout my life and career, I have met many people, including seniors, who are affected by mental health problems. Certainly the stigma related to mental health issues for seniors is significant. I know this personally because my mother suffered from mental health problems and was very ashamed of it.

I have observed the devastating impact untreated mental health conditions have on individuals and their family members' lives. This bill makes positive steps towards encouraging awareness and coordination of mental health service for seniors. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and vote in favor of it.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would like to make some closing remarks and acknowledge that during this opportunity that I have had in a year and a half to work with Chairman TIBERI, I have learned to appreciate his commitment to helping people, as he said in his opening remarks, and this bill, H.R. 5293, which will amend the Older Americans Act of 1965, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 through 2011, and for other purposes, is one that makes me feel very proud to be a part of this work that has been accomplished. I am a proud sponsor of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska, another contributing member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, Mr. OSBORNE.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, as an older American, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5293, the Senior Independence Act, which reauthorizes the Older American Act. And I want to congratulate Chairman TIBERI, who is not an older American, but he is getting there, as well as Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member MILLER and Mr. HINOJOSA.

The Senior Independence Act, as has been pointed out many times, reauthorizes and strengthens the delivery of social services for older Americans. In my State, Nebraska, 13.6 percent of our population are over 65. In most States, the average is between 10 and 15 percent, and this is a very rapidly increasing percentage. So this is an important segment of our population, and I would like to focus in my brief time here on the significance and the possibilities that lie before seniors.

President Bush stated this. He said, ''Too often society views retirement as an ending not just of a career, but of an active life. For many, even most, the opposite is true. Today's elderly are the healthiest, most energetic, best-educated generation of seniors in history. They have more free time, and they want to use it. They have the wisdom of years, and they want to share it.''

So seniors are a vast untapped resource in our society, and so we think that we need to better harness those abilities and those talents that they have.

During committee consideration of this legislation, I along with Mr. FORTUÑO offered an amendment to authorize a pilot project within the Administration on Aging called the Silver Scholarship Initiative to encourage and reward older Americans who dedicate at least 600 hours of service each year to their communities by providing them a $1,000 educational award. This award can be used for themselves or, probably more likely, for grandchildren, members of their family, or just a young person that they want to designate. This would allow us to harness those volunteer hours and make this more a useful period of their lives.

So while this provision was not added to the bill, I strongly believe in this idea, and I hope that Congress will keep looking for ways to encourage all Americans, especially seniors, to contribute to their communities in the form of this service.

Thank you, and I want to encourage passage of this bill.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for his hard work in building a coalition to put this bill together, and particularly I rise in strong support of the provisions reauthorizing the vital senior nutrition programs. This legislation, like the Stop Senior Hunger Act that I introduced last year, recognizes how important these programs are and how much they help the elderly, the homebound, the disabled, and the frail across America. The senior nutrition programs and these services play a vital role in helping older Americans lead active, independent, healthy lives and avoid unnecessary institutionalization.

The Older Americans Act nutrition programs serve about 250 million congregate and in-home meals to about 6.6 million older adults annually. I have been on some of the deliveries with the volunteers to the Meals on Wheels program. I have had an opportunity to look into the faces of the seniors who are receiving these programs. Very often it is the only contact of the day. It is an extremely cost-effective program, but, more importantly, it is a program that genuinely helps seniors. These meals support quality of life, promote independence, reduce health care costs, decrease nursing home admissions, and help those with long-term illnesses and those who may just need a little short-term assistance after the hospital stay during the time of need. In the words of the Meals on Wheels Association of America, the oldest and largest organization representing senior meal programs, these programs are needed so no senior goes hungry.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor and a privilege to be the sponsor of this legislation, to work with Chairman MCKEON, before him Chairman BOEHNER, the ranking member of

the subcommittee, Mr. HINOJOSA, the field hearings that we had, the wonderful staff, the bipartisan vote out of committee. I urge all my colleagues to vote ''aye'' on this great piece of legislation for our aging seniors across our country.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Senior Independence Act of 2006.

The Older Americans Act was enacted in 1965 to establish the Administration on Aging to institute and support Federal nutritional and social programs for this Nation's seniors, and since then, millions of this Nation's elderly have benefited from the Act's many programs.

This Act is more important to the country today than ever before. More than 49 million people in the United States are over the age of 60, making it the fastest growing age group in the country. By 2050, that number will reach nearly 90 million and will count as almost a quarter of our population.

With this rapid demographic increase, it is essential that we ensure the establishment of effective Federal efforts to aid America's elderly. There are more seniors who are minorities, more seniors who are trying to go back to work; more seniors who are living longer; and more seniors living in urban areas. Specifically, the Senior Independence Act will promote home- and community-based supports to help older individuals avoid institutional care, strengthen health and nutrition programs, improve educational and volunteer services, increase Federal, State, and local coordination, and safeguard employment-based training for older Americans.

This Act was conceived forty years ago in a spirit of bipartisanship to better the lives of those put in less fortunate circumstances. I would like to commend Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member MILLER today on their spirit of bipartisanship during this reauthorization.

I am especially thankful to the Chairman and his committee staff for working with me to include my amendments that would recognize the growing number of older Americans who are living in urban areas and would encourage life-long learning.

The number of Americans aging in urban areas is growing and its diversity is increasing. Between 1999 and 2030, the urban minority population of 65 and older is projected to increase by 217 percent, as compared with the projected 81 percent increase among the white population. My amendment, which has been included in the bill, will assist urban seniors by providing grants to discover how older Americans can age successfully in urban areas.

The bill also adds my amendment to promote and disseminate information about life-long learning programs. Researchers and clinicians are increasingly interested in the concept of successful aging, and they are finding that a person who engages in a healthy lifestyle including continuing education, thinking and maintaining social contacts are part of successful.

Together, these amendments will improve the lives of older Americans by helping to address the unique needs of those living in urban areas and also to help promote the benefits of taking part in life-long learning programs.

In closing, I would also like to pause and remember the life and work of Dr. Elizabeth Kutza. Dr. Elizabeth Kutza was the Professor of Community Health and former Director of the Institute on Aging at Portland State University. Dr. Kutza died on Friday, June 9, 2006, after a seven-year battle with breast cancer. Dr. Kutza and her family are in my thoughts and prayers.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member MILLER for their outstanding writing of this bill and for making sure that the Older Americans Act can continue to provide for the growing number of seniors in our country today.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of providing the social and nutritional support that older Americans need, and in support of the Seniors Independence Act of 2006.

Since originally enacted in 1965, the Older Americans Act has been an important vehicle by which senior citizens in need have received nutritional support, community service employment, pension counseling services, protections against neglect and abuse, and many other services.

Nutrition services through Title III of the Older Americans Act, such as the ''Meals on Wheels'' program, are essential in helping senior citizens who cannot prepare their own food to still have access to convenient and nutritious meals. The program serves those most in need, such as the aged, the less affluent, those who live alone, and members of minority groups.

I was pleased that I was able to amend the Seniors Independence Act during markup to stop the Department of Labor from using an unfair calculation of income to determine eligibility for Title V seniors community service employment programs (SCSEP). In January 2005, the Department of Labor issued a ''Training and Employment Guidance Letter'' that unilaterally changed the eligibility criteria for Title V. Instead of discounting certain forms of income like veterans' compensation, Social Security Disability Insurance, unemployment compensation, and a portion of traditional Social Security benefits, the new regulation mandated inclusion of that income, thus making fewer seniors eligible for vital services.

It would be inconsistent to state that the program targets persons with greatest economic need and persons who are disabled, and then use their Social Security income or disability benefits to exclude them from participation. It would also be a mistake to hold someone's service in the Armed Forces against them in determining their eligibility for employment assistance. The amendment that I offered in the Education and the Workforce Committee restores the eligibility criteria to the pre-2005 levels, and it was unanimously agreed to. I thank Chairman MCKEON and the rest of the committee for their help and cooperation on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the Seniors Independence Act of 2006 reauthorizes vital services for some of the most vulnerable Americans, and those in greatest need. I rise in support of H.R. 5293, and I urge its passage by this body.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5293, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 426) recognizing the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the passage of the Food and Drugs Act for the important service it provides the Nation, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 426

Whereas the Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 768; chapter 3915), transformed the Food and Drug Administration (''FDA'') into a scientific regulatory agency;

Whereas the FDA is the oldest consumer protection agency in the United States;

Whereas the FDA is the primary consumer protection agency in the United States and the world;

Whereas FDA has the critical mission of protecting the public health by ensuring that—

(1) foods are safe, wholesome, sanitary, and properly labeled;

(2) human and veterinary drugs are safe and effective;

(3) devices intended for human use are safe and effective;

(4) cosmetics are properly labeled; and

(5) consumers are protected from electronic product radiation;

Whereas FDA is also responsible for advancing the public health by helping to speed innovations which improve peoples' lives;

Whereas, in protecting and promoting the health of citizens of the United States, the FDA has been a pioneer and leader in the field of food and drug science;

Whereas people around the world enjoy a higher quality of life due, in part, to the work of the FDA to expand food safety, medical product safety, and regulatory science; and

Whereas the centennial anniversary of the passage of the 1906 Food and Drugs Act occurs on June 30, 2006, marks the 100th anniversary of the Agency's founding, and is a major milestone in FDA's celebrated history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress recognizes the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services and its employees for—

(1) 100 years of service in working to ensure the safety of our food and the safety and efficacy of our medical products;

(2) providing leadership to the world in the regulatory sciences; and

(3) their hard work and extraordinary dedication to the protection and promotion of our Nation's public health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 426, a resolution offered by the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. JOE BARTON of Texas, and the ranking member of the committee, Mr. JOHN DINGELL of Michigan.

Today the House is honoring the 100th anniversary of the Food and Drug Administration, an organization responsible for ensuring the gold standard of safety for the medical products Americans use and the foods we consume.

□ 1200

For a century now, the dedicated public servants at FDA have worked professionally and tirelessly to promote public health by regulating drugs, biologics, medical devices and cosmetics in a science-based way. As a result of their continued efforts, the United States stands alone, rightfully laying claim to the safest and most effective medical product supply in the world.

Additionally, the agency's vigilant work on food safety protects us against natural and man-made threats to the safety of the foods we eat.

The long-standing tradition of professionalism and diligence of this importance agency, which regulates roughly 25 percent of our gross domestic product, continues today under the able leadership of the Acting Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Dr. Andrew C. von Eschenbach. Under his leadership, the FDA enters its second century of service, with both a broad history and a bright future.

As chairman of the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee, I look forward to continuing to work closely with Dr. von Eschenbach and his agency's outstanding staff on many important public health issues. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Dr. von Eschenbach and the more than 10,000 civil servants for their continued service to the American people who are safer and healthier because of their efforts.

Again, I would like to commend Chairman BARTON and Ranking Member DINGELL for offering this worthy resolution and for their strong leadership on FDA-related issues. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my colleagues, both Chairman BARTON and Ranking Member DINGELL, for introducing this resolution.

The Food and Drug Administration is the Nation's premier consumer protection agency. It ensures that food and drugs are safe and properly labeled, that medical devices are safe and effective, and that cosmetics are properly labeled. In the 100 years since its founding, the FDA has changed with the times and has adapted to the health and safety needs of Americans.

As initially enacted, the 1906 Food and Drug Act prohibited food, drinks and drugs to be adulterated or misbranded.

Over the years, the scope of the FDA has increased significantly. In 1938, its authority was extended to cosmetics and devices through a law that also established a new system for regulating drugs. The 1938 law also gave the authority to inspect factories.

By the 1960s, the FDA's role in ensuring drug safety expanded even more as the 1962 drug amendments required pharmaceutical manufacturers to prove the effectiveness of their drugs before being allowed to market them.

In 1958, the FDA played a key role in the country's response to the growing AIDS epidemic by approving the first blood test for AIDS.

Given the sensitive nature of its many activities and the effect they have on Americans from all walks of life, the FDA has not been without controversy or its critics. Yet, 100-years after its creation, I hope that we can all agree that the FDA remains a critical part of our efforts to protect and improve the health and safety of our Nation.

Every day, the FDA evaluates and approves new drugs and medical devices that improve our lives and productivity. It regulates food packages so we know what we are getting when we buy food for our families at the grocery store. The agency develops oversight policies regarding blood donations to ensure safe blood supplies. These are just some of the way the FDA's responsibilities are essential to protecting the public health.

As we come up on the 100th anniversary of this vital Agency, I am happy to support this resolution honoring the FDA and its staff for their 100 years of work to protect and improve public health.

Just a side note, Mr. Speaker, the FDA Commissioner von Eschenbach actually was a great researcher at MD Anderson in Houston, and with the National Cancer Institute, now at the FDA. Again, I know of no better person to be at the FDA because of both his experience, both as a cancer patient, but also as a researcher. He knows how important it is to make sure our drugs are protected will actually cure us, and will do what they say they will.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no other additional speakers, and I will be prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have two speakers, and I am glad to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a colleague from the same class of mine.

(Mr. HINCHEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to my good friend and colleague from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for providing me with this opportunity.

As we have heard, Mr. Speaker, next week the Food and Drug Administration turns 100 years old, and it is unfortunate that this agency is not making laudatory headlines as it celebrates such an auspicious occasion.

Instead, the Food and Drug Administration is at the nadir of its trustworthiness with the American people. Its basic defense of the public health has simply been perverted in the name of so-called conservative interests.

As a member of the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee which has oversight over the Food and Drug Administration, I have been frustrated by the agency's cozy relationship with the pharmaceutical industry whose products it is supposed to regulate.

In 2001, fees paid by the drug companies funded 32 percent of the FDA's budget for drugs. Today, that figure is nearly 50 percent, and it is expected to go higher. Making matters worse, the FDA must negotiate with the drug industry on how those user fees are allocated. This financial dependency, along with the FDA's constant negotiations with companies over how to spend the fees, is the foundation for the conflict of interest that exists between the FDA and the pharmaceutical industry and others it is supposed to regulate.

I have been alarmed that financial conflicts of interest are waived by the FDA among its advisory committee members. The agency relies heavily on these scientists and these experts to guide policy when questions arise concerning medical treatments. When the FDA allows conflicted scientists to serve on these boards, events that have occurred over 100 times already during this fiscal year alone, the public health is obviously jeopardized at the expense of inappropriate personal interests.

I have been saddened by the stories I have heard from American families who have paid the price for mismanagement of this agency. I have met with many of these families on the efforts by the FDA to preempt their right to sue pharmaceutical companies in local and State courts. These families must be allowed to seek the understanding and justice they are owed after their loved ones are injured or killed from an adverse reaction to a product regulated by the FDA. I will meet with some of these families again later next week.

For these and many other reasons, I and many of my Democratic colleagues have introduced legislation, the FDA Improvement Act and others, to address many of the loopholes that currently exist at this agency. This legislation would sever the financial links between the FDA and the drug companies. It would restore the independence of the FDA. It would strengthen the agency's efforts to guarantee post-market drug safety. It would eradicate conflicts of interest on FDA advisory boards. It would restore the public trust in this very critically important agency.

Last month, the Wall Street Journal and Harris Interactive released a poll on public perceptions of the job that the FDA is doing on the safety of prescription drugs. Only 36 percent of the adults polled believe that the agency was doing a good job on ensuring the safety and efficacy on new prescription drugs. Eighty-two percent of the people polled believed that the FDA's decisions are influenced by politics over medical science to a great extent or at least to some extent.

According to its own Web site, the FDA is our country's oldest consumer protection agency. It should be given the authority to do its job independently, and the administration should sufficiently use that authority to protect the American people. It is a two-step process.

Yesterday, the American Association of Retired Persons reported that prices for brand-name pharmaceuticals jumped nearly 4 percent during the first 3 months of this year alone. The men and women paying for these drugs should be able to trust in the safety and the efficacy of the products for which they are paying so dearly.

The Food and Drug Administration's 100th anniversary should be a time of celebration, and if we are going to make it such, we have to bring forward legislation to the floor of this House, legislation which makes the Food and Drug Administration free and independent, legislation which reestablishes the arm's-length relationship between the regulator and the regulated. That arm's-length relationship has completely disappeared because the FDA has become financially dependent upon the agency, the entities, the corporations, the drug companies that it is supposed to regulate, and that regulation has fallen apart.

Let us bring forward legislation to the floor of this House which improves the FDA and protects the American people.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our colleague from Chicago (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in thanking Congressmen BARTON and DINGELL for introducing H. Con. Res. 426, which recognizes the 100th anniversary of the passage of the Food and Drug Act. I also want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I rise in support of this resolution. First of all, Chicago had a great deal to do with the development of the Food and Drug Act because of the book that Upton Sinclair wrote, ''The Jungle,'' and the vast stockyards and meat packing plants that were in Chicago, running amok and running afoul at that time.

But I most directly want to associate my comments with those of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), who just spoke, because I too believe that we must, in fact, have enough distance between the Food and Drug Administration and any kinds of political considerations.

I have had the opportunity in the last few weeks to meet and hear and be in the presence of Dr. Andrew C. von Eschenbach, the new acting director, and I must tell you that I have been tremendously impressed with his vision, with the articulation of a mission for the Food and Drug Administration, and with the assurances that he continues to give that science-based evidence will be his approach.

So I am optimistic about what the Food and Drug Administration is going to continue to do in the future, and we are going to find ourselves pleasantly pleased, I believe, under the leadership of Dr. von Eschenbach.

So I thank the gentleman again from Texas for yielding.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, again, I know I do not have the right to close, but I just encourage passage of this bill and recognize the 100 years, not that it is perfect, but we are still working on it, particularly in our committee, and encourage passage of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are not here today to say that the Food and Drug Administration is infallible. They certainly have made mistakes, as I am sure every Member of this body has made mistakes.

We are here, though, to say that over the past 100 years, there have been tens of thousands of FDA employees who have dedicated their lives to ensuring that our food and our medical products are safe. Time and again, Congress has entrusted fundamental safety responsibilities to the FDA.

We do not have a perfect system, but because of the dedicated public servants at the FDA, the United States stands alone as having the safest and most effective medical products supply in the world.

In 2002, we entrusted the FDA with new authorities to protect our food supply from terrorist threats. Every day, the employees at the FDA go to work to protect the best interests of the American people.

Although we may have disagreements over particular issues, we are better off as a country by having the dedicated individuals at the FDA working for the American people. We should not politicize a resolution that seeks to recognize their hard work. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 426, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH CENTERS RENEWAL ACT OF 2006

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5573) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide additional authorizations of appropriations for the health centers program under section 330 of such Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5573

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 ''Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) Community, migrant, public housing, and homeless health centers are vital to thousands of communities across the United States.

(2) There are more than 1,000 such health centers serving over 15,000,000 people at over 3,700 health delivery sites, located in all 50 States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and other territories of the United States.

(3) Health centers provide cost-effective, quality health care to poor and medically underserved people in the States, the District of Columbia, and the territories, including the working poor, the uninsured, and many high-risk and vulnerable populations, and have done so for over 40 years.

(4) Health centers provide care to 1 of every 8 uninsured Americans, 1 of every 4 Americans in poverty, and 1 of every 9 rural Americans.

(5) Health centers provide primary and preventive care services to more than 700,000 homeless persons and more than 725,000 farm workers in the United States.

(6) Health centers are community-oriented and patient-focused and tailor their services to fit the special needs and priorities of local communities, working together with schools, businesses, churches, community organizations, foundations, and State and local governments.

(7) Health centers are built through community initiative.

(8) Health centers encourage citizen participation and provide jobs for 50,000 community residents.

(9) Congress established the program as a unique public-private partnership, and has continued to provide direct funding to community organizations for the development and operation of health centers systems that

address pressing local health needs and meet national performance standards.

(10) Federal grants assist participating communities in finding partners and recruiting doctors and other health professionals.

(11) Federal grants constitute, on average, 24 percent of the annual budget of such health centers, with the remainder provided by State and local governments, Medicare, Medicaid, private contributions, private insurance, and patient fees.

(12) Health centers make health care responsive and cost-effective through aggressive outreach, patient education, translation, and other enabling support services.

(13) Health centers help reduce health disparities, meet escalating health care needs, and provide a vital safety net in the health care delivery system of the United States.

(14) Health centers increase the use of preventive health services, including immunizations, pap smears, mammograms, and HbA1c tests for diabetes screenings.

(15) Expert studies have demonstrated the impact that these community-owned and patient-controlled primary care delivery systems have achieved both in the reduction of traditional access barriers and the elimination of health disparities among their patients.

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR HEALTH CENTERS PROGRAM OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT.

Paragraph (1) of section 330(r) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b(r)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, in addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (d), there are authorized to be appropriated $1,963,000,000 for fiscal year 2007, $1,999,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $2,015,000,000 for fiscal year 2009, $2,041,000,000 for fiscal year 2010, and $2,041,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

□ 1215

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5573, the Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006, which is legislation to reauthorize the Community Health Center program for another 5 years. As we learned from the hearings we held last month in the Subcommittee on Health, the Community Health Center program has been an unprecedented success, and community health centers are an integral part of this country's health care delivery system, providing quality health care services to people and communities that would otherwise not have access to such care.

We are sticking with the old maxim of not fixing something that isn't broken, and this legislation represents simply a straight reauthorization of that program and seeks to build upon the success of the program by significantly increasing the levels of authorized funding.

I am proud to sponsor this legislation, along with my friend, Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS of Florida, and I would like to thank the 24 members of the Energy and Commerce Committee who have joined us as cosponsors of this bill.

Again, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us today, which will reauthorize the community health center program through 2011. Over the years, the health center program has gained tremendous support from Democrats and Republicans, the Congress, and the President, a claim that can be made by very few Federal programs.

This support is due to the overwhelming impact that health centers have made on the health and well-being of our country's most vulnerable populations. In 2005, health centers provided care to 6 million uninsured individuals who represented 40 percent of the patient population at health centers. Ninety-one percent of health center patients are low income, and 36 percent are Medicaid.

Without a doubt, health centers are meeting their mission for providing much-needed health care to the medically underserved in this country. Much of this success can be attributed to the core elements of section 330 of the statute we seek to reauthorize today. To be eligible for Federal funding, health centers must be located in medically underserved communities; they must have independent boards, a majority of which must be governed by members of the community who utilize the center for health care; and they must also provide compulsory, primary, and preventive health care with services available to all community residents regardless of the patient's ability to pay.

This focus on primary and preventive care has yielded tremendous savings for our health care system, as health centers provide the uninsured and underinsured with access to care that they would otherwise seek in our hospital emergency rooms.

A study in Harris County, Houston, Texas, where my district lies, found that 57 percent of the emergency room visits could be handled at a primary care clinic. This is a perfect example of the type of health care problem that health centers help solve.

Access to affordable primary care at health centers has also reduced the need for inpatient and specialty care. Because of medical problems in health centers, patients are treated earlier before they require in-hospital treatment. In fact, a study suggests that health centers saved Medicaid approximately 30 percent in annual spending on beneficiaries receiving care at our Nation's health centers.

This successful result is that health centers have become the medical home for more than 15 million Americans. Health centers also represent the Nation's largest primary care system, with one in nine Medicaid beneficiaries and one in five low-income individuals receiving care at health centers.

I have a personal interest in this issue because we have been working for years in the Houston area to establish additional community health centers to serve our growing uninsured and underinsured population. My State of Texas, unfortunately, ranks number one in the number of uninsured and with 25 percent of Texans living without insurance.

The statistics for the Houston area are just as troubling. More than 30 percent of Harris County residents are living without health insurance. Despite the obvious need for additional health centers in the Houston area, we have been playing catch-up for quite a while. Last year our area was awarded five additional FQHCs, federally qualified health centers, bringing our total to nine sites, including look-alike centers.

With more than 1 million uninsured, however, the Houston area will still have fewer than 10 FQHCs, while other large cities, like Chicago, have more than 70 sites. In the Houston area we know our work is not done. As a Nation we have a long way to go before we meet the President's goal of locating health centers in every low-income county in this country.

In fact, studies suggest there are still more than 900 poor counties in the U.S. in need of a health center. To ensure that these goals are met, it is crucial that we pass this bill to reauthorize the health center program, whose current authorization expires this year.

Mr. DEAL, Mr. BILIRAKIS and I have put together a compromise bill that will reauthorize the program to 2011, keeping intact the core elements of the program that have been critical to its success, and I want to thank all my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee who supported this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), who has been one of the cosponsors of this legislation and a leading supporter of community health centers.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEAL, and I do rise in support of this bill which I have cosponsored with Chairman DEAL and with our colleague from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

I have long championed community health centers, Mr. Speaker, because they have been a model for delivering primary and preventive care efficiently and effectively for more than four decades. They serve more than 16 million Americans, many of whom are underinsured or uninsured, in areas where people need most services. They make their services available to all residents of the communities in which they are located without regard to their ability to pay.

One of the reasons community health centers have successfully provided care to so many through the years is that the individual centers are governed by a community board, a majority of whose members are patients of the health center itself. I think this feature makes health centers more responsive to the needs of the communities they serve than they otherwise might be.

Health centers have proven that health care need not be complicated or expensive to work well. The health centers program started more than 40 years ago with the idea that patients should run the show, a remarkably simple formula for success. This patient democracy, if you will, shapes the delivery of health care to the community and determines the range of affordable services the health center will provide.

And those services are certainly needed. Despite our best efforts, there are still far too many Americans who lack health insurance and for whom community health centers are their only source of care. These vulnerable individuals need the Community Health Centers program to remain strong and vibrant as they work toward greater health security for themselves and their families.

The authorization for this valuable program expires this year; however, I have introduced legislation with our colleague from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) to reauthorize the Federal health center program through 2011. Our bill would authorize $1.93 billion in funding in fiscal year 2007, thereby increasing funding next year to the level the President has requested, or approximately $181 million more than last year.

Although we introduced the bill only a few weeks ago, I am pleased that it already has 233 bipartisan cosponsors, more than half the House, including almost every member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. I believe these numbers are a testament to the broad and bipartisan support for reauthorizing the Federal health center program this year while preserving the key elements of its authorizing statute.

The bill we are considering today is identical to the Bilirakis-Green bill, except it includes specific authorization levels for fiscal years 2008 through 2011, which would bring health center funding to $2.04 billion by fiscal year 2011 and allow for the continued expansion of health centers in needed areas around the country.

I certainly want to thank our full committee chairman, Mr. BARTON, and our subcommittee chairman, Mr. DEAL, for acting expeditiously on reauthorizing this important program.

Although I am pleased the bill before us today maintains the fundamental structure of the Federal health center program, I do support making what I believe are commonsense legislative changes to enhance the ability of community health centers to provide care to those who need it, and, hopefully in the coming weeks, to examining the merits of several of the proposals which my committee colleagues have put forth that I believe would do just that.

I am especially supportive of H.R. 1313, legislation our colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) has introduced, which would extend liability protection to volunteer physicians at community health centers. I believe that this change, which the National Association of Community Health Centers fully supports, will encourage doctors and other medical professionals to volunteer their time and talent at health centers in underserved areas which are facing workforce shortages.

I believe that it is imperative we move forward on Mr. MURPHY's legislation as soon as possible. There currently, as we know, is a serious shortage of health care providers in areas where community health centers are located. In addition, there will be an increasing demand for physicians to serve the millions of new patients that will be seeking care as centers come on line as part of President Bush's initiative to put new community health centers in medically underserved areas around the country.

As many of us know, the high cost of medical liability insurance can be prohibitive, especially for physicians who are going above and beyond, so to speak, by volunteering at community health centers. The bill that Mr. MURPHY has introduced, which I have cosponsored, would do that by extending the medical liability protections under the Federal Tort Claims Act to volunteer physicians at community health centers.

I believe this commonsense proposal would encourage more qualified health care providers to volunteer their much-needed services at health centers that desperately need their expertise. Although I would have preferred, Mr. Speaker, to also be considering this legislation here today, I am nonetheless, of course, fully supportive of the bill and urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, community health centers have deservedly earned bipartisan support in Congress because of their long and well-documented record of success. This bill will help them continue their mission well into the future, especially in the most needed areas around the country. I urge all our colleagues to both support and invest in proven health care solutions by voting for H.R. 5573. The health and well-being of our constituents depends on it.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our colleague on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Congressman ENGEL of New York.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me, and I rise in strong support of the Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006.

Community health centers ensure that over 15 million low-income Americans, including 1 million New Yorkers, get access to affordable primary care and preventive services regardless of insurance status or ability to pay. In my own district, I am very proud of the good work that the Mount Vernon Neighborhood Health Center, Refuah Health Center, the Community Medical and Dental Care Center in Monsey, and the Bronx Community Health Network do. I am proud of them.

Patients who use community health centers are some of our Nation's most vulnerable, with unique and complex health care needs. It has been estimated that nearly 70 percent of community health center patients have family incomes at or below the Federal poverty level. These patients, therefore, benefit from the special services that community health centers provide, such as transportation and translation assistance, which truly opens access to health care.

Community health centers improve health outcomes through their cost-effective, high-quality care. It is estimated that the health centers save the Federal Medicaid 30 percent in annual spending through innovative care. Both the Institute of Medicine and General Accountability Office have praised health centers for their effective management of chronic illnesses and have said they are a model in screening and diagnosing conditions like asthma, cardiovascular disease, depression, cancer, and HIV/AIDS. In addition, community health centers are estimated to be responsible for cutting infant mortality rates in the communities they serve by as much as 10 percent.

Considering these facts, we should support the community health centers with additional funding. Less than 25 percent of applications for new health center sites were funded last year, despite being qualified. It is also worth noting that when we do consider health information technology on the floor, we must ensure appropriate Federal investment in grants and loans to ensure community health centers get access to the technology.

While the unanimously passed Senate bill included Federal funding for low-income providers, the Energy and Commerce bill, unfortunately, did not. Health IT has the potential to even further improve the quality of care at the community health centers, but the centers simply cannot afford the technology without extra help.

I should note that New York City appropriated $27 million to help provide

1,000 New York City doctors treating underserved patients with electronic health record systems by 2008. The city's contribution is being matched by an additional $13 million contributed by the community health centers participating in the program. The end result is that 30 community health centers, which include 150 sites, will be linked throughout New York City. This worthy initiative would certainly benefit from Federal assistance as well.

Mr. Chairman, thank you again for calling for the reauthorization of the health centers program. Millions of people will be better for it.

□ 1230

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Community Health Center Reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, we are approaching 1,000 community health centers with 3,600 sites serving over 13 million Americans. There are over 80 of these sites in northeast Georgia alone, in my district and in Chairman DEAL's district. They operate in rural communities where health services are either scarce, or, in some cases, nonexistent. They help keep our poor out of expensive emergency rooms.

With 25 percent of our population living in rural areas, only 10 percent of our physicians practice there. Rural Americans, like many folks in my district, are more likely to live below the poverty level and therefore be uninsured.

Health centers are Medicaid and Medicare providers, guaranteeing access for much of our elderly. While health care costs have risen, health centers have been kept theirs well under those of other providers.

Patients of health centers are generally healthier, use emergency rooms less and save money. In Georgia, they save the State $13.4 million each year in Medicaid costs alone. Community health centers are a good deal for poor Americans and taxpayers.

I have been an enthusiastic supporter of this program, and I am glad the President has supported the expansion of health centers in 200 new communities.

Mr. Speaker, the least expensive way possible to provide health care is to provide the best possible treatment up front. Community health centers are doing just that, and all of us need to support them.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), an active member of the committee.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support as well of the Health Centers Renewal Act, and commend all of our colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee, but especially the subcommittee chairman, Mr. DEAL, and the ranking member, Mr. BROWN, for working together in this bipartisan fashion to pass this legislation.

Community health centers are vital to our Nation's delivery of primary care services to those who otherwise would lack access to health care. In my own district, we are fortunate to have several excellent health centers, including Clinicas del Camino Real in Ventura County, the Santa Barbara and Isla Vista Neighborhood Clinics in Santa Barbara County, and Health Care for the Homeless in San Luis Obispo County.

At a time when this body often seems too willing to divest from primary and preventive care, health centers are a model of success. They ensure that individuals in low income and medically underserved communities can receive checkups, screenings and early interventions, especially in a culturally sensitive environment. This is essential.

It means that conditions can be diagnosed and treated before they unnecessarily progress, at which point they often require very expensive treatment and sometimes hospitalization.

Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise that care at our health centers is the most cost effective care there is. We would do well to look at the lessons learned at our community health centers' focus on primary and preventive care and expand this to all areas of health care delivery in this country.

We know we need to be doing much more to expand access to care to encourage Americans to take advantage of primary care services available to them. Oftentimes, the community health center is the only care available to our constituents, so I support the reauthorization of health centers, and I hope we can use this as a stepping stone to further improve access to primary care for our entire Nation.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), a member of the committee who has been very supportive of community health centers and has some very good ideas for additional improvements.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman and chairman, Mr. DEAL. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation and to have worked closely with him on this vitally important bill that saves money and lives, and I am pleased to represent Cornerstone Community Center, one of the centers in my district.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5573 is a great step toward meeting our Nation's health care needs. Community health centers are a critically important solution to providing affordable and accessible quality care to millions of Americans who are uninsured or underinsured.

Medical care at community health centers is approximately $250 less than the average annual expenditure for office-based doctor visits. And keep in mind that over 30 percent of patients seeking care at a health center are uninsured. That is some 15 million people a year that seek care.

Moreover, health center services save money and lives by treating diseases before they become chronic conditions, require hospital care or require a trip to the emergency room.

I have with me here a list of the typical procedures that are offered at community health centers: Prenatal care, dental care, mental health care, substance abuse counseling, hearing and vision screening. They also offer discount prescription drugs. They provide vital case management for those with chronic illness, and keep in mind that 80 percent of health care costs go to those with chronic illness. Oftentimes, those complex cases require that sort of case management to help them meet the needs of their cases. They provide smoking cessation classes, blood pressure monitoring, weight reduction programs, and a host of other programs so vital to saving money in health care.

It also provides a health care home for many folks, many clinics giving patients a card so they recognize this is a place where they know their doctor and their doctor knows them.

By expanding community health centers, Americans could save as much as 30 percent for Medicaid patients, or $17 billion annually, due to reduced specialty care referrals and fewer hospital admissions.

However, our Nation's community health centers are experiencing a staffing crisis. A March 2006 publication in the Journal of the American Medical Association reported that community health centers have a 13 percent vacancy rate for family physicians, a 9 percent vacancy rate for interns, 20 percent vacancy for OB–GYNs, and an 8 percent vacancy rate for podiatrists, 22 percent for psychiatrists, and 18 percent for dentists. In other words, although we are trying to meet the needs of the 15 million who use the community health centers, the problem is growing in that not enough doctors are available to provide that care.

Vacancies of needed medical personnel at community health centers jeopardizes access to care to the Nation's uninsured and underinsured. Plus, the President has called for more centers around the Nation to fill our needs, and 11,000 more doctors are needed to fill those needs.

I have a letter from the National Association of Community Health Centers that says there is a dire shortage of health care providers in underserved communities where health centers are located. Congress and the President have worked to double the capacity of the Federal health centers programs, but in order to ensure that millions of additional patients can be served through this initiative, health centers must also double their workforce by adding 12,000 clinicians and 48,000 administrative staff soon.

Many skilled health care providers are willing to volunteer their time and

expertise. Volunteer doctors acting as Good Samaritans have proved invaluable to clinics across the Nation. However, many skilled medical volunteers are turned away because community health centers cannot afford to cover their additional medical liability insurance.

Over the past year, I have been pleased to work with Chairman DEAL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and also Chairman BARTON to make volunteering at community health centers more practical to doctors in order to meet the needs of families. Community health centers play a key role in any reform-minded approach to improving our health care delivery system.

Mr. Speaker, there is a desperate need for doctors and medical personnel of all sorts at community health centers, and I pledge I will continue to work with Chairman BARTON and Chairman DEAL and other members of the Energy and Commerce Committee and every Member of this body to explore every solution possible to meet our Nation's community health center staffing crisis.

We owe this to the patients, to the taxpayers of America who recognize this is a cost-saving, viable measure where we can provide care to millions of Americans who otherwise do not have it. This is the way we should be doing this, through community health centers, centers where the doctors know the patients and the patients know the doctors.

Please let us continue to work together to make this care affordable and accessible for patients all around the Nation so they do not have to see dire consequences that come when their conditions get worse because they couldn't receive the care they needed.

I thank the chairman for yielding me this time and for our collaboration together.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), our colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5573, the Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006.

H.R. 5573 reauthorizes the Community Health Center program, guaranteeing a funding source for critical providers in communities like mine.

Community health centers leverage what little they have to ensure working families, the uninsured, and our Nation's children have access to critical medical care.

More than 40 million people in our country lack health care coverage today, including one in three in the San Gabriel Valley and in East Los Angeles. Eighty-three percent of the uninsured are from working families, and 14 million of those families are Latinos.

Community health centers are a fundamental component to our safety net, often providing vital care in a culturally competent and linguistically appropriate manner for all families, and often being the only source of care.

In my own district, community health centers bear the brunt of responsibility for treating the uninsured. After 70 years of serving much of my congressional district in the city of Azusa, our health center there was forced to be closed. There was not sufficient funding to keep it open. I knew one in three people in my district without health insurance would suffer without access to this care.

Through the support of the city of Azusa, Los Angeles County and many other community organizations, the clinic in Azusa was opened. Now it is there because we were able to secure section 330 designation. Now they can open their doors and serve the thousand or so patients that come through their doors every month. It is exciting to tour that clinic and see the kind of assistance that mothers are receiving in terms of prenatal care, to see that the elderly are having someone help them manage their diabetes, and to see that young children are getting their immunizations. Those things are vitally important to our community.

There is another community clinic that has been in my district for over 30 years, and what is wonderful about this particular clinic is that it also serves surrounding congressional districts. Mr. DREIER's constituents receive services from the East Valley Clinic, as do Mrs. NAPOLITANO's constituents. We worked there to help leverage support and fund services to serve all of our residents and constituents.

I am proud to say this is a wonderful bill to be able to express our strong support, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY).

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the chairman for his fine work on bringing forward this bill, as well as the ranking member, and for the bipartisan nature of this bill.

As so many other speakers have testified this morning, community health centers are an integral part of our health care network throughout our country, and are an increasingly important aspect of trying to deal with the uninsured and underinsured.

The reason they are so important is that community health centers focus on preventive care and primary care. They offer low-cost alternatives to emergency room visits, which is not only the most expensive care that people can get, but also why should we be letting illnesses progress to that stage when community health centers can help people with preventive and primary care.

Community health centers focus on the uninsured and the underinsured, a critical element of our health care delivery system. And the cost savings to our system are significant, as other people have testified this morning.

In my State of New Hampshire, in 2004 there were 219,000 patient visits to community health centers. Not only do they provide basic preventive care, but also education, outreach, screenings, nutrition counseling, substance abuse counseling, prenatal care, and dental care, so the community health centers are full service medical care for so many different people in our community.

I have eight community health centers in my district. I have visited three of them, and I would like to cite them all for their good work: The Avis Goodwin Community Health Center in Dover that is run by Janet Atkins; the Manchester Community Health Center in Manchester, the director is Ed George; and the Lamprey River Community Health Center in New Market run by Ann Peters recently won a Federal project designation and was able to significantly expand their ability to treat patients in their area of New Hampshire. Their efforts are noteworthy. That is why this legislation is so important to be able to not only encourage the existing health care centers we have, but to expand them and expand their mission.

So I urge my colleagues to support the bill. I thank the chairman and thank the ranking member for the bipartisan nature of this bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

□ 1245

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the reauthorization of the community health centers for a number of reasons.

First of all, more than probably anything else, community health centers are the reason that I am a Member of Congress. My public work began at a community health center, the Martin Luther King Center in Chicago, then the Miles Square Center in Chicago. I became a member of the association when we organized it, ultimately became chairman of the legislative committee. The current president of the association, Tom Van Coverden, was my staff person when I was chairman of the legislative committee. I became its speaker of the house and eventually became president of the National Association of Community Health Centers. And so I used to be one of those people who would run around here knocking on Members' doors asking them to appropriate money and to support community health center programs.

Community health centers are the best thing that has happened to ambulatory health care since Medicare and Medicaid for large numbers of poor people throughout the country. I commend them. I have been in centers all over the country, and they do outstanding jobs.

They are also the main economic engine in many communities, the biggest employer. People get a chance to work who have never had a job before. I know individuals who are nurses and physicians who came to work in community health centers as aides, as orderlies, who are now professionals. It is

really the best thing that I have ever encountered in health care.

My district, this is the one time that I envy the members of Commerce and Energy because I also have 26 hospitals in my congressional district, probably more than any other district in the country, five medical schools, and so health is a big part of what goes on where I live on a daily basis.

I commend the committee for an outstanding piece of legislation, the great work that it does. And, yes, they are going to have their convention in Chicago in August of this year, and we look forward to hosting them at that time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank Mr. DAVIS for a very inspiring testimonial of the importance of community health centers, and to learn of his longtime dedication to them, and I thank him for that.

I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, Mr. SHAYS.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague as well in thanking Mr. DAVIS for his comments.

I am a huge fan of what I call community-based health centers. These clinics, these health centers do awesome work. So, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 5573, the Health Centers Renewal Act, which will reauthorize the Community Health Center program for 5 more years and increase the program's funding. This continues the strong commitment Congress has shown to these centers over the past 5 years.

During the last reauthorization, this administration sought to double the amount of people receiving care through community health centers from 10 million to 20 million. Already nearly 16 million individuals are now receiving quality care, and half of these individuals are uninsured. So of the 46 million uninsured, approximately 8 million are receiving excellent care from these centers.

By preventing costly hospitalizations and reducing the use of emergency care for routine services, it is estimated community clinics save the health care system over $6 billion annually.

So, in conclusion, I strongly support passage of this legislation so community health centers can continue providing high-quality, cost-effective care. And I thank Mr. DEAL and others, including Mr. GREEN, for bringing this bill out. It is an important bill, and I urge its passage.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to another member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, a good member, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to join in support of this important bipartisan Health Centers Renewal Act, H.R. 5573.

Each and every day health centers provide high-quality primary and preventive care to our constituents. In Illinois, community, migrant, homeless and public housing health centers operate 268 primary care sites and serve close to 1 million patients every year.

Community health centers do a great deal with limited resources. They provide critical medical care services to many who would otherwise have no other place to go or would end up in an emergency room. They provide early care and chronic disease treatment, keeping people healthy and productive. They are models of accountability and patient involvement.

As the reauthorization bill points out, health centers are community-owned and patient-controlled, an important factor in their ability to reduce barriers to health care access and disparities in health care delivery.

They are also extremely cost-effective. According to the Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, Illinois health centers save over $34 million in State Medicaid expenditures alone. The cost of serving a patient in a health center is about one-third less than in other settings.

As grateful as we are for all the work the community health centers do, it is also important that we recognize that they cannot solve the health care crisis facing our Nation by themselves. We need a vibrant Medicaid program and strategies to expand affordable access to health care for all, especially for the specialty care services that community health centers do not provide.

Finally, I want to take a moment to recognize the outstanding work of the Illinois Primary Health Care Association, which represents the State's community health centers. The association provides important support, not just in advocacy, but in helping health centers learn about and enter the new world of health information technology, IT, assisting in the expansion and construction of new health centers, encouraging culturally appropriate care. We thank them for meeting the new challenges of a growing medically indigent population that is diverse in every conceivable way.

I particularly want to thank the health centers that serve my district so well, centers operated by Access Community Health Network, Heartland Health Outreach, Heartland International Center, Howard Brown Health Center, the Chicago Department of Public Health, and the American Indian Health Service of Chicago. This reauthorization bill is important in making sure that they and other health centers around the country can continue to provide timely, high-quality care to those who would otherwise lack a source of care.

I strongly urge support of H.R. 5573, and encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I would reserve my time pending the right to close.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague and our ranking member on the health subcommittee, Congressman BROWN.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas, Mr. GREEN, who is doing yeoman's work in bringing community health centers to Houston and to his whole State. I thank him for that and thank Chairman DEAL for his good work on this issue.

Every year, a quarter million Ohioans, more than that, 280,000 Ohioans, from Lisbon to Piketon, from Fremont to Chillicothe, from Hough to Lincoln Heights, visit facilities associated with the 27 community health care centers in my State. Many of them are uninsured. Many of them, most of them, have incomes below the Federal poverty level. These centers give these thousands of Ohioans access to a medical home where they can receive a comprehensive range of health care services. Without these centers, many of these Ohioans might opt to delay care. Some of them are likely to end up in the emergency room. Many of them will suffer permanent illness as a result. All of that strains the system, creates unnecessary cost for our health care system, and causes undue bad health and undue human suffering. Investing in community health centers in Mansfield and Youngstown and Barnesville, Ohio, is a far better alternative.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by thanking both our chairman and ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. BARTON and Mr. DINGELL, as well as the chair and ranking member of our health subcommittee, Chairman DEAL and Ranking Member Mr. BROWN, who we just heard from, the committee staff and their hard work on the bill.

There are many of us on the committee with strongly held views about health centers. Some want higher authorization levels, while others sought certain changes in the statute. In the end we came together in a bipartisan fashion to ensure that our differences didn't overshadow our shared support for this important program. And that it has made a tremendous difference in many lives of our constituents.

The bill before us today is truly an example of compromise within our committee, and I would like to thank my colleagues for putting together the good of the health center program above all else when it comes to this bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 5573, the "Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006". Community Health Centers are local, non-profit, community-owned health care providers that serve low-income and medically under-served communities. They provide healthcare services to more than 15 million people annually, 6 million of whom have no health insurance coverage. They are located in more than 3,400 communities in every single State, including my home State of Michigan where we have approximately 30 health centers.

Community health centers are vital to the health and well-being of our country's most vulnerable citizens. There are over 41 million uninsured Americans and untold numbers of under-insured persons. This number is increasing at a rapid pace, forcing risky delays for important primary and preventive healthcare services.

For almost 40 years, America's health centers have helped communities meet escalating health needs and address costly and devastating health problems, from infant health development to chronic illness, to mental health, substance addiction, homelessness, domestic violence, and HIV/AIDS. Community Health Centers span urban and rural communities across the Nation and their remarkable success has earned them broad bipartisan support among Federal, State, and local policy-makers. We should continue to do everything within our power to support these health centers and provide them with the resources they need so that they can continue to do their jobs as successfully and effectively as they have for the past four decades.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5573, the Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006. Community Health Centers are important resources for our country's healthcare system and vital sources of healthcare for many Americans. Their work, the services and care they provide, and the impacts on the lives of the over fifteen million Americans they serve are commendable. Community Health Centers are important to providing quality healthcare and services to our country's underinsured, uninsured, and underserved communities.

The Northern and Southern Community Health Centers on Guam are two of the more than one thousand such health centers that serve Americans across the country. The Northern and Southern Community Health Centers on Guam are valued and trusted healthcare delivery sites for residents of Guam.

That these community health centers are flexible in their response to the particular needs of the communities they serve is of particular value. This flexibility and ability to adapt to local needs helps ensure that local communities continue to benefit from the high-quality, focused care provided by Community Health Centers such as the Northern and Southern Community Health Centers on Guam. Key among these flexible and locally tailored services is the aggressive outreach, education, and preventative medicine programs these Community Health Centers offer.

But flexible care and services tailored to local needs alone will not ensure that Community Health Centers continue to offer and provide local communities with high-quality, cost-effective healthcare. Community Health Centers, like the Northern and Southern Community Health Centers on Guam, are small and lack significant organic capabilities to earn capital. Continued access to capital to grow these centers and improve their services is vital to their continued success. I strongly support programs that provide Community Health Centers across America access to additional capital resources.

It is only as a result of the efforts of the many professionals within the greater Community Health Center community that its innovative healthcare programs and services can be provided and adequate financial resources can be best utilized for the benefit of the Center and the community it serves. The Northern and Southern Community Health Centers on Guam are staffed by dedicated professional healthcare providers and support personnel who are committed to delivering the best care possible to their patients. Their efforts to provide high-quality care to residents on Guam are representative of their commitment to our island's unique community. The compassion and level of service they display in carrying out their duties is representative of the highest qualities of professionalism demanded by the medical profession. Lastly, the level of respect they have earned among the medical community on Guam and from the patients they serve on-island is notable.

I support H.R. 5573 and the additional authorization of appropriations for the health centers program established under the Public Health Service Act.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006 (H.R. 5573), which would authorize appropriations for Fiscal Years 2007–2011 for health centers to meet the health care needs of our medically underserved populations.

Health care centers (aka Federally Qualified Healthcare Centers (FQHC)) provide essential services to our communities. More than a thousand FQHCs serve over 15 million people in 3,700 communities across the United States. FQHCs not only provide primary and preventive care, but also meet emergency care needs in their communities. My State of Hawaii has 13 FQHCs across the state, and 10 of which are in my district alone.

We are all well aware of the important role of FQHCs in providing cost-effective, quality health care to our poor and medically underserved communities. FQHCs exist in areas where economic, geographic, or cultural barriers limit access to primary health care for the working poor, the uninsured, and many high-risk and vulnerable populations. More important, these health care centers tailor their services to specific community characteristics and needs.

When Congress established the FQHC system nearly 40 years ago, we intended a unique public-private partnership by providing direct funding to community organizations for the development and operation of these healthcare centers. Federal grants, on average, constitute 24 percent of the annual budget of FQHCs by assisting communities to find partners and recruit doctors and other health professionals. Today's passage of H.R. 5573 will continue that time-proven commitment and mission by helping to reduce health disparities, meeting health care needs, and providing a vital safety net in the health care system across our country and especially in my home.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support the Health Centers Renewal Act and urge its expedited passage in the Senate.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and would urge the adoption of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5573.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GME SUPPORT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2006

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5574) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5574

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 ''Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. PROGRAM OF PAYMENTS TO CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS THAT OPERATE GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 340E of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''and each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' after ''for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2005'';

(2) in subsection (f)(1)(A)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011, $100,000,000.''; and

(3) in subsection (f)(2)—

(A) in the matter before subparagraph (A), by striking ''subsection (b)(1)(A)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)(1)(B)'';

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011, $200,000,000.''.

(b) REDUCTION IN PAYMENTS FOR FAILURE TO FILE ANNUAL REPORT.—Subsection (b) of section 340E of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter before subparagraph (A), by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2) and (3)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIRED.—

''(A) REDUCTION IN PAYMENT FOR FAILURE TO REPORT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The amount payable under this section to a children's hospital for a fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 2008 and after taking into account paragraph (2)) shall be reduced by 25 percent if the Secretary determines that—

''(I) the hospital has failed to provide the Secretary, as an addendum to the hospital's application under this section for such fiscal year, the report required under subparagraph (B) for the previous fiscal year; or

''(II) such report fails to provide the information required under any clause of such subparagraph.

''(ii) NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE MISSING INFORMATION.—Before imposing a reduction under clause (i) on the basis of a hospital's failure to provide information described in clause (i)(II), the Secretary shall provide notice to the hospital of such failure and the Secretary's intention to impose such reduction and shall provide the hospital with the opportunity to provide the required information within a period of 30 days beginning on the date of such notice. If the hospital provides such information within such period, no reduction shall be made under clause (i) on the basis of the previous failure to provide such information.

''(B) ANNUAL REPORT.—The report required under this subparagraph for a children's hospital for a fiscal year is a report that includes (in a form and manner specified by the Secretary) the following information for the residency academic year completed immediately prior to such fiscal year:

''(i) The types of resident training programs that the hospital provided for residents described in subparagraph (C), such as general pediatrics, internal medicine/pediatrics, and pediatric subspecialties, including both medical subspecialties certified by the American Board of Pediatrics (such as pediatric gastroenterology) and non-medical subspecialties approved by other medical certification boards (such as pediatric surgery).

''(ii) The number of training positions for residents described in subparagraph (C), the number of such positions recruited to fill, and the number of such positions filled.

''(iii) The types of training that the hospital provided for residents described in subparagraph (C) related to the health care needs of different populations, such as children who are underserved for reasons of family income or geographic location, including rural and urban areas.

''(iv) The changes in residency training for residents described in subparagraph (C) which the hospital has made during such residency academic year (except that the first report submitted by the hospital under this subparagraph shall be for such changes since the first year in which the hospital received payment under this section), including—

''(I) changes in curricula, training experiences, and types of training programs, and benefits that have resulted from such changes; and

''(II) changes for purposes of training the residents in the measurement and improvement of the quality and safety of patient care.

''(v) The numbers of residents described in subparagraph (C) who completed their residency training at the end of such residency academic year and care for children within the borders of the service area of the hospital or within the borders of the State in which the hospital is located. Such numbers shall be disaggregated with respect to residents who completed residencies in general pediatrics or internal medicine/pediatrics, subspecialty residencies, and dental residencies.

''(C) RESIDENTS.—The residents described in this subparagraph are those who—

''(i) are in full-time equivalent resident training positions in any training program sponsored by the hospital; or

''(ii) are in a training program sponsored by an entity other than the hospital, but who spend more than 75 percent of their training time at the hospital.

''(D) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than the end of fiscal year 2011, the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall submit a report to the Congress—

''(i) summarizing the information submitted in reports to the Secretary under subparagraph (B);

''(ii) describing the results of the program carried out under this section; and

''(iii) making recommendations for improvements to the program.''.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 340E of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e) is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2)(E)(ii), by striking ''described in subparagraph (C)(ii)'' and inserting ''applied under section 1886(d)(3)(E) of the Social Security Act for discharges occurring during the preceding fiscal year'';

(2) in subsection (e)(2), by striking the first sentence; and

(3) in subsection (e)(3), by striking ''made to pay'' and inserting ''made and pay''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5574, the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education Support Reauthorization Act of 2006, which is legislation to reauthorize the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education Payment Program for another 5 years.

Without question, Children's Hospitals are an integral part of this country's health care delivery system. They improve health outcomes by providing a unique set of specialized health care services and treatment options for children.

The Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education Payment Program is designed to provide financial assistance to children's teaching hospitals which do not receive significant Federal support for their resident and intern training programs through Medicare because of their low Medicare patient volume. By reauthorizing this important but relatively young program, we are able to help ensure that the mission of these teaching hospitals is continued.

I am also proud to say that this legislation makes improvement to the program by strongly encouraging the participating hospitals to report important new data measures to the Department of Health and Human Services.

I am proud to sponsor this legislation with my friend from Ohio and the ranking member of the health subcommittee, Mr. BROWN. And I would like to thank the 20 members of the Energy and Commerce Committee who joined us as original cosponsors of this bill.

I would also like to commend Chairman DEBORAH PRYCE of Ohio and Chairman NANCY JOHNSON of Connecticut for their strong and continued leadership on this important issue.

Again, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It has been a pleasure working with Chairman DEAL from Georgia to introduce and move this legislation through the House. I appreciate his strong support and concern about funding, of creating an ongoing, more predictable funding treatment for graduate medical education.

Children's Hospitals, as we know, care for our Nation's youngest members, helping them grow and thrive. When a child develops a serious illness, these hospitals fight back with every weapon at their disposal, focused expertise, cutting-edge technology, a mission that embraces all children regardless of their family's income, regardless of their insurance status, regardless of their family's ability to pay.

Like other teaching hospitals, freestanding Children's Hospitals, we have many of them in Ohio, in Akron, in Toledo, Columbus and in Youngstown, freestanding Children's Hospitals make it a priority to pass on their expertise. They train the next generation of children's health care providers, ensuring a steady stream of physicians fluent and conversant in the unique challenges of pediatric care.

Most of our Nation's teaching hospitals rely on the Medicare GME program, Graduate Medical Education program, to help cover the costs associated with training new physicians.

□ 1300

However, Children's Hospitals, as I discovered in Akron Children's some years ago, which obviously serve few Medicare patients, the program for the elderly, are largely excluded from this funding. Before the enactment of Children's Hospital GME, this anomaly forced Children's Hospitals to divert funding from their medical mission to their teaching mission. Two crucial missions, teaching and health care, serving children, one source of funding with no cushion in it, and who is caught in the middle of this funding squeeze? Sick children. It makes no sense to finance Graduate Medical Education for professionals who treat adults but not for professionals who treat children.

In 1999, Chairman BILIRAKIS and I introduced legislation to address this investment gap. Since its enactment, the Children's Hospital GME program has met and surpassed expectations. Our

Nation's investment in Children's Hospitals enables these providers to simultaneously train tomorrow's pediatric workforce and treat today's young patients, many of whom are battling for their lives. Serious illness is always heartrending, but when serious illness takes a child, it is an unfathomable loss. Children's Hospitals save young lives, and there is no mission more important than that.

Earlier this year, the administration proposed cutting the funding for Children's GME by 66 percent. Such a drastic cut would have devastating effects on the Nation's 60 freestanding Children's Hospitals, including the six that serve my home State of Ohio, and including Ms. PRYCE's Columbus Children's Hospital and have an impact on those like Rainbow in Cleveland that are not freestanding but still need the revenue to train their pediatric specialists. Columbus Children's Hospital alone would have faced a 76 percent cut in GME funding.

My child was at that hospital after an accident once. I know how serious and important they take their work and what a terrific job they do at that hospital in Columbus.

The Bush administration never justified the 66 percent cut. That is not all that surprising since it simply cannot be justified. This program works.

It is true that reckless fiscal decisions, tax cuts during wartime comes to mind, this body and the other body have continued to cut taxes for the wealthiest of our citizens and then logically the President proposes a 66 percent cut in Children's Hospital funding. Those reckless decisions by the Republican majority have plunged the Federal budget into the red. But the President is not doing any of us favors, and both parties recommend that, people sitting on the floor, Mr. MURPHY and Chairman DEAL and Ms. PRYCE. The President is not doing us any favors when he tries to compensate for his fiscal mistakes by making more of them. You would not take pennies from your child's piggy bank to pay off your million dollar yacht. You should not take dollars from our Children's Hospitals to pay off your trillion dollar tax cut. That would be a mistake.

Republicans and Democrats alike reaffirmed our support in committee for full GME funding when we passed this legislation out of the Commerce Committee, which Chairman DEAL and Chairman BARTON led. There is no 60 percent cut in the authorization. There should be no 66 percent cut in the appropriation.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, helps safeguard our Nation's greatest asset: our children. I hope all Members of this body join Chairman DEAL and me in supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5574, legislation that will reauthorize and strengthen the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program.

Mr. Speaker, once in a great while, a program stands out among a crowded field of programs that grabs the attention of policymakers. Back in 1999, together with the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), we saw such a program and took the reins to bring it to our colleagues' attention.

This program, known as Graduate Medical Education, was great at providing teaching hospitals that served Medicare patients with the tools and resources they needed to train doctors and treat patients. But what we realized was that the program did not reach teaching hospitals that treat children. Obviously, Children's Hospitals do not receive much in the way of Medicare payments. In fact, at the time no Federal program provided Children's Hospitals with the resources they needed to train and retain doctors and treat kids.

So in response to this inequity, Congresswoman JOHNSON and I worked with our colleagues to enact legislation that created a discretionary program to pay for Graduate Medical Education at Children's Hospitals.

Under the strong leadership of Chairman RALPH REGULA of the Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriation Subcommittee, Congress has taken the extraordinary step of providing equitable GME funding for independent Children's Hospitals at a level of about $300 million over the past several years. This program has strong bipartisan support and extraordinary support in my home State of Ohio.

I feel extraordinarily fortunate to have a state-of-the-art Children's Hospital in my hometown of Columbus, Ohio, as was mentioned earlier. At a time when programs are, and should be, scrutinized for their effectiveness and value, I am proud to report on what Children's Hospital in Columbus has been able to accomplish with the funding for the program we are seeking to reauthorize today. In the past 5 years, Columbus Children's has increased the number of physicians trained each year by over 100 percent. It has doubled residency fellowship programs and has launched these programs in areas of local and national shortage, such as pediatric surgical critical care, child neurology, and child abuse and neglect. It has initiated programs for primary care in underserved urban and rural areas. And because the Children's Hospital GME program has provided for the cost of their residency training, just as the Federal Government has always done for adult hospitals, these improvements for education and training of physicians for children have not come at the expense of patient care or research.

What all of this means is that the program is working. It is contributing to an improvement in the quality of care that our children receive at Children's Hospitals all across America. And that is exactly what our kids deserve.

I want to thank my colleagues, Chairman DEAL and Ranking Member BROWN, for prioritizing the reauthorization of this important program and commend all of the Children's Hospitals across the country for their extraordinary commitment to the health of our Nation's children.

As the motto of Children's Hospital in Columbus states: ''For Every Child, For Every Reason.'' That is what Children's Hospitals are all about and why I am so proud to support this worthy program. I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as a psychologist who spent many years working in the Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, I was pleased to cosponsor H.R. 5574, the Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2006, and I am pleased to speak on the bill today.

The Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program has been of significant help to Children's Hospitals across the country, like Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, whose pediatrics department is also headed by Dr. David Perlmutter. For several years I served on the staff of Children's Hospital in Pittsburgh and remain on the faculty of the School of Medicine at the University of Pittsburgh as an associate professor of pediatrics; so I have seen firsthand through many years the ongoing value of pediatric education for young physicians where they have so much of their learning that comes not from books but at the bedside. Children's Hospitals provide the world class expertise needed to teach the next generation of medical professionals.

Recently, I received a letter from Mr. Roger Oxendale, the president of the Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, who summarized the importance of the bill by saying, ''The Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program provides the ability to serve all children through clinical care, research, and public health advocacy, as well as its primary purpose of the training of future pediatricians, pediatric specialists, and pediatric research scientists.'' And this bill, he said, ''means a great deal to our hospital and the future of pediatric medicine.'' That support has really echoed throughout our Nation's Children's Hospitals in terms of the service they provide but also what is needed to keep that ongoing medical education going.

This payment program provides Federal funds to freestanding Children's

Hospitals to support the training of pediatric and other residents in Graduate Medical Education programs. This program compensates for the disparity in the level of Federal funding for teaching hospitals for pediatrics versus other hospitals.

So I would urge all of my colleagues to support this vital and necessary legislation to reauthorize the training for pediatric programs for another 5 years and to ensure that America can continue to meet the health care needs of our Nation's children with high quality.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join Ms. PRYCE and Mr. MURPHY and Chairman DEAL in passing this legislation unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to one of the real leaders in this area, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 5574, legislation to reauthorize the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program. Back in 1998, before my colleague from Ohio, Congresswoman PRYCE, and I authored this legislation, Children's Hospitals' residencies were getting .5 percent of what Medicare provided for other teaching hospitals. Thanks to that legislation that we authored and put in place a number of years ago, Federal GME support for Children's Hospitals approaches 80 percent of what Medicare provides to other teaching hospitals. Yes, only 80 percent.

Nonetheless, as a result, Children's Hospitals have been able to increase the number of residents they train, including both general pediatricians and pediatric specialists, increase the number of training programs they provide, and improve the quality of the training they provide and strengthen the programs they provide not only to residents but to the communities.

Between 2000 and 2005 in my own State of Connecticut, the Connecticut Children's Medical Center increased the total number of full-time equivalent residents by 31 percent. About 50 percent of their graduates pursue careers in primary care and 50 percent go on to subspecialty fellowship programs. In addition to so significantly strengthening our capacity to care for children with serious medical problems, they also have introduced new curricula to provide training in community pediatrics and professional development and, indeed, have had a systemic impact on the practice of pediatrics in many settings throughout the State.

I am proud of what they have accomplished. I am proud of what we have done here on this floor and in preceding Congresses to strengthen the training of pediatricians and pediatric specialists, and I urge support of this legislation.

And I thank my colleague, Mr. DEAL, for the work of him and his subcommittee and the full committee in bringing this forward this week.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5574, the Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2006. In FY2002, 59 children's hospitals received payments totaling $276 million. These hospitals provide specialized health care for infants, children and adolescents. Most have a wide variety of pediatric specialists to care for all types of medical problems.

The Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act is of importance to me as it affects many citizens of my congressional district. My district contains 26 hospitals and many are children's hospitals. In Chicago, Advocate Lutheran General Children's Hospital recently opened the world's first Ambient Experience pediatric radiology suite. The project seeks to make children more comfortable potentially reducing the need for sedation and repeat examinations. Federal funding has helped hospitals such as Advocate Lutheran General Children's Hospital the ability to take care of the sick children of Chicago.

Our society must continue to recognize the needs of children. Urie Bronfenbrenner, the co-founder of the national Head Start program, once said, "no society can long sustain itself unless its members have learned the sensitivities, motivations and skills involved in assisting and caring for other human beings." I am pleased that we are continuing to understand the needs of children in our society and that we are continuing to make progress with this issue.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express gratitude for the passage of H.R. 5574, the Children's Hospitals GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2006. This bill will extend funding through fiscal year 2011 for children's hospitals that provide approved graduate medical residency programs. Hippocrates once said, "Healing is a matter of time, but is sometimes a matter of opportunity." Kansas City's Children's Mercy Hospitals and Clinics continue to provide numerous opportunities for the children of Missouri and Kansas to receive the best pediatric healthcare available. The services Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education (CHGME) provides are invaluable. The $7 million received by Children's Mercy Hospitals and Clinics in the Greater Kansas City Metropolitan Area trains 125 interns and residents from the University of Missouri-Kansas City Medical School each year. The CHGME program ensures that children will continue to receive excellent healthcare and our Nation's pediatric health workforce will remain strong and competitive for years to come.

Since Children's Mercy Hospital in Kansas City is the only children's hospital between St. Louis, Missouri and Denver, Colorado, I know it is essential to continue to provide this vital funding. These valuable funds will keep the hospitals running efficiently while training our future pediatric care providers. I will support the restoration of CHGME's full funding for $300 million when the House considers the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2007.

Children's Mercy Hospitals and Clinics provide services spanning from Wichita, Kansas to Springfield, Missouri, and the passage of H.R. 5574 will ensure on-going financial support for over 60 children's hospitals, including Children's Mercy Hospital in Kansas City where the program started. From heart surgery to brain tumors to burn treatment, patients at Children's Mercy Hospitals and Clinics know they are receiving the best medical care possible and parents will never forget the "angels" who saved their children's lives. I am proud to support a program that has improved the lives of countless children nationwide, especially in my district, Missouri's Fifth Congressional District, while also expressing gratitude to the Missouri and Kansas delegation for their unending support.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in expressing our pleasure at the passage of this bill, and also to Children's Mercy Hospital in Kansas City for providing such a valuable service to so many families. The residents of Missouri's Fifth Congressional District take comfort in knowing the medical experts up at Children's Mercy Hospital are constantly on call ensure our children's well being. The health and safety of our children should remain a national priority, and today, I am proud to be a Member of Congress as we pass H.R. 5574.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5574, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO INCREASE CHILDHOOD CANCER AWARENESS, TREATMENT, AND RESEARCH

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 323) supporting efforts to increase childhood cancer awareness, treatment, and research, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 323

Whereas an estimated 12,400 children will be diagnosed with cancer in the year 2005;

Whereas cancer is the leading cause of death by disease in children under age 15;

Whereas an estimated 2,300 children will die from cancer in the year 2005;

Whereas the incidence of cancer among children in the United States is rising by about one percent each year;

Whereas 1 in every 330 Americans develops cancer before age 20;

Whereas approximately 8 percent of deaths of those between 1 and 19 years old are caused by cancer;

Whereas while some progress has been made, a number of promising opportunities for childhood cancer research still remain untapped;

Whereas limited resources for childhood cancer research can hinder the recruitment of investigators and physicians to pediatric oncology;

Whereas peer-reviewed clinical trials are the standard of care for pediatrics and have improved cancer survival rates among children;

Whereas the number of survivors of childhood cancers continues to grow, with about 1 in 640 adults between ages 20 to 39 who have a history of cancer;

Whereas up to two-thirds of childhood cancer survivors are likely to experience at least one late effect from treatment, many of which may be life-threatening;

Whereas some late effects of cancer treatment are identified early in follow-up and are easily resolved, while others may become chronic problems in adulthood and may have serious consequences; and

Whereas 89 percent of children with cancer experience substantial suffering in the last month of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congress should support—

(1) public and private sector efforts to promote awareness about the incidence of cancer among children, the signs and symptoms of cancer in children, treatment options, and long-term follow-up;

(2) pediatric cancer research to improve prevention, diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation, post-treatment monitoring, and long-term survival;

(3) policies that encourage medical trainees and investigators to enter the field of pediatric oncology;

(4) policies that encourage the development of drugs and biologics designed to treat pediatric cancers;

(5) policies that encourage participation in clinical trials;

(6) efforts to encourage the incorporation of pain management for pediatric cancer patients into medical education curricula; and

(7) policies that enhance education, services, and other resources related to late effects from treatment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 323, a resolution authored by my colleague, Representative PRYCE of Ohio. This resolution expresses support for efforts to increase childhood cancer awareness, treatment, and research.

Just uttering the word ''cancer'' conjures up a fearful imagery. All of us can name a friend, a neighbor, coworker, or family member whose life has been touched by this terrible disease. Many here today have gone through or are going through the ordeal of cancer. Thankfully, more and more people are continuing to lead full and productive lives both during and after cancer. And while it is a tragedy whenever cancer takes someone's life, the tragedy is only intensified when cancer cuts short the life of a child.

As a parent and as a grandparent, I can only imagine hearing these dreadful news stories that my child or my grandchild may have been diagnosed with incurable cancer. That would be a terrible story to hear. The impact on families going through such shock and sadness is truly profound. Parents would do anything to cure their son or daughter.

All of us long for the day when a cure is found and cancer is eradicated from the face of the earth.

□ 1315

With advances in science and medicine, we are getting closer every day. But while research for many forms of cancer is vibrant and moving steadily forward, childhood cancer research lags behind in many ways. Promising avenues for research remain unexplored. There are several reasons why this is true. First, because childhood cancer is rare, it doesn't receive the same attention as more common adult cancers.

Second, as a further consequence of this rarity, there is less known about the causes of childhood cancer. This hinders efforts to create effective treatment and prevention strategies.

Finally, because children's young bodies are still developing, they present special problems for administering the powerful cancer therapies that are often used on adults.

The purpose of the resolution before us today is to draw public attention to these issues and to call for increased public and private efforts to address the problem of childhood cancer.

One issue that deserves our attention is the lack of professionals specializing in childhood cancer. We need to encourage more health professionals and students to enter this important field. Work with children who have cancer is a very difficult job and the burnout rate is high. It takes a very special combination of compassion and toughness for a caregiver to remain at a child's side as cancer takes its toll on his or her body.

We need caring people of many backgrounds, including physicians, nurse practitioners, data managers, research assistants and other health care professionals to take childhood cancer research and treatment forward. These professionals can ensure that as many children as possible are able to reap the benefits of research through clinical trials and other opportunities.

While the job of working with childhood cancer patients is tough, the payoff is high. Every ray of a child's smile and every extra day a family spends with their loved one can make all the difference.

Another issue we should consider very carefully is the availability of cutting edge cancer treatments. Experts say the future of cancer research lies in targeted treatments that are specially engineered to treat an individual person's cancer. These are the so-called designer cancer treatments. Designer treatments can attack a cancerous tumor while saving healthy cells in the body. This approach offers the hope of a cure with fewer side effects.

With the availability of such treatments, there is less need for children to endure difficult chemotherapy and other harsh treatments that may cause severe and lifelong side effects such as blindness and hearing loss.

While designer cancer treatments hold great promise, they require high-tech equipment and a host of specialty trained professionals to make them a reality. Each drug is specially tailored for an individual patient, making the drugs labor intensive and prohibitively expensive to produce.

While we should continue to explore both public and private options to provide these drugs to as many children and adults as possible, we should resist the temptation to impose price controls that would discourage these cutting-edge technologies from coming to fruition. Price controls of all kinds are ineffective in lowering the price of a product and cause more harm than good. Rather than getting the drugs to more people, they will cause fewer drugs to be manufactured and everyone's access will be diminished.

Through research, public awareness, education and wise public policy, we can make strides in the fight against childhood cancer. With this resolution, we are calling attention to the problem of childhood cancer and supporting efforts to improve its diagnosis and treatment.

Again, I commend Ms. PRYCE for her leadership on this issue, and I encourage my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to thank my Ohio colleague, Congresswoman DEBORAH PRYCE, for introducing this legislation. Ms. PRYCE has been instrumental in raising awareness of childhood cancers and promoting the research needed to overcome them.

Every year, more than 12,000 children in our country are diagnosed with cancer. More than 2,000 of them lose their lives. Although survival rates are increasing and great progress has been made to develop new diagnostics and treatments and cures, cancer remains the number one disease killer of children. There is, of course, no tragedy comparable to the loss of a child. If we can prevent cancer from taking the life of a child, then we must prevent cancer from taking the life of a child.

This resolution calls for Congress to support public and private sector efforts to promote awareness about the

incidence of childhood cancer, its signs and symptoms, its treatment options and its long-term follow-up care. The resolution also calls for increased public and private investment in childhood cancer research, incentives to encourage health care providers to enter pediatric oncology, and incentives to spur development of better pediatric drugs and remedies. There is no more important fight than the fight against childhood cancer.

I think the legislation we just passed on the reauthorization of GME for Children's Hospitals, coupled with Ms. PRYCE's legislation here, will really matter to children in this country. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the author of this resolution, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEAL for making this a priority, and Ranking Member BROWN. I appreciate your words and I associate myself with both of your remarks, and I rise today as a voice for the thousands of families across America who have been touched by pediatric cancer.

Each day, two classrooms full of children are diagnosed, two classrooms, and I rise today for the children who will be diagnosed today and for their families who love them.

This week, we celebrate Gold Ribbon Days, a time for children and their families to come to Washington, D.C., to raise awareness about pediatric cancer. Some of those children are fighting their own battles. To them, we offer support. Some of these families have lost their children to cancer. To them, we offer compassion. And to some of those children who are survivors, they offer us hope.

This morning, I had a chance to spend time with the children and families in town for Gold Ribbon Days. We held a rally right outside the Capitol to tell our stories. We celebrated the fact that this body today would be considering this important resolution that will help raise awareness, education and research. Those families are so thankful, Representative DEAL. Thank you so much for allowing us this time.

We also celebrated the premier tonight of the much anticipated documentary called ''A Lion in the House.'' This film, produced by two brilliant Ohio filmmakers, is extraordinary. It offers an unprecedented look at the cancer journey of five young people and their families over a 6-year period. For those of us who have traveled on our own journey, this film depicts our experiences, our struggles and our pain. For those of you who have not traveled on this journey, this film will give you empathy and compassion.

Never before has such a delicate and serious topic like childhood cancer been brought to the public's attention in such a powerful and meaningful way; real families sharing stories, the very, very private moments, the highs and the lows, the roller coaster of never knowing what lies around the corner, the confusion, the frustration and the darkness, the joy and the pain, the love and the loss.

The families we meet in the film, their resilience, courage and wisdom, remind us that while it is human nature to question the sanity and injustice of why such a tragedy has befallen those of us who have been touched by pediatric cancer, we must find a way to channel our pain and our anger into action to change the course of this disease. That is what Gold Ribbon Days is all about, and this resolution is part of our action plan.

I want to recognize and thank the pediatric cancer organizations, the advocates, the children and their families who are waging their own battle against cancer. They are the tireless soldiers in our army, and until we rid the world of the scourge that is childhood cancer, we must keep up our strong army and we must keep up the fight, and we shall.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have one final speaker. I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution to fight childhood cancer. I would like to especially thank Congresswoman PRYCE for her leadership and strong dedication to this issue, which I can't think of any issue more important than this one.

My father died from this disease, but no parent should ever have to bury a child. As the father of five, I wake up every morning thanking God for the health and happiness of my children. Not all parents are as fortunate.

Unfortunately, cancer is the number one killer of children in this country today, and it destroys not only these innocent victims, but their families as well.

In too many cases, the moms, the dads, the sisters and brothers of children with cancer must stand by a hospital bed and watch helplessly as this horrible disease consumes the life of an innocent child.

Two of my constituents, Tim and Donna Culliver, lost their son Adam to childhood cancer. Faced with the loss no parent could put into words and a lifetime of pain they will feel forever in their hearts, they bravely have chosen to honor Adam by leading the fight to cure childhood cancer and by courageously working to ensure that no other mom or dad has to suffer as they did. And we should help them.

We can and must increase the funding for childhood cancer research. Underfunding this cancer research delays the goal of finding a cure for children like Adam Culliver. This is an investment we cannot afford to pass up. Unlike many of the investments that we make here in the Congress, this one will actually save the lives of innocent children.

Every day we do get closer to a cure. Three out of four children who are diagnosed with cancer will survive the disease, but that is not good enough. The loss of one child to this disease is too much.

Congresswoman PRYCE and I have introduced legislation called the Conquer Childhood Cancer Research Act, which provides for $100 million in desperately needed grants for childhood cancer research, and I urge all my colleagues to show their support for this important bill.

I spent the last 2 days with the families whose children have been afflicted by this terrible disease. They gave me a baseball bat that was signed by children at MD Anderson Hospital in Houston. The fortunate thing is that some of the children who signed that bat are survivors. The unfortunate thing is some of the children who signed that bat no longer are alive.

I want to take that bat and get our bill passed through the Congress, and, once and for all, defeat childhood cancer.

Many of my colleagues' offices will be visited today by the families who have suffered through this nightmare. I urge them to listen to the compelling stories the families have to tell and imagine how you would feel if you were in their place, and find the compassion in your hearts to help. This is an issue that no Member of Congress should say no to.

I ask you to fight for these families so no more families will have to suffer again.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, children are one-third of our population and all of our future. If our American way of life fails the child, it fails us all. Today, we have the opportunity to ensure the best healthcare, research and treatment is provided for our children suffering with cancer. Our investment in children will benefit not only their future, but ours as well.

At present, 12,400 children have been diagnosed with cancer. Typically, cancer is the leading cause of death by disease in children under age 15. In 2005, cancer took the lives of 2,300 children. Our limited resources for childhood cancer have hindered the recruitment of investigators and physicians into the field of pediatric oncology. Not long ago, cancer was seen as a death sentence. But today we have hope as survival rates climb and new treatments are on the horizon.

Both public and private sector investments must be made to improve prevention, diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation, post-treatment monitoring, and long term survival. We should provide incentives to encourage the development of drugs and therapies to treat pediatric cancers. Our American citizens deserve the best in healthcare and we must ensure that they get it.

Let us continue to work together to fight childhood cancer and pass this bill.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 323, which supports efforts to increase childhood cancer awareness, treatment, and research. Childhood is supposed to be a carefree and exciting time filled with joy and wonderment. Too many children, unfortunately, spend their childhood fighting for their lives against cancer. Cancer takes the lives of up to 2,300 children each year. It is imperative that we do more to combat childhood cancer.

The number of childhood cancer survivors is growing. Progress is being made but more must be done. This positive trend must be increased.

To do so, efforts to increase childhood cancer awareness, treatment, and research must continue. Increased public awareness of childhood cancer will help increase public and private sector investment in childhood cancer research. More and broader investment will improve prevention, treatment, and long-term survival for cancer patients.

H. Res. 323 provides policies that encourage the development of pediatric treatments and enhances educational resources related to cancer treatments. By supporting H. Res. 323, we demonstrate our support for providing cancer patients adequate resources in medicine and education.

The recent and tragic passing of a young girl, a daughter of Guam, brought this issue to the forefront of the minds of my constituents. Justice Taitague, a 5-year-old who suffered from leukemia, passed away in February 2003. Her best chance for life was a marrow transplant. The first-ever marrow drive on Guam was held as a result of the efforts of Dr. Thomas Shieh, president of the Guam Medical Society, the Hawaiian Bone Marrow Donor Registry, and the National Marrow Donor program. This "Drive for Justice" registered 3,400 donors in 3 days. Awareness of the need to address childhood cancer is high on Guam. But more must be done.

We must continue to promote awareness of, research on, and treatment for childhood cancer research. We must also increase funding to support those activities. I strongly support H. Res. 323, as it will help raise awareness of the need for continued investment of financial resources and intellectual energies toward combating childhood cancer. I urge my colleagues' support.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and ask this Congress to pass the Pryce legislation.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I too yield back and urge the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 323, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1430

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5573, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5574, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on H. Res. 323 will resume tomorrow.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

HEALTH CENTERS RENEWAL ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5573.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5573, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 3, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 306]

YEAS—424

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman

Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Flake
Hostettler
Paul

NOT VOTING—5

Cleaver
Evans
Lewis (CA)
McKinney
Rothman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1454

Mr. SALAZAR and Mr. STARK changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 306, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GME SUPPORT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5574, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5574, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 4, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 307]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—4

Flake
Linder
Paul
Waters

NOT VOTING—7

Bass
Carnahan
Evans
Lewis (CA)
Marshall
Rothman
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1503

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEED FOR BORDER SECURITY ACTION

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge the Senate to take immediate action to secure our borders. Our constituents have watched in disbelief and disgust as the Senate passed a no-illegal-left-behind bill that gives in-state tuition and Social Security to illegal immigrants. Rather than seal our gaping borders, the bill gives the green light to even more illegal immigrants to cross our borders.

Though it would be a huge challenge to reconcile our varying bills, I ask my colleagues to stand with me to turn a terrible Senate bill into something that will secure America and make its citizens proud. I urge immediate action on a conference committee, so we can finally plug the holes in our border and show lawbreakers that Americans will not tolerate their disrespect for our laws.

MEDICARE PART D: A FLAWED HEALTHCARE POLICY

(Mr. BISHOP of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, two new reports released yesterday make an open and shut case that the Medicare part D drug benefit is inadequate to meet the needs of America's seniors. One report indicates that drug prices are increasing at four times the rate of inflation. The other report shows that the VA, which negotiates with the drug companies for better pricing, is paying 46 percent less for brand-name drugs than the prices listed by Medicare plans for the same drugs.

Is there any better proof that we should have allowed the government to negotiate for lower prices when we had the chance? How can we explain or justify these exorbitant drug price increases to seniors? The drug companies say it is not their fault and blame the insurance companies, who return blame to the drug companies.

There is really nowhere else to turn except to the Medicare bill, which continues to disappoint, frustrate and anger seniors. Part D works just fine for the drug companies and the HMOs, but it is not working for those seniors who, through no fault of their own, haven't signed up for a plan and will pay for the consequences of a bad plan for the rest of their lives.

Like our energy policy, which coddles oil companies earning record profits, the Republicans' flawed health care policy built around part D rewards the pharmaceutical industry, another coddled industry, at the expense of one of the most vulnerable segments of our population, our seniors.

NEEDED LEGISLATION

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we work toward completing our appropriations work, I think it is important to acknowledge that there are some policy questions of concern.

I have introduced legislation to address the signing statements of the Executive, the President, which allows the President not to veto legislation when he is opposed, but really to send out signing statements that then causes the executive branch to totally ignore the laws of Congress. If we are to have a separation of powers, we need to make sure that Congress has its own powers to pass its laws and have them applied.

I also think it is important to acknowledge that the no-knock decision by the Supreme Court is in and of itself unconstitutional, and I will be writing legislation to put back in place that the fourth amendment is truly constitutional.

It is important, as well, as we debate the immigration issue that we bring down the tone of divisiveness, and I hope to file a sense of Congress resolution that would encourage all Members of Congress not to divide us on the debate of immigration.

I hope we will pass legislation as well that says no amnesty should be given to those in Iraq who kill American soldiers. I will be introducing legislation on that as well.

CONGRATULATING THE MIAMI HEAT ON WINNING THE NBA CHAMPIONSHIP

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, on a lighter note, it has been said that there is no ''I'' in ''teamwork.'' Indeed, a successful team beats with one heart. So, I rise today to congratulate the entire Miami Heat organization, Micky Arison, head coach Pat Riley, the Heat players and the entire Miami community for beating with one heart and winning the 2006 National Basketball Association championship.

The Heat became only the third team in NBA history to win the final series after being down two to nothing. For four games in a row, they were too hot to handle.

I know that I speak for Heat fans throughout south Florida and across the country when I say that the Heat could not have made us more proud last night. The entire Heat organization overcame a great deal of individual and collective adversity throughout the season. Yet despite doubters, they proved to have the hearts of champions.

The Heat victory was a true tapestry, comprised of the youthful talent of Finals Most Valuable Player Dwayne Wade and the veteran leadership of Alonzo Mourning, Shaquille O'Neal and Gary Payton. This team truly is 15 strong.

Congratulations to the Heat fans in south Florida, who have patiently waited 18 years for a championship parade on Biscayne Boulevard. There are no fans more deserving.

INCREASE FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal minimum wage is now the lowest that it has been, adjusted for inflation, in over 50 years. Here in Congress we have not made an adjustment; we have not given the lowest-income, most hard-pressed economic citizens of our country any raise since 1997.

I thought for a moment that there was a glimpse of hope as we have seen a proposal that finally passed in the Appropriations Committee that would have made in order an amendment that would have raised it gradually from $5.15 to $7.25 an hour. But now we see this is tied up in partisan politics, and it looks as though the Republican leadership is not going to allow the House of Representatives to vote on giving low-income Americans a salary increase.

Mr. Speaker, in my State of Oregon the voters have gone ahead and passed a statewide initiative that provides an automatic increase in the minimum wage, taking it out of politics. It is supported by our public, it is good for our economy, and it is good for our citizens. I hope we can do the same here in Congress.

REDUCING AMERICA'S DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in 2003, we spent $103 billion buying oil from nondemocratic countries, such countries as Iran, Syria and Venezuela, hardly American allies by any stretch, and, in fact, people who in some ways are funding the war against us in the war on terrorism.

We need fuel independence. We need to pass the bipartisan H.R. 4409, which accelerates the market towards flex-fuel vehicles, ethanol-run vehicles, hybrids, and an assortment of other energy-saving measures. It will, in fact, by the year 2020 reduce our dependence on foreign oil by 20 percent.

We need to drive by a cornfield and say, that is our next tank of gas. The technology is already out there. In Brazil, 40 percent of the cars run on ethanol. In America, only 3 percent of them do.

What we need to do is make it so that this technology is affordable and practical for all households in America. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor and pass H.R. 4409.

HONORING POLICE LIEUTENANT GREGORY BENNERSON

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, as I rise this morning, my Virgin Islands community is paying a fond but sad farewell to a favorite son of St. Croix, Police Lieutenant Gregory Bennerson.

Just to speak of his years as a policeman and rise to the position of commander of criminal investigations does not do full justice to his life and contributions. He dedicated much of his free time to youth and involved himself in many activities that uplifted and guided them to be the best they could be.

Greg served as a senator in the 23rd Legislature of the Virgin Islands. He was well on his way to being elected once again, because our community values and needed his consistency, his diligence, his commitment to truth, to values, and to all of the people of the Virgin Islands.

Greg was a devoted son, father, and solid, caring, selfless friend. It was out of this that his humanity became manifest and extended to everything else he did. We are all saddened by his loss, which touches my family and I personally.

Although we grieve, we should take heart that knowing Greg won an even more important election. He now looks over and advocates for us in a far better and all-powerful place. May he rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, my Virgin Islands community is saying a fond but sad farewell to a favorite and favored son of St. Croix, Lieutenant Gregory Bennerson of the Virgin Islands Police Department.

As excellently as he has served the Department—just to speak of—his years of service as a policeman and his rise through the ranks to the position of Commander of Criminal Investigations does not do full justice to his life and contributions.

A young man himself, he dedicated much of his free time to youth and worked with boys and girls clubs, was a PTA president and led the pre-cadet and Police Athletic League, but also involved himself in many other activities that uplifted our youth and guided them to be the best they could be.

He also gave his time and support to domestic violence prevention and the Women's Coalition, as well as to improving health services at the Governor Juan F. Luis Hospital. Greg loved St. Croix and was its dedicated advocate and devoted servant.

First a Republican following in the footsteps of his much revered dad, he became a Democrat and served his adopted party with commitment and passion. Greg served as a Senator in the 23rd Legislature of the Virgin Islands and at the time of his passing he was well on his way to being elected once again. Our community valued and needed his consistency, his diligence, his commitment to truth, to values, to right, and to all of the people of the Virgin Islands.

Though a big tease, with a subtle sense of humor, more than anything else he was a devoted son, father, and solid, caring, and selfless friend. It was out of this that his humanity became manifest and extended to everything else he did.

We are all saddened by his loss, which touches my family and me personally.

As I said in tribute at a gathering at home, although we grieve, we should take heart knowing that Greg won an even more important election. He now looks over and advocates for us in a far better and all powerful place.

May he rest in peace.

□ 1515

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SUPPORTING THE WAR ON TERROR

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, there was an historic debate on the House floor last week between both sides of the aisle concerning the war in Iraq. Unfortunately, I got a call late on Wednesday evening that my wife Erica had been rushed to the hospital with a serious medical emergency, and I was absent from that debate because I had to go to my wife's bedside at the hospital. I am happy to report she is at least out of the hospital, although the infection in her hand is still giving her a lot of trouble.

I wanted to at least state my opinion on the war in Iraq and the consequences of American action, and I think heroic action, that is taking place in Iraq and also in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, we are involved in a war on terror. The battle for Iraq and the battle for Afghanistan are clearly part of that war on terror. And if you want to talk about terror, how terrible could it be that what we have discovered happened to two of our fine soldiers, Kristian Menchaca and Thomas Lowell Tucker, who were slaughtered and butchered by our enemy, and we are just learning of the horror of what they did to those poor young men, those heroes, those American heroes who were willing to stand in the gap and be counted so that the people of Iraq can do what they have done, form up a government, make that government functional, get that government to where it is operational so that we can meet our goal.

Our goal is a free Iraq, a democratic Iraq, because, as the President says, when we have free democratic countries, we don't have disputes with those countries that go to war. We are trying to advance the cause of freedom around the world and protect ourselves from people who would slaughter our citizens of this country.

This is not warfare that we are talking about of these people. We are abiding by the rules of war; they are abiding by the rules of terrorism, which is no rule. And that is why we have to continue to take this fight to the enemy where they are until we have established a victory for the United States. And I honestly believe that victory is on the horizon.

I have made three trips to Iraq. I have visited with individual soldiers in Iraq. They are proud of their mission, they are proud of their accomplishments, they are proud of the things that they do for the Iraqi public. They have stories to share, as one soldier shared with me who was in the hospital and had a rose there with him, about a little girl who gave him that rose and said thank you. He didn't understand the language she was speaking, but he knew it meant thank you.

These troops are doing humanitarian as well as soldierly efforts to make life for the Iraqi people better. But, more importantly, we as American citizens should never tolerate an enemy that would butcher our troops. If there is any amount of decency in these people, they would at least abide by simple, simple rules of war. But they don't. We have had beheadings. We have had slaughter and mutilation of our American corpses.

Mr. Speaker, we are on the right side of Iraq. I am proud that the 4th Infantry Division, which is in my district, and the 1st Calvary Division have been active participants in making life better for the Iraqi public. And, Mr. Speaker, I honor them by standing here today and say I fully support America's war on terror and the war in Iraq. And I apologize that I was not here for the debate, but I am grateful for all those who stood up for the United States of America's effort in the battle of Iraq.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, thank you so much for granting me this time.

As chair of the House Democratic Caucus, Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my congratulations to Chairman SENSENBRENNER, Ranking Member CONYERS, the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Mr. WATT, and the chair of the Hispanic Caucus Mrs. NAPOLITANO, for the great work and the significant sacrifices they gave in helping us to fashion a Voting Rights Act renewal that we thought was acceptable for the vast majority of the Members of this body.

We are extremely disappointed, however, that the leadership of the House has decided to pull the Voting Rights Act which we had hoped to be considering this afternoon.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the Judiciary Committee had 12 or 13 hearings, and everybody in this body had an opportunity to come before that committee to let their views be known. Everybody in the voting public had ample opportunity to present their views and their emotions to the committee.

After all of this, we thought we had an agreement that this legislation would come before this body on suspension. We can understand why it was necessary for the Rules Committee to allow two amendments to be offered. We understand politics, and we do not have a problem with that. We do, however, have a problem with raising expectations among the people of this great State and having those expectations dashed as they were today.

We are hopeful that the leadership will bring this legislation before this body before we go out for the July 4 break. I do not believe there is any better way to celebrate this Nation's birthday, which we do on July 4, than by saying to the American people that the Voting Rights Act, which was created to get rid of creative devices that work to nullify and dilute the impact of minority voting in our great State.

I am proud to represent the State of South Carolina in this body. I used to teach history to students in that State. I used to tell my students all the time that one of the reasons that we study history is so that we can understand the past so that we will know pretty much how to prepare for the future. And one of the things I used to tell them, Mr. Speaker, is that if a thing has happened before, it can happen again. And I am afraid that the creative devices that were developed in the 1890s and early 1900s in this country under what we call the Black Codes, things like numbered posts, things like at-large voting, things like what we call full-slate voting, would be allowed back into our electoral process if we politicize section 5 that grants review. And if we were to turn that section over to a political appointee to make determinations as to whether or not they allow to be required other forms of exceptions, that is exactly what we will do with that law.

So, Mr. Speaker, I come today to thank the bipartisan group of legislators on the Judiciary Committee for fashioning an acceptable compromise to bring to this body. And I also ask the leadership of the Republican Party to please bring this legislation to this body next week and give us an opportunity to say to the American people that we will celebrate our birthday on July 4 with an understanding that everybody, irrespective of status, will have their votes counted and counted effectively.

DEMOCRATIC AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats gave the Republicans a gift last Friday. Let me give you a drum roll here. It is a wonderful gift given by the left to the conservatives here in Washington, D.C. Let me tell you what that gift was. It was the Democrat agenda. They call it the new direction. Someone said after they released this agenda that it was a new direction. When you are going in circles, you are constantly going in a different direction every time you go around that circle. And that is what the opposition party here in this Chamber is doing, they keep going in circles. It is the same old ideas.

They call it an agenda, but it is more like the Cliff Notes for Liberal Lunacy, Mr. Speaker. The theme of their agenda is best described as, well, promise, tax, spend. Promise, tax, spend. It is what they do best. And it is encouraging to see, and it shows a stark difference between the two parties and where we want to take our country, Mr. Speaker.

They say fiscal responsibility. That is one of their agenda items. Well, that is a wonderful thing to advocate, but it is laughable coming from Democrats. Here on this House floor, just this year, the opposition party has asked for $45 billion in new spending; $45 billion. And they call that fiscal responsibility. That is just amazing. And do you know what? They want to have all these new spending programs and call it fiscally responsible. Well, how are they going to do that? How are they going to pay for it? By raising every American's taxes. That is how they will do it.

They say roll back the Bush tax cuts. What that means is every American will pay more next year if the Democrats are in control than if Republicans are in control. That is what it means.

Energy policy. Energy policy. They want to lower gas prices and achieve energy independence. It sounds good. It is very good. Their voting record is far different from that. As we proposed ways of exploring for new energy sources, oil and gas, renewable energy, putting forward bold ideas here on the House floor, they just vote ''no.'' We want to put out tax incentives for new innovation and new ideas for energy production. They say ''no.'' We want to drill and explore for energy in Alaska. They say ''no.'' One hundred eighty-four Democrats voted against exploration of ANWR; 196 Democrats voted against the passage of the Gas Act to relieve high fuel prices for every American; 124 Democrats voted against the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which provided tax incentives and energy production improvements.

Look, the Democrats' rhetoric is far removed from the reality of their voting here on the House floor. But let us talk about what they have done to energy. When you constrict the supply of energy and the demand goes up, costs go up for the consumers. As demand rises and supply is constricted, prices go up. It is very simple, basic economics. Well, the Democrats are in favor of constricting that supply and making the costs go up. That is the policies they have advocated.

But let us move on to taxes. As I said, they have all these new spending proposals, but what are they going to do? Let us talk about the tax cuts the President has implemented in the last 5 years. One hundred eleven million American taxpayers have seen their taxes decline by an average of $1,800. That is a wonderful thing for the American people. Over 5 million individuals and families will see their income tax liabilities completely eliminated because the President cut taxes across the board. So if you pay taxes, you have received a tax cut, Mr. Speaker, but those that don't pay any taxes didn't receive a tax cut. That is who the Democrats are saying are left behind by tax cuts. Well, it is a basic notion of fairness, Mr. Speaker. If you pay taxes, we have cut your taxes. But if you don't pay taxes, how can we cut your taxes? So I think the American people should remember that when the Democrats talk about Republicans not cutting everyone's taxes.

□ 1530

Let us talk about the economic growth that we have implemented as a conservative party here in the House and the Senate with a good President working hard. We have had real per capita disposal income growth of 8.5 percent increase since 1999.

HONORING AMERICA'S FALLEN IN IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, we recently marked a sad milestone in the war in Iraq, as the number of Americans fallen surpassed 2,500. We owe it to each of these families to do everything we can to honor the debt of gratitude we owe them, a debt that can never be fully repaid.

Over the past year, I have led 20 other Members of Congress from both parties in reading the names of the fallen in Iraq and Afghanistan into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the words of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, each of these heroes stands in the unbroken line of patriots who have dared to die that freedom might live and grow and increase in its blessing.

God bless and keep each of the brave Americans whose memory we honor today: 1. 1st Lieutenant Benjamin T. Britt. 2. Specialist Cheyenne C. Willey. 3. Sergeant Regina C. Reali. 4. Master Sergeant Joseph J. Andres, Jr. 5. Sergeant Myla L. Maravillosa. 6. Specialist Anthony O. Cardinal. 7. Specialist Sergio Gudino. 8. Specialist Dane O. Carver. 9. Chief Warrant Officer Isaias E. Santos. 10. Chief Warrant Officer Richard Matthew Salter. 11. Sergeant Dominic R. Coles. 12. Private Joshua M. Morberg. 13. Specialist Lance S. Sage. 14. Specialist Aaron M. Forbes. 15. Private 1st Class George Anthony Lutz II. 16. Specialist Prince K. Teewia. 17. Staff Sergeant Ayman A. Taha. 18. Private Jonathan R. Pfender. 19. Sergeant 1st Class Shawn Christopher Dostie. 20. Sergeant Marce-

lino Ronald Corniel. 21. Sergeant 1st Class Jason Lee Bishop. 22. Staff Sergeant Christopher J. Vanderhorn. 23. Lance Corporal Ryan S. McCurdy. 24. Corporal Albert Pasquale Gettings. 25. Specialist Ryan D. Walker. 26. Sergeant Jason Lopezreyes. 27. Lieutenant Colonel Michael E. McLaughlin. 28. Sergeant Adam Leigh Cann. 29. Private Robbie M. Mariano. 30. Sergeant Johnny J. Peralez, Jr. 31. Sergeant 1st Class Stephen J. White. 32. Captain Christopher P. Petty. 33. Major William F. Hecker III. 34. Corporal Brett L. Lundstrom. 35. Lance Corporal Jeriad P. Jacobs. 36. Lance Corporal Kyle W. Brown. 37. Sergeant Radhames Camilomatos. 38. Specialist Clinton R. Upchurch. 39. Specialist Robert T. Johnson. 40. Sergeant Nathan R. Field. 41. Civilian Darren D. Braswell. 42. 1st Lieutenant Joseph D. deMoors. 43. Major Douglas A. LaBouff. 44. Major Michael R. Martinez. 45. Major Stuart M. Anderson. 46. Specialist Jacob E. Melson. 47. Specialist Michael I. Edwards. 48. Chief Warrant Officer 4 Chester W. Troxel. 49. 1st Lieutenant Jaime L. Campbell. 50. Lance Corporal Jason T. Little. 51. Lance Corporal Raul Mercado. 52. Sergeant Michael Joseph McMullen. 53. Petty Officer 1st Class Michael Anthony Jordan. 54. Lance Corporal Jonathan Kyle Price. 55. Chief Warrant Officer 2 Kyle E. Jackson. 56. Chief Warrant Officer 3 Mitchell K. Carver, Jr. 57. Corporal Justin J. Watts. 58. Specialist Dustin L. Kendall. 59. Private 1st Class Kasper Allen Dudkiewicz. 60. Chief Warrant Officer 2 Ruel M. Garcia.

This brings our total to 1,957 names read.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to recognize and thank the brave men and women who continue to serve our Nation with distinction in Iraq, Afghanistan and throughout the world.

Our thoughts, our prayers are with you and your families both during your service and after you come home.

God bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DROUGHT SITUATION

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the chart that is being presented here which is a drought monitor and reflects pretty much the current situation in drought.

The interpretation of that map would lead you to understand that yellow means abnormally dry. The light brown indicates a moderate drought. Brown is severe drought. Red is excessive or extreme drought, and then black or dark brown is exceptional drought.

We can see that a large part or the central part of the country is either in an extreme or exceptional drought, and that is disturbing, but if it only was ongoing for this particular period of time would not be so damaging.

The problem is that this is a 7-year process. We are in the seventh year of this drought, and most of those areas we are beginning to see some patterns emerge that are very disturbing.

This, for instance, is what has happened in some of the cities and towns in my district and in the State of Nebraska, and you see Lincoln, Grand Island, Hastings, Kearney, a minus 27, 28 inches over that period of time. Some other areas in the eastern part of the State are 10, 15 inches down, but if you look at this map, what you will notice is that the western two-thirds of Nebraska, the western half of Kansas, western half of Oklahoma, much of South Dakota, at times North Dakota, Montana, down into Texas, Arizona and New Mexico have experienced this extreme drought and this loss of water.

What that means is the aquifers in most of those areas are declining. The reservoirs are down to where they are 25, 30 percent full instead of 75 to 100 percent full, and as a result, we are beginning to see a pattern that is really very difficult for many of our farmers to continue to combat.

In many cases here, what we have seen is a reduction of herds. As water has been insufficient and pastures dry out, you cannot support as many cows on that pasture, and you have to sell off some of your brood stock, and of course, that has hurt the cattle industry in those areas.

We have also had to compensate by increased irrigation, and of course, that has been very expensive as fuel prices have gone up, as fertilizer has increased in costs by triple, sometimes quadruple over the last 3 or 4 years. Those input costs have squeezed profit margins to the point where many people are not able to survive in farming.

Also, we have seen some rather major changes in agricultural practices, mitigation of drought. For instance, we are now planting more sorghum, which requires less water than corn or soybeans. We are seeing skip row planting where we are not planting every row that we used to because of the lack of water. Using no till, which means that you plant the seeds in the ground without actually plowing up the ground because that causes water to evaporate so that preserves water.

So, a lot of changes have been made, but even so, this has not been enough. We are still seeing all of those problems.

What we are seeing is a major loss of equity in many of these farmers. They simply had to go to the bank and borrow more money and sacrifice whatever equity they have built up in their farm or in their ranch. As a result, we are seeing some people now that are teetering on the brink to some degree.

We will see what happens in the rest of this planting season and growing season, but things are getting somewhat extreme and somewhat dire.

2002, 2004, we had some drought relief. We are not sure what will happen because in those years we were able to get an offset, and we went into the conservation security program and secured, roughly, $3 billion in both of those years for drought mitigation, but this year, again we will be asked for an offset. I really do not know where that is going to come from.

We are concerned, and I am simply on the floor here today speaking, letting people know, make them aware of this thing that has continued now in this year for the better part of 7 years and is really affecting the agriculture sector.

IRAQ AND THE FISCAL YEAR 2007 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House voted on the Defense appropriations bill for the year 2007, and once again, we missed a golden opportunity. We missed an opportunity to pass a bill that strengthens our national security, while at the same time, reflecting the very best of American values.

Foremost among these values is our desire for peace, our capacity for global leadership and our compassion for the people of the world.

Unfortunately, the Defense bill passed by the House, which included a $50 billion bridge fund for Iraq, came to a grand total of $431 billion. This amounts to more than all other discretionary programs combined. With this latest appropriation, the war in Iraq now totals $320 billion.

With this amount of money, we could have given more than 61 million American teenagers a 4-year university scholarship. We could have created nearly 3 million affordable housing units, a process by the way that would in itself have created over 1 million jobs.

Remember, this is the same war that Paul Wolfowitz said could be paid for out of Iraq's oil revenues, the same war that caused Bush economic adviser, Lawrence Lindsey, to be fired when he suggested it might cost as much as $200 billion.

Three years, more than $300 billion later, and over 2,500 American soldiers killed and more than 18,000 wounded, and with Iraq's oil still not flowing at the capacity it was before the war, there is still no end in this war in sight. We are still mired in a seemingly endless conflict.

The President still has not told the American people how he plans to bring our troops home, or even what an end to the war would look like. In fact, when pressed, our President, the commander-in-chief, explained that ending the war would be the job of a future President.

Mr. Speaker, this administration likes to claim that those who support the U.S. leaving Iraq are somehow not supportive of our troops, but the very, very opposite is true. Those who would leave our soldiers in harm's way for years on end on a dangerous and ill-conceived mission should ask themselves whether this is the best way to truly support our troops and to truly secure America.

What we need is a smarter approach to national security, an approach that puts sanity back in our Nation's defense policies.

With the help of Physicians for Social Responsibility, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, and Women's Action for New Direction, I have introduced a plan that would do just that. It is SMART security, H. Con. Res. 158, and it represents a sensible, multilateral, American response to terrorism.

SMART security focuses on investments in multilateral partnerships and regional security arrangements, rather than spending billions of dollars for perpetual war and Cold War relics like the missile defense system.

SMART attacks terrorism at its source with an ambitious international development agenda that supports democracy and economic growth in the troubled regions around the world.

You see, Mr. Speaker, it is time for a fundamental change in our national security policy, a change affected through our actions on the ground and through the bills we pass in Congress. Yesterday's Defense bill was a step in the opposite direction.

The first step in the right direction is an end to the war in Iraq. For the sake of our soldiers, their families and our national security, it is time to stop spending billions of dollars on this war, and it is time to bring our troops home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING CHRIS BROWN

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Aristotle once said that, ''All who have meditated on the art of governing mankind have been convinced that the fate of empires depends on the education of youth.''

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor one of those responsible for educating the next generation of Americans. His name is Chris Brown, who is a principal of Corinne Elementary School in Box Elder County, Utah. Chris is a 2006 recipient of the Huntsman Award for Excellence in Education.

Now in its 14th year, this award was created by one of Utah's businessmen to honor his father who was a teacher. It nominates up to 500 teachers every year. The winner is chosen by a panel of their peers, as well as business and community leaders. They are remarkable people.

Chris Brown originally planned on getting an MBA, but his wife encouraged him to become an educator, and as she said, he ''just fell in love with it.'' He earned a bachelor of arts and bachelor of science degree from Utah State, and then he taught social studies at Bear River Middle School for 6 years before going on to become a principal now at his fourth elementary school.

□ 1545

Chris's focus has been on the students, and it goes beyond the school grounds. Every summer he visits every student who attends Corinne Elementary School to understand their home environment, to reach a friendship with their families, as well as to set goals for the upcoming year. He works hard to ensure that children from all walks of life are provided with the best educational experience.

Chris's wife Sharon, who is also an elementary school principal, says, that to Chris, everything about his job is being with the students. He feels an administrative position should give him time to be closer to students. He is in the classroom every day. He teaches social skills to his students every year. He leaves home between 4 and 5 in the morning, very seldom gets back before 7 at night, unless his wife creates some kind of fit, and he goes to work early and stays late so that he can do his administrative duties at that time and has time for the kids during the day.

He is kind of leader who is always trying to find some kind of positive interaction with his students. He sees them in the classroom often. He believes if the students see him in the classroom, they will know what they are doing is important. Every Monday and Tuesday he is in the classroom visiting every one of them, teaching social skills that would be expected of them.

On Wednesdays he meets with the teachers and the literary teams discussing each student's needs. He wants them to know how to read and gives teachers and aides ideas that fit into the student's ability, not some one-size-fits-all program. On Friday the students come to Chris's office to pass off their spelling words so that they have a positive interaction with the principal.

Mr. Brown makes sure that everyone stays focused on the most important issue, which is the kids. When a growing class size met his school and was problematic, he reduced the number by creating an additional third class which he himself taught.

At his current school he can be seen on the playground kicking soccer balls with his students at recess. In fact, one parent said, the whole second grade lives for PE with Mr. Brown. She overheard her son Daniel tell a homeschooled neighbor, ''You have to go back to school so you can have PE with Mr. Brown.''

Chris and his wife Sharon were both brilliant, student-oriented classroom teachers. I know, I team-taught with Sharon. They both have taken the same commitment to kids to the dark side of administration. Chris Brown has gone above and beyond the call of duty. Each student under his care knows that he truly cares about them and that he values them.

His commitment to the students demonstrates the quality of leader and teacher that he is. It is right that he has been recognized with this award by his peers, because he does education right. And, besides, Chris Brown still did the best audience belly dance we ever had at our Renaissance Festival.

It is an honor to recognize Mr. Brown. It is an honor to present him to you as someone who does his job in education right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IRAQ PLAN

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, for over a year, the American people have asked in increasing numbers for the Congress and the President to work on a real plan for Iraq. As we all know, the American people have been increasingly frustrated by the lack of progress both there and here.

For one thing, the battle lines have grown beyond Iraq's borders. The continuing U.S. presence in Iraq has inflamed tensions throughout the Arab world, and hostile sentiment is growing. That makes it harder to deal effectively with Iran and harder to achieve stability and security for Israel and the Palestinian people. In other words, the

casualties in the Iraq war are spreading to U.S. strategic and diplomatic interests throughout the Middle East.

The price we pay continues to escalate, and so does the violence. Iraq has become an unlimited front without battle lines and without a visible enemy. That is the Iraq war our soldiers face every single day.

On any given day, the level of violence may be more or less than the day before, but no one doubts that the United States' soldiers patrol and rest a heartbeat away from certain violence and potential death. They live the Iraq war 24/7 and patrol an unlimited front in an open-ended commitment of U.S. forces.

While the President waits for the Iraqi clerics to declare themselves ready to take up government, some in the Iraqi Government itself are demanding to know when the U.S. forces will leave. Now, that might sound ungrateful after all the sacrifice by our soldiers and all the money we have spent. On the other hand, it may be the clearest sign yet that the Iraqi leaders are emerging who recognize that Iraq will never stand alone until it is on its own.

They are not alone in this desire. It is what the American people want. It is what they want to see, an end to the unlimited sacrifice by U.S. soldiers, unlimited expenditures by the U.S. Government, and unlimited battle lines surrounding our troops.

Despite the nature of last week's debate, the American people finally have begun to see this House take a step forward, with 153 Members voting in favor of the Murtha plan for strategic redeployment. It begins to address the military issues associated with projecting U.S. power in a region without keeping U.S. forces in the middle of Iraqi sectarian violence. The Murtha military option does something else. It offers a realistic opportunity for diplomacy to take root in ways both familiar and effective in the region.

For some time I have urged the involvement of the United Nations as a first step to diffuse the focus on hostility directed towards the United States. The more the U.S. is seen as directing people, government, and events in Iraq, the more we prolong the violence. That has been a familiar theme in the Middle East and one that I heard repeatedly last August when I met with civic and business leaders at a prestigious Arab leadership forum in Amman, Jordan.

Zbigniew Brzezinski, who served as National Security Adviser under President Carter, has outlined a vision for Iraq that is a thoughtful roadmap for peace. The nations of the Middle East, including Iraq, have relied for centuries on a gathering of regional leaders to resolve conflicts. It is time to establish a way for that historical process to occur.

Adopting the Murtha plan is the first step. U.N. leadership is second, because it sets the stage for the nations to become involved without military forces and without the balance tipping to any one ideology, including some we absolutely do not support.

Finally, the roadmap leads to a regional conference where those closest to the problem have the most to gain and/or lose in solving it.

Now, the role of the United States at this point would be a role the United States can play better than any other nation in the world. We can help broker peace from the sidelines instead of fighting the war on the front lines. U.S. diplomacy has accomplished miracles over the years. Israel today is better off than it was before President Carter called the parties to Camp David. It is time we make a similar commitment to a peace process in Iraq.

Let the Murtha plan be the foundation block on the road to peace in Iraq. One hundred fifty-three Members of the House voted to support what the American people believe: We can protect the American interests without automatically ordering our soldiers into combat. We can project American military might without occupying a country.

We have a realistic plan for Iraq and a growing desire to see it implemented. It may take an election to start the real discussion about Iraq, but the American people are ready, willing, and determined to have it. The election is coming.

BRZEZINSKI'S IRAQ PLAN MAKES SENSE

Former national security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski suggests that the U.S. could leave Iraq now and create a better and stronger situation.

His simple four-point proposal is (essentially):

1. Washington should quietly ask Iraqi leaders to publicly ask the US to leave, rather than announce arbitrarily a date for the departure. (The catch—If we had any diplomats left in this administration, they could call Ali Sistani and the Kurdish leaders and the top Sunni leaders and ask them to agree to this easily—but the Dubya-Cheney administration's diplomacy quotient is zero!)

2. After such a public request, the US and Iraqi governments would jointly consult on a date for ending the occupation to allow a complete and orderly disengagement.

3. After this, the Iraqi government—not the US—should then also call for a regional conference of Muslim states, some immediately adjoining Iraq, others more distant, to help consolidate internal stability.

4. On leaving, the US should convene a donors' conference of Western states, Japan, China and others with an interest in Iraq's future stability to help with the restoration of the Iraqi economy.

LOWERED VISION

(By Zbigniew Brzezinski)

America's Iraq policy requires a fundamental strategic reappraisal. The present policy—justified by falsehoods, pursued with unilateral arrogance, blinded by self-delusion, and stained by sadistic excesses—cannot be corrected with a few hasty palliatives. The remedy must be international in character; political, rather than military, in substance; and regional, rather than simply Iraqi, in scope.

Rectifying the increasingly messy Iraqi adventure requires understanding its root: the extremist foreign policy pursued by this administration. Its rhetoric has been demagogic, especially at the very top. Its strategic content has been manipulated by officials preoccupied more with reshaping the security landscape of the Middle East than with maintaining America's ability to lead globally. Domestic support for its policies was mobilized by the deliberate exploitation, as well as stimulation, of fear among the electorate. The Iraq war is not only an outgrowth of this flawed approach to foreign policy, but also its symbol.

Unlike the 1991 war against Iraq, for which more than 80 percent of the cost was borne by America's allies, this time American taxpayers must foot the bill, which is already approaching $200 billion. The number of Americans dead and wounded is in the thousands and climbing, and the number of innocent Iraqis killed is considerably higher. America's relationship with Europe—which is integral to global stability and to the protection of U.S. interests—has been badly strained. America's credibility has been tarnished among its traditional friends, its prestige has plummeted worldwide, and global hostility toward the United States has reached a historical high.

Most immediately dangerous, the war has focused Arab hatred on the United States. The U.S. occupation of Iraq is now seen by most Arabs as a mirror image ofIsrael's repression of the Palestinians. The Bush administration's unqualified support for Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's brutal treatment of the Palestinians has created a political linkage between the war in Iraq and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that is evident to almost everyone in the world except the current White House.

The initiatives President Bush took this week point in the right direction, but they are too late in coming and involve too little change in substance. The president now accepts implicitly what top-level administration officials explicitly rejected when I spoke with them just a few months ago: the need for a U.N. umbrella over the U.S. grant of even limited sovereignty to the Iraqi government. The administration, however, still refuses to bite the bullet and make difficult decisions on the role and duration of the U.S. military presence in Iraq or on the larger dilemmas of regional peace in the Middle East.

The administration has yet to confront squarely the fact that the deteriorating situation both in Iraq and in the region will not improve without a politically comprehensive and coldly realistic revision of current policies that addresses four key points: (1) The transfer of ''sovereignty'' should increase, rather than discredit, the legitimacy of the emerging Iraqi government, and hence it should issue from the United Nations, not the United States; (2) Without a fixed and early date for U.S. troop withdrawal, the occupation will become an object of intensified Iraqi hostility; (3) The Iraqi government should reflect political reality, not doctrinaire American delusions; and (4) Without significant progress toward an Israeli-Palestinian peace, post-occupation Iraq will be both anti-American and anti-Israel.

First, the transfer of nominal sovereignty to a few chosen Iraqis in a still-occupied country will brand any so-called ''sovereign'' Iraqi authority as treasonous. A grant of ''sovereignty'' by the United States to the Iraqis—while an American proconsul backed by an occupation army remains ensconced in a fortress in the very heart of the Iraqi capital—will have no political legitimacy. The president's assertion (repeated more than once in his speech on Monday night) that such a transfer will bestow ''full sovereignty'' on Iraq is Orwellian artifice.

The urgent need is to subordinate, as soon as possible, the U.S. occupation—which is

rapidly alienating the Iraqis—to the visible presence of the United Nations, headed by a high commissioner to whom effective authority should then be transferred. A genuinely empowered U.N. high commissioner could, in turn, progressively yield genuine sovereignty to the Iraqis with much greater prospects of gaining Iraqi public support for the interim government.

The authority of any such high commissioner should extend to the security sphere. The American military commanders in Iraq should retain full discretion to respond to attacks upon U.S. forces in the manner they deem necessary, but any offensive operations they—or other coalition forces—conduct should require explicit authorization from the high commissioner, perhaps in consultation with the Iraqi leaders. That change in command and control would automatically transform the character of the U.S. presence in Iraq from a military occupation to internationally supervised peacekeeping. The U.N. resolution the Bush administration proposed Monday makes token gestures to that end, but it does not fundamentally alter the continued and overt supremacy of the United States in Iraq.

Second, the longer the U.S. military presence lasts, the more likely it is that Iraqi resistance will intensify. It is, therefore, in America's interest to credibly convey U.S. determination to let Iraqis manage (however imperfectly) their own security. Setting a reasonable deadline for the departure of U.S. troops—far enough in the future not to look like a pell-mell withdrawal but soon enough to concentrate Iraqi minds on the need for self-sufficiency—could take practical advantage of the fact that the countrywide situation on the ground is currently not quite as bad militarily as necessarily selective TV images suggest.

April 2005—two years after the occupation began—might be the appropriate target for terminating the U.S. military presence. A publicly known date for the departure of U.S. troops would refute suspicions that the United States harbors imperialist designs on Iraq and its oil, thereby diluting anti-American resentments both in Iraq and the region at large. Only a firm deadline for military withdrawal will convince the Iraqis that we truly intend to leave. Conversely, failure to set a date will encourage Iraqi politicians to compete in calling for early U.S. departure.

Admittedly, there is a risk that a U.S. withdrawal will be followed by intensified instability, but such instability would harm U.S. global interests less than continued (and perhaps rising) resistance to a seemingly indefinite U.S. occupation—which, in any case, has not suppressed low-level but widespread crime, violence, and terrorism. That resistance could take the form of intensified urban warfare, such as that waged five decades ago by the Algerians against the French. The United States could doubtless crush such an insurgency with an intensified military effort, but the political costs of such escalation—massive civilian casualties, pervasive destruction, and the inevitable exacerbation of national, cultural, and religious indignities—would be colossal.

The United States should consult with the principal members of its military coalition about an appropriate deadline. A set date of April 2005 could force other states, notably our European allies, to focus on the need for a wider and more ambitious effort to help the Iraqis stabilize and reconstruct their country. The militarily significant members of the coalition (those with 1,000 or more troops in Iraq) are Great Britain, Italy, Poland, Ukraine, and the Netherlands. Their views should be solicited, if for no other reason than because the publics in these countries are increasingly hostile to continued participation in Iraq's occupation, while some of the officers commanding their contingents in Iraq have been quite critical of heavy-handed U.S. military tactics.

Third, the internationalization of the supreme political authority in Iraq and the setting of a date for U.S. withdrawal will require a redefinition of the oft-proclaimed (but largely illusory) goal of transforming Iraq into a democracy. Democracy cannot be implanted by foreign bayonets. It must be nurtured patiently, with respect for the political dignity of those involved. An assertive and occasionally trigger-happy occupation is no school of democracy. Humiliation and compulsion breed hatred, as the Israelis are learning in the course of their prolonged domination over the Palestinians.

Post-occupation Iraq will not be a democracy. The most that can be practically sought is a federal structure, based on traditional, often tribal, sources of authority within the three major communities that form the Iraqi state: the Shia, the Sunnis, and the Kurds. It would be unwise, however, to demarcate these communities into three territorially defined regions, for that would almost certainly produce intense border conflicts among them. Until the dust settles from Saddam Hussein's dictatorship and the U.S. military intervention, it would be wiser to rely on the traditional arrangements within the more numerous existing provinces—a strategy that could promote political compromise across sectarian lines. The result would likely be a somewhat Islamic Iraqi national government that roughly reflected the country's demographic, religious, and ethnic realities.

Fourth, but far from least, the United States must recognize that success in Iraq depends on significant parallel progress toward peace between the Israelis and Palestinians. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is the single most combustible and galvanizing issue in the Arab world. If the United States disengages from Iraq before making significant headway toward settling that dispute, it could face a sovereign Iraqi government that is militantly hostile to both Israel and the United States.

Therefore, the United States—if it is to gain any international (and especially European) support for remedying its Middle Eastern dilemmas—will have to clarify its stand on the eventual shape of an Israeli-Palestinian peace settlement. It should by now be clear that the conflict will never be ended by the two parties on their own. U.S. unwillingness to define, even in broad terms, the fundamentals of a peaceful outcome abandons those Israelis and Palestinians who genuinely desire peace to the mercies of their extremist leaders. Furthermore, endorsing Ariel Sharon's goals but ignoring the Palestinian side of any compromise is delaying, rather than accelerating, the peace process—while compounding the suffering on both sides.

To mobilize those Israelis and Palestinians who seek peace, and to convince the Middle East that U.S. occupation of Iraq is not simply a conspiratorial extension of Israeli domination of the West Bank, the United States should more explicitly state its position regarding the six key issues that a final Israeli-Palestinian peace will have to resolve: not only (as Israel demands) that there can be no right of return for Palestinian refugees, and that the 1967 lines cannot automatically become the final frontier, but also that there will have to be equitable territorial compensation for any Israeli expansion into the West Bank; that settlements not proximate to the 1967 line will have to be vacated; that Jerusalem as a united city will have to be shared as two capitals; and that Palestine will be a demilitarized state, perhaps with some NATO military presence to enhance the durability of the peace settlement.

A fundamental course correction is urgently needed if the Middle East is to be transformed for the better. Slogans about ''staying the course'' are a prescription for inflaming the region while polarizing the United States and undermining U.S. global leadership. A bold change of course—given the gravity of the situation confronting the Iraqis, Israelis, and Arabs more generally, as well as concerned Europeans—could still snatch success from the tightening jaws of failure. But there is little time left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN HONOR OF THE INAUGURAL CARIBBEAN AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Caribbean American community in honor of the first-ever National Caribbean American Heritage Month.

On June 27, 2005, the House unanimously adopted H. Con. Res. 71, my resolution to declare June National Caribbean American Heritage Month. On February 14, 2006, the Senate followed suit, thanks to the work of Senator SCHUMER of New York and Arielle Goren on his staff.

And let me begin by recognizing the many people who helped realize this 2-year bipartisan, bicameral effort, because this was quite a feat. First, I want to recognize our colleague, a great leader on so many issues and especially on health care, Congresswoman DONNA CHRISTENSEN from the Caribbean, who has been tremendous in terms of bringing us together to address the issues of health disparities throughout our country and throughout the world.

Also, I would like to thank the Institute of Caribbean Studies, especially Dr. Claire Nelson and her team, for joining us in this effort from the very beginning.

Also, we must recognize our friends from the Caribbean diplomatic corps, who worked so hard to spread the word about this effort both at home in the Caribbean and in their embassies and consulates across the country.

There are so many Members of Congress who supported this effort. In addition to early support from my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus and friends of the Caribbean Task Force, the former chair of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Representative Cass Ballenger, was the first Republican to endorse this bill, and his successor, Chairman DAN BURTON, was one of the first to help urge the President to issue an official proclamation.

This was truly a bipartisan effort, with, of course, our chairman Mr. HYDE of the International Relations Committee and our ranking member Mr. LANTOS, who lent their very strong support.

And, of course, we never would have done any of this without our staff. First, let me commend and thank my staff person Jamila Thompson for her leadership and for her commitment to not only this issue and this bill, but for so many of the efforts that she mounts. She has roots in the Bahamas, and she understands the importance of recognizing Caribbean Americans and their proper role and proper recognition in our country.

Also, we had many staff members, Ted Brennan, Jack Scharfen, Paul Oostburg, Dan Getz, and Mark Walker. They all worked in a bipartisan way to make this a reality and really to realize this dream for many, many people.

The Government Reform Committee, Chairman TOM DAVIS, and our Ranking Member HENRY WAXMAN. They applauded the passage of this resolution last year and were instrumental in its passage.

And, of course, in the final weeks before the proclamation was issued by the White House, a coalition was formed that was very instrumental in urging the White House to officially declare June National Caribbean-American Heritage Month. This coalition included Senator Mel Martinez from Florida, Ambassador Tom Shannon, State Department's Assistant Secretary for the Western Hemisphere, and Brian Nichols of his staff.

And the Caribbean American community was very active around this effort. It could not have been done without them. From Glenn Joseph and John Felix in Florida; to Jean Alexander and Horace Morancie, Anthony Carter, and so many others in New York; to Shorron Levy in California, this became, quite frankly, an international grass-roots effort. It was really an exercise in democracy. So I am pleased that on June 5, the President responded by officially declaring June National Caribbean American Heritage Month.

And let me also say that we know the Caribbean is as racially diverse and ethnically and religiously diverse as the United States. We have some phenomenal spokespersons who are traveling throughout the country, like Sheryl Lee Ralph and basketball legend Rick Fox. Sheryl Lee Ralph is a woman of Caribbean descent from Jamaica actually, and is a great actress as well. Her voice on HIV and AIDS, as well as promoting and spreading the word about Caribbean American Heritage Month, will be very valuable in terms of making sure that our entire country knows about the phenomenal contributions of Caribbean Americans.

On a very personal level, my relationship with persons of Caribbean descent began with the late great former member of this body, the first African American woman elected to Congress, Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm. I worked as a volunteer in her historic 1972 Presidential campaign. As a woman of Barbadian and Guyanese descent, Congresswoman Chisholm never forgot her roots and connections to the Caribbean. Her work, whether it was fighting for equal access to education in the United States Congress or Haitian refugees in detention camps, her commitment always stemmed from her faith and her strong Caribbean values.

When the United States-Caribbean relations began to deteriorate over the war in Iraq, the coups in Haiti, and the Cuban embargo, I knew that we needed to go back and really recognize our deep and strong relations with the Caribbean. So we need to send a message of goodwill to the Caribbean American community. So soon we will be introducing the Shirley Chisholm Caribbean Educational Exchange Act of 2006 to provide existing and expanded educational exchanges between our country and the Caribbean.

WHO SUPPORTS THE CARIBBEAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH EFFORT?

The Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and CARICOM Foreign Ministers included the following statement in their joint press release issued at the conclusion of the US-CARICOM Ministerial Meeting held in The Bahamas in March 2006:

''The Ministers and the Secretary of State welcomed the recent resolution of the U.S. Congress to commemorate Caribbean American Heritage Month in June. The resolution is a recognition of the deep and lasting human ties that bind the United States and the Caribbean.''

This bi-partisan effort to create a National Caribbean-American Heritage Month is supported by Ambassador Albert Ramdin, Assistant Secretary General of the Organization of American States, the Caucus of CARICOM Ambassadors in Washington, DC and the following organizations:

The Institute for Caribbean Studies, DC; Caribbean-Central American Action, DC; Caribbean American Chamber of Commerce of Florida, Inc.; The West Indian American Day Carnival Association, NY; Caribbean-American Cultural Association, Inc. of North America (CACANA), FL; Caribbean-American Center of New York; Conference of Heads of Caribbean Organizations of Central Florida; TnT International, Inc.; The Caribbean American Chamber of Commerce and Industry—Greater Washington Area Network; South Florida Caribbean Diaspora Task Force; Trinidad & Tobago Working Women's Committee, DC; Caribbean Association of World Bank Group and IMF Staff, DC; Caribbean American Chamber Commerce and Industry, Inc. (CACCI), NY; Global Exchange, CA; Caribbean Peoples International Collective, NY (CPIC); The St. Lucia Nationals Association; Dominica Academy of Arts & Sciences, DC; Metro Atlanta Caribbean Cultural Arts Centre, Inc. (MACCA); The Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA); The Caribbean Voice, NY; Northern California Caribbean American Heritage Month Committee; Central Florida's Caribbean Sun Newspaper; The Guyanese Society of St. Louis; The Caribbean Club in Mount Vernon, NY; Caribbean Professional Networking Series, DC; Caribbean World Arts & Culture, Inc.; St. Kitts and Nevis Association of Metropolitan Washington; The West Indian Social Club of Hartford, Inc.; The Inter-American Economic Council; Sunrise Symphony Steelpan Corporation; Barbados Assoc. of Central Florida; Jamaican American Association of Central Florida; Grenadian-American Educational and Cultural Organization of Central Florida, Inc.; Caribbean and Floridian Association, Inc. (CAFA); Guyanese American Cultural Association of Central Florida; Orlando Carnival Association, Inc.; Alliance of Guyanese Expatriates of Central Florida; Caribbean Students' Association at the University of Central Florida; Jamaican/American Partners in Education, GA; Central Florida Cricket League; Caribbean Bar Association (Central Florida Chapter); Antigua and Barbuda Association of Central Florida; Association of Asian Cultural Festivals, Inc.; Caribbean Community Connection of Orlando, Inc.; Trinidad & Tobago Association of Central Florida; Suriname American Network; Haitian American Support Group of Central Florida, Inc.; Caribbean-Guyana Institute for Democracy; The Indo-Caribbean Council, NY; The Haitian American Historical Society, FL; Caribbean American Intercultural Organization; Sistas-With Style, CA; Dominican American National Roundtable, DC; West Indian Social Club of Hartford, Inc.; Caribbean American Society of Hartford; The Ballentine Group; Jamaica Progressive League; St. Lucian American Society of Hartford. Mico Alumni Association Inc.; Guyanese American Cultural Association; Connecticut Haitian American Organization, Inc.; Barbados American Society of Hartford; Sportsmen Athletic Club & Cricket Hall of Fame; Cultural Dance Troupe of the West Indies; Trinidad and Tobago Steel Symphony; Jamaica Ex-Policeman Association of Connecticut; West Indian American Newspaper; Center for Urban & Caribbean Research; CAYASCO, Inc.; Martin Luther King Jr. Soccer League; Morancie Family Reunion, Inc., NY; Tropical Paradise Restaurant and Juice Bar, NY; Jamaica Nationals Association, DC; Medgar Evers College, NY; Carriacou Charitable Health Services, Inc., NY; The Caribbean World News Network, NY; The Shirley Chisholm Cultural Institute for Children, Inc., DC; Caribbean Research Center, NY; Montserrat Progressive Society of NY, Inc.; The Georgia Caribbean-American Heritage Month Planning Committee, GA; Ainsley Gill & Associates LLC, DC; SOCA Warriors United, NY; The Black Diaspora, NY; Sunrise Symphony Steelpan Orchestra, Inc., NY; Gloria's In & Out Restaurant, NY; Virgin Islands Association, DC; CCB International, Inc., NJ; TATUCA, NY; Callaloo Magazine, NY; Department of African American Studies, Ohio University; Hannah's Place International, NY; Guyana Folk Festival, DC; Caribbean Sunshine Awards, NJ; Trinidad and Tobago Business Association, Inc., NY; RAJHUMARI Center for Indo-Caribbean Arts & Culture, NY; Mauby Media Services, NY; Merrymakers Cultural Association, NY; Caribbean People's Association, NJ; Trin-American Social & Cultural Association, DC; Trinidadian and Tobagonians Inc., NY; Gasparillo Group, NY; Trinidad and Tobago Association of Washington, MA; Caribbean Journal, NY; St. Anthony's Spiritual Baptist

Church, PA; Friends of the Caribbean, Inc., DC; The International Consortium of Caribbean Professionals (ICCP); Tropicalfete.com, NY; St. Louis-Georgetown Sisters Cities Committee, MO; Virgin Islands Association of the District of Columbia (VIA); Patterson Dental Clinic, NJ; Barbados American Society of Hartford, Inc.; TransAfrica Forum, DC; Caribbean-African-American Hotline, Ads, News, Gospel & Global Events (411XCHANGE), NY; Belizean Information & Services International, NY; St. Vincent and the Grenadines Nationals Association of Washington, DC; eCaroh Caribbean Emporium, MA; Caribbean American Weekly (CAW), NY; Council of St. Vincent and the Grenadines Organizations U.S.A., Inc., NY; St. Vincent Benevolent Association; Bequia United Progressive Organization, Inc.; Chateaubelair Development Organization; Club St. Vincent, Inc.; Canouan United Social Organization, Inc.; Friends of the St. Vincent Grammar School; Girls High School Alumnae; Hairoun Sports Club; St. Vincent and the Grenadines Humanitarian Organization; Mas Productions Unlimited; Striders Social and Cultural Organization; St. Vincent and the Grenadines Ex-Police Association; St. Vincent and the Grenadines Ex-Teachers Association; St. Vincent and the Grenadines Nurses Association; United Vincie Cultural Group of Brooklyn; Concerned Americans for Racial Equality, NY; Benevolent Missions of Atlanta, Inc. (BMA); Barbados Association of Greater Houston; Bahamian Junkanoo Association of Metropolitan DC.

H. CON. RES. 71 COSPONSORS (81) DURING THE 109TH CONGRESS

Reps. Becerra, Berkley, Berman, S. Bishop, C. Brown, S. Brown, Bordallo, *Burton**, Butterfield, Capuano, Carson, Christensen, W.L. Clay, Clyburn, Conyers, Crowley, Cummings, D. Davis, J. Davis, Delahunt, Engel, Faleomavaega, Farr, Fattah, *Feeney*, Ford, *Fortũno*. B. Frank, A. Green, Grijalva, Gutierrez, A. Hastings, Honda, Jackson-Lee, Jefferson, E. B. Johnson, Tubbs Jones, Kaptur, Kilpatrick, Kucinich, *Kuhl*, Lantos, Lewis, Lofgren, Maloney, McCarthy, McDermott, McGovern, McKinney, McCollum, Meek, Meeks, Menendez, Millender-McDonald, G. Moore, Nadler, Napolitano, Norton, Owens, Pallone, Payne, Rangel, Rush, T. Ryan, Serrano, D. Scott, Schakowsky, *Shimkus*, Slaughter, Solis, B. Thompson, Towns, Van Hollen, Velázquez, Waters, Watt, Weiner, Wexler, Woolsey, Wynn

H. RES. 570 CO-SPONSORS DURING THE 108TH CONGRESS (65)

Reps. Payne, *Ney*, Christensen, *Ballenger*, Owens, Rangel, Serrano, Hastings (FL), Tubbs Jones, McDermott, Meek (FL), Clyburn, Capuano, Watt, Lewis, A. Davis, B. Scott, S. Bishop, B. Thompson, Norton, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Waters, Cummings, Kilpatrick, Rush, Lofgren, Towns, Grijalva, D. Scott, Majette, Weiner, Meeks (NY), Acevedo-Vilá, Conyers, Kucinich, Wynn, Jackson-Lee, *Sweeney*, Berman, Delahunt, Woolsey, *Feeney*, *Shimkus*, Van Hollen, Engel, Deutsch, Watson, Ballance, Menendez, Berkley, Jefferson, Ruppersberger, Lantos, Maloney, Israel, Maloney, Gonzalez, Lacy Clay, Wexler, *Ros-Lehtinen*, Ford, Jackson, Millender-McDonald, C. Brown, D. Moore.

*Republicans are italicized.

CARIBBEAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH, 2006—BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

During Caribbean-American Heritage Month, we celebrate the great contributions of Caribbean Americans to the fabric of our Nation, and we pay tribute to the common culture and bonds of friendship that unite the United States and the Caribbean countries.

Our Nation has thrived as a country of immigrants, and we are more vibrant and hopeful because of the talent, faith, and values of Caribbean Americans. For centuries, Caribbean Americans have enriched our society and added to the strength of America. They have been leaders in government, sports, entertainment, the arts, and many other fields.

During the month of June, we also honor the friendship between the United States and the Caribbean countries. We are united by our common values and shared history, and I join all Americans in celebrating the rich Caribbean heritage and the many ways in which Caribbean Americans have helped shape this Nation.

Now, Therefore, I, George W. Bush, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim June 2006 as Caribbean-American Heritage Month. I encourage all Americans to learn more about the history of Caribbean Americans and their contributions to our Nation.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifth day of June, in the year of our Lord two thousand six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and thirtieth.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1600

HONORING BRUCE MICHAEL ABRAMS

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to acknowledge a great friend of mine, but more importantly, a great friend of the San Diego community, Bruce Michael Abrams. On Sunday, June 25, Bruce is being honored at the ninth GLBT Community Tribute Banquet. Upon learning of this award, Bruce stated that receiving the community tribute this year is humbling and a wonderful honor, and at the banquet Bruce will urge people to get engaged and give back to the community.

No stranger to being honored, Bruce Abrams has received numerous awards in the past, such as the Douglas Scott Political Action Award and the Liberty Award presented by the Lambda Legal Defense Fund.

Throughout his 20 years of activism, Bruce has used his education and influence to promote positive change and garner needed funds for the whole community. He has emphasized the importance of all people being involved in their neighborhoods and communities.

The Bruce M. Abrams Lending Library at the center is a direct result of what I call progressive philanthropy. Bruce not only helped to start this community resource, he ensured that the library would have a group of supporters who would be able to keep it going throughout the years. Today the library houses more than 2,000 volumes.

His resume of volunteer service includes a long list of current and past board memberships, including the San Diego Democratic Club, San Diego Foundation for Change, Equality California, and the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. Since last year, Bruce has served as a city commissioner on San Diego's Human Relations Commission.

No novice to the political arena, Bruce first cut his teeth working on the gubernatorial campaign of Mayor Tom Bradley. Frequently, Bruce holds political receptions, charity benefits and galas at his beautifully decorated home. As I personally know, these events are not mere fund-raisers, but elegant gatherings which bring people together for real communication. Everybody loves the evenings at Bruce Abrams' home.

When not raising the moral consciousness of the world, Bruce works as a probate and planning attorney. He has a B.A. from the University of Oregon and a J.D. from the Thomas Jefferson School of Law. He truly is the ''attorney for the community.'' Bruce, we love you.

AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE FULL ACCOUNTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I know from time to time all of us have to balance our bank books. Now if the discrepancy is $9, we might ignore it figuring we made a small error.

If it were $90, most of us would recalculate and discover the error and call the bank.

If the statement is off $900, we will probably be down at the bank visiting the manager.

If our account is missing $9,000, we would be on the phone to our lawyer.

At $90,000, it would probably mean that we were working at Enron.

If $900,000 were missing from an account, there would probably be a call to the accountant, the IRS and our creditors. Or else we might be a CEO working at a large corporation who lost their bonus.

When $9 million shows up missing, usually that means contract overruns

or fraud and a government audit is inevitable.

A congressional committee might look into unaccounted expenditures of $90 million, and we might read about it in the New York Times.

When $900 million goes missing, corporations collapse, mergers are cancelled, contracts are terminated, inspectors general are appointed, contracts are sometimes banned or fined, and charges are brought to court and people usually begin to take notice.

I point all of this out to ask what should happen when we find out that $9 billion is discovered by an official investigation to be missing in our contracting accounts for the reconstruction of Iraq relating to one corporation, Halliburton, and oil revenues. Apparently, this administration thinks very little should happen because there has been no further investigation, appointment of a special inspector, a charge against a person responsible, or even any penalty or ban on that corporation which continues to make massive profits from contracts with the U.S. military despite evidence of overcharging, minimal accountability for funds, incompetence, and abuses of international and civil rights.

And if that doesn't concern us enough to act, shouldn't we pause over recent revelations of an additional $12 billion in unaccounted funding shipped as currency in $100 bills directly to Iraq from the Federal Reserve? Worse yet is the story we are learning from the funds we can account for and how they have been spent or misspent, stolen or wasted, and how little they have improved the lives of the Iraqi people they are supposed to help.

The expenditures for the Iraq war continue to grow at a rate that is putting our country into levels of spending and debt never seen before. Don't the American people deserve a full accounting of where their tax dollars are going at a time when more money is being spent to allegedly improve the infrastructure and life-style of the people of Iraq than here at home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. HARRIS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CARIBBEAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my time out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the contributions of my fellow Caribbean-Americans as we celebrate the first Caribbean Heritage Month. I want to begin by commending the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) who I was privileged to join in introducing H. Res. 71, which expressed the sense of Congress that there should be established a Caribbean-American Heritage Month, and also to commend and applaud Dr. Claire Nelson and the staff and members of the Institute for Caribbean Studies, and to thank President Bush for making it official by signing the proclamation proclaiming June 2006 as Caribbean-American Heritage Month.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Caribbean-American, with family ties to Cuba, Antigua, the Virgin Islands and the U.S., and consider this achievement an important one. The contributions of the people of the Caribbean, which go back even before the birth of this Nation, span every field from sports to entertainment, politics, art and culture to labor organizing, and all are significant and need to be made known to all Americans.

One of the most important persons of Caribbean descent in the founding of this country was Alexander Hamilton, a general in the American Revolution and our first Secretary of State. He was born on the island of Nevis and raised in St. Croix.

In the struggle to end our enslavement, which I am sure was greatly inspired by the successful Haitian revolution, it is noteworthy that Denmark Vessey also came here from St. Thomas in the now U.S. Virgin Islands by way of the Guadeloupe to lead an unsuccessful, but the largest slave rebellion that was ever planned in this country.

The ongoing fight for emancipation and liberation, my fellow Virgin Islander Edward Blyden, along with George Padmore, Marcus Garvey and Claude McKay, were among the first West Indian Americans to become well known and well respected leaders in the African American struggle for racial equality.

Others from the Virgin Islands who also had their roots in other Caribbean islands, like Ashley Totten and Frank Crosswaith, who were born on St. Croix, helped to found some of the major labor unions still operating today. J. Raymond Jones from St. Thomas, also known as the Silver Fox, ran New York City politics in the 1900s, and those are only a few.

Other famous West Indian Americans include former U.S. representative and first female presidential candidate Shirley Chisholm; Franklin Thomas, former head of the Ford Foundation; Federal Judge Constance Baker Motley, the first black woman appointed to the Federal judiciary; activists such as Stokely Carmichael, Kwame Toure, Roy Innis, Malcolm X and Louis Farrakhan; as well as world renowned actor Sidney Poitier; civil rights activist and singer Harry Belafonte; Earl Greaves, philanthropist, businessman and publisher of Black Enterprise; and now Colin Powell, the first black U.S. Secretary of State, all have made impressive contributions to this country.

Mr. Speaker, the small islands of the Caribbean also wield a cultural influence that have spread to the remote corners of the world. Our culture, notably the music, calypso, reggae, Afro-Cuban and their derivatives, which were created by and large by a people who were long considered marginalized, has spread far and wide and enjoys extensive popularity today.

But more than just our musical influence, Nobel prizes for literature have gone to poets St. Jean Perse of Guadeloupe and Derek Walcott of St. Lucia from among a number of highly regarded Caribbean writers.

Moreover, internationally admired painters Winfred Lam of Cuba and Leroy Clarke of Trinidad and Tobago and Haiti's ''naive'' artists took inspiration from a complex cosmology born from West African religions and Christianity. And Trinidad and Tobago's carnival was the basis for the breathtaking costumed parades designed by Peter Minshall of Guyana and Trinidad for the Barcelona, the Atlanta and the St. Lake City Olympics.

The most important contribution of all, however, remains the close ties between this country and the nations of the Caribbean. Those ties are not only ties of geography, but of history, and most important of the common ideals of freedom, justice and democracy which guides our nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fitting and proper that we honor the contributions of the people of the Caribbean to our history and culture.

Indeed, if providence had not made it possible for our Founding Father, Alexander Hamilton, to New York from my home island of St. Croix to further his education and work in New York City, we might not be celebrating the founding of this Nation next week, and instead, have remained a colony of the United Kingdom even today.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague who was here earlier, Ms. LEE, to pay tribute to the Caribbean-Americans who have given so much to this country, and to once again thank her and thank the members and the leaders of Institute for Caribbean Studies and to thank the President for the proclamation which named this month, June 2006, Caribbean-American Heritage Month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FORD PLAN IN MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that America is losing its independence as goods that used to be made here are displaced by foreign imports. In fact, America is in unchartered waters today. We have an accumulated trade deficit of nearly $1 trillion a year.

Today, I want to talk a little bit about super NAFTA and what the Bush administration is planning to lock NAFTA in even tighter in this country and across the continent.

There is something called the Agreement on Security and Prosperity that is being negotiated by the Bush administration very quietly. No hearings are being held in this Congress. Most Americans have never even heard the term, but it really is the successor to NAFTA.

In addition to what it anticipates in terms of a new transportation corridor that will come up through Mexico and the American highway into the United States, it also includes the incentives to major corporations, such as Ford Corporation of our country that is laying off people in our country, now an additional 30,000 jobs to be lost here in the United States, and Ford is planning to employed over 150,000 more workers in Mexico, announcing it will be investing over $9.2 billion in Mexico.

It is hard to explain to the American people how big that investment really is, but truly it will employ 15 percent or 1 of 7 of all unemployed people in Mexico, so many of them having been uprooted from their farmsteads, because NAFTA included no transition provisions to allow people to have a life and to survive inside of Mexico's rural areas, and over 2 million families have been uprooted from Mexico's farm communities and are doing what, they are moving north to eat.

At the heart of our illegal immigration problem is NAFTA's disruption of the Mexican countryside.

But in any case, this Security and Prosperity Agreement, as it is being called, has no democratic underpinning to it. It is being negotiated by the very same elites that negotiated NAFTA.

And let's look at some of the signs of what is happening. It is suddenly clearer why a company from Spain called Cintra wants to be the gatekeeper on this new highway structure to manage the flow of goods from Mexico, including the hundreds of thousands of vehicles that Ford Motor intends to manufacture in Mexico after making its $9.2 billion investment there.

Cintra is a subsidiary of Ferrovial, the Spanish transportation company founded by multi-billionaire Rafael del Pino, who is one of the richest people in the world.

Cintra already operates the Chicago Skyway, one of the nodes along the way here under a 99-year concession, and is planning development of the Trans-Texas Corridor, which is another part of this plan.

□ 1615

Cintra is a 50/50 partner with Macquarie Infrastructure Group an Australian investment bank in another place in America called Indiana, where the Indiana Turnpike, can you believe this, has been leased to a foreign interest. And we are told that Ohio, the State that I represent, might be the next State to unwisely rent one of its major assets to a foreign nation.

Human Events magazine recently had this description. It said, ''The North American Super Corridor Coalition is a not-for-profit organization dedicated to developing this international, integrated multimodal transportation system along the international midcontinent trade and transportation corridor.''

Where does that sentence say anything about the United States?

Still, this group has received $2.5 million in earmarks from the U.S. Department of Transportation to plan this NAFTA superhighway as a 10-lane, limited-access road, plus passenger and freight rail lines running alongside pipelines originally laid for oil and natural gas.

One glance at the map of the NAFTA superhighway on the front page of NASCO's Website will make clear that the design is to connect Mexico, Canada and the United States into one transportation system. But guess what is going to happen? If you look at what is going on in Mexico, guess where Mexico is getting most of the parts to put into their production? Not from the United States. They are getting them from China. In fact, a lot of production in Mexico has been moved to China.

So imagine this: Huge container ships continuing to come in from China and Asia, hitting up against ports like Lazaro Cardenas in Mexico, where the workforce earns almost nothing, and the major ports in our country of Los Angeles, of Oakland, all along the west coast, I just wish we were shipping goods out. But right now our longshoremen and our dock workers are loading and unloading containers in the United States.

But you can go around the United States. You can bring in that massive set of shipments from Asia through Mexico and up into the United States.

And imagine if this corridor is then leased, leased to foreign interests who then charge tolls and become familiar with the transportation systems of the United States.

This is the heart of America. This can displace every other major transportation system that we have if this is locked in piece by piece, and we have plenty of evidence that that is exactly what is going on already as an underpinning to this agreement that is being called security and prosperity.

My question is, how much democracy will that agreement actually have in it? Will it be prosperity for all, or just for people who are rich enough to own global companies, like Cintra, that will invest anywhere, don't know the people in our communities, frankly don't care, and are willing to move production anywhere?

The people of the United States had better wake up. We'd better ask ourselves why are Americans having to work so hard for less? Why is it more expensive for them to send their children to college, and then those kids graduate with huge debts? Why isn't your pension plan secure? Why are you having to pay so much more for health care? Why is not your retirement benefit there forever?

Because these kinds of interests don't want you to have it because they are so filthy rich off the investments they are making globally. They don't care about you, they don't care about this country, they don't care about where you come from, and, my friends, they don't care about democracy.

EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there is a present and growing interest in our country in the potential for the materials created from stem cells to produce quite miraculous cures. Indeed, we have been working with adult stem cells for more than 30 years, and there are a large number of applications in medicine.

We have been working with embryonic stem cells for far less than that, but because of their primordial nature, the experts in the research field and the medical field believe that there ought to be more potential from embryonic stem cells than there are from adult stem cells.

But the way we now create embryonic stem cell lines presents ethical problems for a large number of American citizens, indeed, I believe, more than half of them, because all embryonic stem cells lines now are produced by destroying embryos. But because of the potentially vast potential for application of embryonic stem cells to medical cures, there is an increasing interest in the possibility of ethically creating embryonic stem cell lines or embryonic cell-like lines of tissues. And that is what we are going to spend a few moments talking about this evening.

I am joined on the floor this evening by Representative OSBORNE, who has a longstanding interest in this subject. And I would like to recognize him now and to commend him for his knowledge and interest in this subject. Congressman OSBORNE.

Mr. OSBORNE. Thank you, Mr. BARTLETT. I appreciate your expertise, your knowledge in this area. And my remarks will be relatively brief because you are the one that truly understands your bill and understands the research much better than I.

But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that nearly all of us have been impacted, either directly or indirectly, by diseases

like juvenile diabetes, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, Lou Gehrig's disease and spinal injuries. And there has been a great clamor over the last 7 years, since embryonic stem cells have been recognized as a possible source of cures for these diseases, that there should be public funding of embryonic stem cell research.

The ethical dilemma, obviously, for those of us who are prolife, who believe in the sanctity of life, is that we would like to see research occur that is helpful, but we don't really want to see human embryos destroyed in the process. And I think that is what brings Mr. BARTLETT and I to the floor together this afternoon, our common interest in some research of this type, but an aversion to the destruction of human embryos. And so I really applaud him for what he has done and for his bill and just make a few comments.

I think the ethical dilemma really revolves around when does life begin. And for some people it is at 9 months. For some it is at birth. For some it is at 3 months, 6 months. But for a great many of us, it is at conception. And if that is your belief, then an embryo constitutes a human life, so what happens to that embryo is of great concern.

And so the research that we are going to talk about this afternoon has to do with allowing research with human embryos that does not harm or destroy the embryo. And therein lies, I think, the interest that I have in this particular process.

There have been a few studies done just recently that I would like to refer to. This came from the National Institute of Neurological Disorders. It is published by the National Institutes of Health. And this is the quote. I believe that this was posted June 21, just a day or two ago. ''For the first time, researchers have enticed transplants of embryonic stem cell-derived motor neurons in the spinal cord to connect with muscles and partially restore function in paralyzed animals. The study suggests that similar techniques may be useful in treating such disorders as spinal cord injury'' in humans. And, of course, this was done primarily with mice. But that is just recently, in the last couple of days, where paralyzed mice have actually had some of their motor functions and some of their paralysis reversed through a process that has not resulted from the destruction of human embryos.

The second study I would like to mention was published on Monday, October 17, 2005, in the Washington Post. It said, ''Two teams of scientists provided the first definitive evidence yesterday that embryonic stem cells can be grown in laboratory dishes without harming healthy embryos, an advance that some scientists and philosophers believe could make the medically promising field more politically and ethically acceptable.''

And I think this was pretty much the genesis of the gentleman's bill and his research. So, rather than taking further time from the expert, I am just going to offer my words of support, my appreciation for his knowledge in this area.

He is, to my understanding, the only geneticist in the House of Representatives, the only one with the adequate scientific understanding to truly bring this forward. And so I applaud you for your research and your stance and for the promise that your bill holds for many of us.

And as many of us know, the President has talked about vetoing any bill that would result in future destruction of human embryos. We believe this is an answer to that concern and a way around that veto.

And so with that, Mr. BARTLETT, I yield to you and thank you for your work.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Thank you. I appreciate you mentioning that recent article on the application of stem cell therapy to these paralyzed mice and the quite miraculous response.

It is kind of ironic and teleologically difficult to explain, to understand why the nerve tissue outside the central nervous system can heal itself. If you cut your hand or your leg, and you lose feeling in your finger or your foot, by and by that feeling will return as the nerves grow. If you cut a nerve in the central nervous system, it doesn't regrow, which is why there are so many paralyzed people from spinal cord injuries and from diseases like multiple sclerosis and so forth.

Stem cell applications provide the hope that we might be able to grow nerve cells and implant them in these patients so that they could recover some activity. And this paper that Congressman OSBORNE referred to in mice gives us hope that that is a real possibility.

Mr. Speaker, I have here in this chart a very abbreviated sequence in the fertilization and the development of the embryo. It begins here with what is called a zygote. A zygote is made up of the two germ cells which have united up here before this one is shown. And then it goes through several developments, through the morula stage and the blastula stage. The blastula is shown here. And finally, the gastrula. And these are sequence. And you will see more of this in the next chart.

But when we get to the gastrula stage, we now have the production of what is called three germ layers. This cell that began up here as a single cell produced by the chromosomes that came from the ovum, the female sex cell, and the sperm, the male sex cell, have now divided again and again and again, and finally these cells begin a process which we call differentiation. They are now differentiating into what will ultimately become all the organ systems of the body.

In this early differentiation, we have what we call the three stem cell lines. We have the ectoderm, which is the external layer; the mesoderm, meaning middle; and we have the endoderm. These we refer to as the three germ layers. And then, of course, we have also the quite unique germ cells themselves. In the female that will, of course, be the ovum from the ovary. In the male it will be the sperm from the testicle.

□ 1630

Now, in each of these three basic germ cell lines, we have a stem cell, which in the ectoderm, it will differentiate into your skin, it will differentiate into your nervous system, the central nervous system, the spinal cord and all the nerves in your body. The mesoderm, the stem cells there will differentiate into the major part of your body. All the muscle, the cardiac muscle, the skeletal muscle, all of the bones, and all of the blood develops from the mesoderm.

The blood is particularly interesting because persisting even in the adult are stem cells for producing blood cells because we keep producing blood cells. They keep breaking down and are removed from the circulation by the liver and the kidney; so we keep producing new ones. So even in the adult, you can see these stem cells, which produce a great variety of blood cells. In the bone marrow, it produces the erythrocytes and the thrombocytes and what we call the polymorphonuclear leukocytes, which are part of the white cells. And then we have the entoderm. There is not much mass of entoderm in our body. That doesn't mean it is not important. The pancreas, the thyroid gland, and the lining of our intestinal system and the lungs and so forth all originate from entoderm.

It is very interesting that these cells retain their original inheritance kind of even in the adult. When you are 50, 60 years old, if you get a cancer and that cancer metastasizes, if it is a cancer on mesodermal tissue, it will metastasize only to other tissues that develop from mesoderm. That is really quite interesting that they have retained that much of their original characteristics, of their original selectivity.

The next chart shows in a little more detail the fertilization process and the development of the embryo. And I am spending a couple of minutes on this, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is important to understand what is being done in the scientific world and what the ethical problems are for those who believe that the embryo is a person in miniature with all of the genetic capabilities to produce a complete human person and therefore it ought not be destroyed.

This is a reproductive tract of the female here, and it shows the vagina and the uterus, and then it shows the two fallopian tubes. And the little square here indicates what is shown in this big chart here. It is just one half of the reproductive system. Here the uterus is split in half. There would be another

mirror image of this on the other side. And it shows here that the ovary, they mature roughly one a month in a female, once every 28 days. And then the ovum erupts from the ovary, and it is almost always, not always but almost always, picked up by a kind of a funnel end of the fallopian tube, which is called the infundibulum.

Once in a while it is not picked up and the ovum will go on out here in the body cavity, and the sperm, which are released, of course, down in the vagina. They go up into the uterus, and then they swim against the current, by the way, because there is some little cilia in here. This ovum has no motility on its own, and it slowly moves down the fallopian tube by cilia in the walls not shown here, which are beating and moving it down, and the sperm swim against that. And some of them will make it out the end of the fallopian tube clear out into body cavity, and if there is an ovum out there, they may fertilize it. And then the fertilized ovum will implant on some adjacent body tissue, and we call this an ectopic pregnancy. Of course, the body is not meant to develop a baby out there; so that needs to be interrupted by surgery or the mother may die.

But as the little diagram here shows, here are the sperm coming up and they fertilize the egg way up into the fallopian tube several days before it will implant down in the uterus. There is quite a miracle that happens here. There are millions of those sperm, and as soon as one of them makes it through the wall of the ovum to fertilize it, there is immediate chemical change in the wall of the ovum and no other sperm can get through because it would be absolutely disastrous if another sperm got through. That would produce when we call polyploidy, and that would result in the death of the embryo. Now, polyploidy reacts very differently in the plant world because that is how we make giant flowers and super fruits and vegetables and so forth.

We simply produce polyploidy, and that makes everything brighter and better and sweeter smelling. But in animals, humans and all other animals, this polyploidy would produce death.

So now the egg is fertilized, and we call it a zygote. So now here is the zygote. It begins its trek down the fallopian tube, and it takes several days. Here we have day 4 and day 5 and day 6 and 7, and you see it is going up around day 7, 8, or 9 before it finally implants in the wall of the uterus. But as it goes down the fallopian tube here, it divides to produce two cells.

Then it divides again to produce four cells and then eight cells, and we will come back to talk about this eight-cell stage because it has a special significance in one of the techniques that may be exploited to produce some ethically generated embryonic stem cell lines, and then it goes on to divide. Again, it goes through the morula stage and then it goes to the blastula stage and then the gastrula stage, and we saw that on the previous chart.

I would like to note that it is about here at the inner-cell mass stage, about at this stage, that the embryo is generally taken, not, of course, from the reproductive tract because all of this can also be done in a petri dish in the laboratory. You simply superovulate the mother and she may produce a dozen or so eggs, and you wash those eggs out, and then you put them in a petri dish and expose them to the sperm, and they fertilize.

And then they begin to develop, and they grow and develop into all of the different stages that we see here. And so in the petri dish when they have developed to the inner-cell mass stage, which, remember, is the stage where we saw that they were going to develop into the three germ lines, this is the stage at which they take the cells. They simply kill the embryo, and they take the cells from the embryo to produce an embryonic stem cell line.

Several years ago the President issued an executive order that said that we could not use Federal money if we were getting our stem cell lines from destroying these embryos but we could use Federal money in continuing with research on stem cell lines that were then in existence. The President said, and some may have indicated that that was the case, that there were probably 60 or so stem cell lines in existence then. If there were, they have now dwindled to about 20, more or less, stem cell lines, all of which are contaminated with mouse feeder cells.

I might spend just a moment to indicate what these feeder cells are. When we take these cells out of the inner-cell mass, these cells really do not like being alone or even nearly alone. They like company. And so they frequently put them in the company of other cells so that they can reproduce because, if separated, it is more difficult to get them to reproduce. So taking them from the fellowship they find in the embryo and putting them in a petri dish to tissue culture them, many of them will refuse to divide. But if you put them in the company of other cells, in this case the mouse feeder cells, then they divide. Well, this has now contaminated these present stem cell lines so that none of them can be used for therapy. It does not disqualify them for research; so some meaningful research is still going on.

There are four different potential approaches to producing embryonic stem cells without harming embryos or embryonic stem cell-like cells that could produce tissue cultures. And we have a bill, H.R. 5526. This is a companion bill to the Santorum-Specter bill in the Senate. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the politics of this is that we have a bill that has been in the Senate for quite a while known as the Castle bill, Mike Castle from Delaware.

What this bill does is to permit the use of Federal money to take some of those surplus embryos which are in our reproduction clinics. When a mother goes in to have in vitro fertilization, as I indicated, they will superovulate the mother with hormones. They get a number of eggs, they will fertilize them in a petri dish, and then they get a dozen, more or less, embryos. They then look at these embryos under a microscope, and they choose the best two or three and implant them in the mother's uterus because they do not all take. My daughter-in-law has just gone through a procedure, and at first, we thought that she had twins, and now it is just a single baby, for which we are very thankful.

The fertilized eggs which are left which have now become embryos are frequently refrozen. The parents pay to refreeze them to keep them, because something may happen to this baby and maybe they will want a second child or a third child, and they will stay frozen for quite a while; so they put them in the freezer. But by and by, they will decide that they do not want more children; so they will no longer pay for keeping the eggs frozen in which case, the fertilized eggs, they are simply discarded. And what the Castle bill says is that parents donate these embryos that are going to discarded anyhow to medical research and to the development of stem cell lines that, hopefully, will provide miraculous cures of many diseases that Congressman OSBORNE mentioned, for which we now hold out high hopes.

The problem that pro-life people have with this is if you are looking generically at 400,000 surplus embryos, and that is about what is out there, about 400,000, you may make the argument that if they are going to be discarded anyhow, why not get some medical good from them? But there are two problems that pro-life people have ethically with this. One is that before you decide to destroy the embryo, you are going to look at it under the microscope to make sure it is healthy because you are going to want to get cells from a healthy embryo.

So it is not 400,000 embryos that you are concerned with now. It is one embryo under the microscope. And when you are looking at that embryo under the microscope, it could be the next Albert Einstein, it could be the next Beethoven. And, again, we are not dealing with the 400,000 out there. We are dealing with the one under the microscope. That is the one for which we have responsibility, and how could you kill the next Einstein or Beethoven?

And another concern that the pro-life community has is that if we permit the destruction of these surplus embryos, who knows, but what we may be producing more surplus embryos so we will have more embryos to use for establishing stem cell lines? So there is a real need, Mr. Speaker, to develop techniques to ethically get embryonic stem cell lines or embryonic stem cell-like lines that will have the potential of embryonic stem cells.

Just a moment to talk about how embryonic stem cells are different

from adult stem cells. Adult stem cells have already gone through a lot of differentiation. They are either of ectodermal, mesodermal, or entodermal origin. They are already destined to become nerve tissue or muscle or blood or the lining of the gut or something like that. And it is true that we can sometimes kind of reverse that differentiation, and we will talk about that in a few moments. And it is also true that even without doing that, you can make some applications to the development of tissues for that specific part of the body. But because of their primordial nature, because of their ability, we call it pluripotency. They can produce any tissue in the body. Totipotency means that they cannot only produce every tissue in the body, but they can produce every tissue that the embryo needs so that it can develop into a full baby. See, the embryo is not just an embryo because about half of the tissues of the early embryo end up with what we call trophoblast or the amnion and corion which attaches the baby to the mother's wall, protects the baby in an enclosed, warm fluid environment while it develops during its 9 months.

□ 1645

These ethical concerns have resulted in a lot of study by a lot of people to see if there is a way of doing it, where we can get the potential from these embryonic stem cell lines, which any one line can produce any and every tissue in the body theoretically.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, we are not there yet, because these embryonic stem cells, much like an energetic teenager, just want to divide. They want to do things. They want to grow.

There are some who feel that their tendency to just grow and divide is going to be very hard to control and you are going to end up producing tumors and cancers and that sort of thing when you put them in the body. But there are a lot of knowledgeable, professional people out there who believe that we can control that, that there is incredible potential from these embryonic stem cell lines, so we are trying to get embryonic stem cell lines or embryonic-like stem cell lines that avoid these ethical confrontations.

The next chart shows us three of the four that were looked at by a special commission that the President set up on bioethics. Several years ago they looked at the various possibilities out there and they looked at the pros and cons, and they have a little white paper on this subject which is worth the hour or so that it takes to read it because it goes through all of these techniques and it looks at the pros and the cons of these techniques.

First, we have here kind of a recapitulation of some things that we have been talking about. This shows the development of the gammies. They go through a process of division, and they divide again and again. Most of those divisions are what we call mitotic divisions, where the chromosomes split and the daughter cells have as many chromosomes as the original cell.

But once in that process there is a division which we call a meiotic division, called meiosis, and in that division the chromosomes split and half of them go to one cell and half to another cell, and that produces a gamete or a sex cell which has only half the requisite number of chromosomes, which we call the haploid number of chromosomes.

Of course, the design now is that these two cells will come together in a process which we call fertilization, when the sperm will fertilize the egg, and then we have the single cell embryo, and then it divides and here we have the 3-day and the 5- to 7-day embryo, which we saw in more detail in previous charts.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot these days about cloning. Dolly the Sheep was the first cloned mammal, and this little sequence here shows how they do cloning.

What they do in cloning is to take an egg cell, and this egg cell has a big cytoplasm, this is what is outside the nucleus, and it has the nucleus. The nucleus contains a lot of genetic material. It contains most of the genetic material that determines whether you are going to be a person or a frog, or whether you are going to be a male or a female.

But out in the cytoplasm are other proteins, protein-like substances, that have a lot of genetic capability too. What they do is pretty much control what goes on in the nucleus. So we have these RNA, ribonucleic acid out there, and these factors now control what goes on in the nucleus.

So if you take an egg and you take the nucleus out of the egg and then you take a donor cell, this is a somatic, which means body, take a cell from the body, and you now combine, you fuse these two cells, you take the cytoplasm from the egg nucleus from the donor cell, and you now have the nucleus from the donor cell in the environment of a cytoplasm from the egg and the factors in that cytoplasm now which control what happens inside the nucleus, with—everything is not detailed here. We kind of shocked this a little bit so the nucleus from the donor cell forgets it is the nucleus from a donor cell, so it now can be controlled by these control factors out in the cytoplasm.

This is now called cloning. So now we have an organism produced that looks nothing like the egg from which you took the nucleus. It now looks like the adult from which you took the somatic cell. So this is what cloning is.

By the way, we will have a chart a little later which shows this. Nature has been cloning for a very long time in a way, because every time we have a set of identical twins, one of them is a clone. I guess you could choose which one of the two you wanted to say was the clone. We will have a chart on that in a few minutes.

The next chart here shows three of the four techniques that are outlined in this report put out by the President's Bioethics Council.

Altered nuclear transfer. I showed the cloning one, because this is very much like cloning. As a matter of fact, the techniques you go through are the same laboratory techniques you go through with cloning.

But what you do here is to knock out a gene for normal development, and you do that before you put the nucleus in the sex cell from which you have removed the nucleus. So you now have deactivated a gene which is necessary for the complete development of the embryo. That gene happens to control the development of what we call decidua, which is the amnion and the chorian.

This cannot develop into a baby because it can't produce an amnion and a chorian, and so it is just a growth of tissues, all the kinds of tissues that are in a baby but not a baby, because you deactivated the gene necessary for the normal development.

What you do later, then, is turn that gene back on. It can never begin a baby. You turn that gene back on so the cells are normal cells, and then you can take cells from that to establish an embryonic stem cell line.

One can imagine, Mr. Speaker, the ethical objections which may be raised to this. But this is simply kind of a crippled child that you have produced here. We don't kill crippled children after they are out of the womb. Why should we kill crippled children produced in the laboratory?

Mr. Speaker, there is almost no technique against which some ethical objection could not be levied. In life, we are always making choices. When you look at the potential good from embryonic stem cell research, there is a level of risk that one is willing to take.

Every time I get in my car and drive down here to the Hill there is a risk involved. Not everybody who drives from Frederick down here makes it down. Every once in awhile there is a fatal accident on the way down here. But the value of what I am doing here I believe exceeds the risk that is involved in coming here, and so I come. It is that way with this nuclear transfer.

The second one of these is embryo biopsy, and I will come back to that in a little more detail later, because this is one I have been personally involved with for a number of years now. I spoke to the President about this before he came out with his executive order and have been working with people at NIH. So I will reserve more discussion of this until we come to a couple of charts a little later.

But let me just indicate that what one does here is to envision removing cells from an embryo without harming the embryo and then using the cell which you have removed to produce a tissue culture of embryonic stem cells. Then if you implant the cells remaining in a mother, they go on to produce

what appears to be a perfectly normal baby.

When I first suggested this several years ago, I did not know in the meantime there were going to be laboratories which were doing precisely this. It started in England, and now there are more than 2,000 babies born worldwide where a cell is taken, generally from the eight cell stage. Generally they get two cells, and they have taken that cell to do a pre-implantation genetic diagnosis.

This is to make sure the baby is not going to be mongoloid or have a genetic defect. If they find no defect from that single cell they have taken out, they implant the remaining cells in the mother, and more than 2,000 times now we have a perfectly normal baby, what appears to be a perfectly normal baby born.

Mr. Speaker, I would be surprised if there was any effect. In a former life, I was privileged to get a doctorate in human physiology. I taught in medical school. I had a course in advanced embryology, and I knew that whenever we had identical twins, that half of the cells were taken away from the original embryo and each half became a perfectly normal baby.

So I argued and asked the researchers at NIH 4 or 5 years ago, was this a rational argument? I argued that if you could take half the cells away from the embryo and each half produced a perfectly normal baby, certainly you could take one or two cells away from the embryo and the embryo wouldn't even know it.

Now we have the potential for something which really is quite exciting, which we will come to a slide a little later and discuss that in more detail.

The last one here of these three, this altered nuclear transfer here and the embryo biopsy and cells from dead embryos, I have several slides in a few moments that we will go over cells from a dead embryo.

Many of these embryos are just not going to make it, which is why the clinician looks at them under the microscope before he implants them in the mother. They now have done a lot of observation and research to determine how early you can identify an embryo which is in effect dead. But like the person who is dead, you can still take organs from the person that are perfectly good for implanting in another person, and we do that all the time.

So it occurred to the researchers in this area that maybe when the embryo was dead, and by that we mean it did not have the ability to further divide, it was not going to become a baby and you could clearly identify that state, that maybe the cells in the embryo, at least some of them, were still quite normal and quite viable. So this whole procedure now presumes that we can identify dead embryos that are not going to make it, but they still have life, good cells in them.

So this procedure would be very analogous to taking organs from that young fellow who rides the motorcycle, my wife calls them ''donorcycles,'' and he has an accident and he is brain dead, but his tissues are still quite good, so they take the tissues from this dead person and implant them. We do that all the time. So there was a thought, and research, observations, seem to verify that indeed there is the possibility of doing that.

The next chart shows us a fourth technique, which is a very exciting one. If, in fact, we can do this, this holds enormous potential, because now we can avoid all of the rejection phenomena.

You see, if you develop a tissue from a embryonic stem cell line or an adult stem cell line and you now put that tissue in a person, it is foreign to them and it will be rejected. So we have a lot of medicines we give which makes them very susceptible to infections and so forth. We have medicines we give them now so they won't reject this tissue.

But in this reprogramming, you now could potentially take a cell from the patient and you could reprogram that cell. What they are doing here to reprogram is exploiting these very fascinating and powerful control factors which are out in the cytoplasm.

Here we have an embryonic cell and it has a cytoplasm, and you can crush the cell and you can now put the nucleus of the donor cell in, or infuse it with this stuff from the embryonic stem cell, and it will now control the nucleus and de-differentiate it and take it back to its primordial state so it now behaves as if it were a embryonic stem cell.

□ 1700

The only possible ethical criticism of this is that where do you get these sex cells to begin with? Well, if you get them by superovulation of the mother, there is some medical risk in superovulation. There is also the possibility, though, that we could dedifferentiate by subjecting them to some sort of a chemical, which would have the same effect on them as these control factors in the cytoplasm here; it is referred to as cell soup, and there are these little polypeptides in there that, like polypeptides that are in a ribonucleic acid which can control what happens in the nucleus. But you may also be able to affect what they do by subjecting them to some sort of a chemical which would kind of reprogram them.

And then the last thing here at the bottom simply looks at stem cells from mature organs. And the one that I mentioned, which is one frequently used, is from the bone marrow, because even in the adult, even today I still have stem cells in my bone marrow because my bone marrow is always making white blood cells and red blood cells and thrombocytes. They are the little cells that are responsible for the clotting of your blood.

Next, I have a chart, and I think there are several of these that look in more detail at Dr. Landry. And Dr. Landry is the one who first made the suggestion. He has proceeded with some vigor to explore the potential here for getting cells, good cells, from a clinically dead embryo. And, of course, the first thing you had to do was to develop a criteria for embryonic death. You need a dead embryo that still has good cells. And, again, let me use the analogy of the dead person from the auto accident who still has good organs. So this is a dead embryo who still has good cells. And it says here that we need a diagnostic test for embryonic death, because if one researcher is going to use cells from an embryo that he says was dead, there has to be some verifiable basis for declaring that the embryo was dead so other people would understand. So obviously it would be dead if he kills it, but it needs to be dead before he takes the cells from it.

Death is a question of medical fact, not law. We can't write a law that says what death is. And, indeed, clinical death now is not defined by law, it is defined by medical fact.

And these embryo do die, and they watch them. They are not dividing. They watch them for several days. They do not divide, and ultimately they just deteriorate, and they are gone. So the argument is that if you can identify when, in fact, they will never go on to develop an embryo, that at that point they are dead as far as any ability to produce a baby is concerned, and if you now do not wait for the several extra days to which deterioration would occur, the point of death, like the point of death from an auto accident where you can get good organs, at the point of death of the embryo, and when it will no longer develop into a baby, you now can take cells from which you can just have the stem cell lines.

The next chart shows a little more detail of this, and what it shows is that embryo 2 is dead. It shows that you can look at the embryo, and they look different, and it can be documented that, in fact, the embryos that are not going to go on to divide at a certain stage in their development look different. You can identify, you can say of a certainty this embryo will go on to divide, this embryo will not go on to divide. And so you can now make that determination. And when we have developed the techniques for this, and when we have determined that, in fact, we can develop stem cell lines from these, then we will have potentially a technique for getting embryonic stem cells without the destruction of an embryo because the embryo is already dead.

The next chart just is more detail of this. We can look at that quickly.

New criteria for embryonic death and natural history study of arrested embryos. They are arrested; that is, that the development stops at a certain stage. It won't continue beyond that. They observed 444 nonviable in vitro fertilized embryos; 142 were arrested at

the stage of an immature morula, about day 5, and we saw it in one of the previous charts. And they determined that these embryos were not going to divide because they just kept looking at them, and they ultimately deteriorated.

So if they, in fact, have good cells, and they have taken cells from these embryos, and then cells, in fact, are viable, and they can be cultured, and so with more research on this, this is a possibility for getting embryonic stem cell lines.

The next chart shows what happens in twinning. And it was this knowledge about I guess it was 5 years ago now when before the President gave his Executive Order, there was an open house at NIH, and staff and members were invited out to talk with the researchers at NIH about the potential for embryonic stem cell research. And there were a lot of staff members there; I think I was the only Member there. And I remember thinking as we were talking about embryonic stem cell research that this is what happened. And it doesn't always happen at this stage, by the way, but this shows the development of twins splitting at the inner cell mass stage. The inner cell mass splits; now the embryo splits in half, and now you have two babies. This also could occur at the two-cell stage. It splits in half at the two-cell stage. And you know roughly when it split by how the babies present. In this case, the babies present in two separate amnions. If it is split here at the two-cell stage, they present in a single amnion.

But what this told me was that obviously you could take cells from an embryo and not hurt the embryo, because in this case half the cells are taken from the embryo. This half went on to produce a baby, and this half went on to produce a baby. So if you could take half the cells from the embryo, and each half produced a normal baby, then why couldn't you take a cell or two from the embryo without hurting the embryo? And I asked the researchers at NIH shouldn't that be a possibility? And they told me, yes, that should be a possibility.

And I was in an event with the President and mentioned this conversation to him, and a couple of days later Karl Rove called and said that he had followed up on this at the President's request, and they couldn't do that. I said, ''Karl, either they didn't understand your question, or they are funning you, because these are the same people that can go inside of a cell and take out the nucleus and put another nucleus in the cell. And they are telling you they can't take a cell or two out of these big embryos? Of course they can.'' And a female sex cell is big. That ovum is a giant cell compared to the somatic cells that they are taking a nucleus out of.

So he said, ''I will go ask them again.'' And so he went back and asked them again. He came back and said, ''ROSCOE, they tell me they can't do that.'' So the President came down with his Executive Order which says that the only stem cell lines we can use Federal money to do research on are those that are now already in existence.

It was a couple of years after that when NIH researchers were sitting in my office that I learned what had happened. Mr. Speaker, this is illustrative of what happens so many times in our society. When we think we are carrying on a dialogue, we are really carrying on simultaneous monologues, and there was just a misunderstanding.

What they told him was that they weren't sure that they could develop a stem cell line from a single cell taken from an early embryo. And that was true. He interpreted it as saying that they couldn't take the cell from the early embryo. Well, what we wanted to do with our research was animal experimentation, which would determine whether or not you could develop a stem cell line from a single embryo. And, as luck would have it, Mr. Speaker, the medical community has kind of almost passed us by now, because in the 5 years since I first started exploring this with NIH and then the White House and then a number of meetings with NIH since then, as I mentioned, in England they have developed techniques for taking a cell from an early embryo, the H cell stage, in the laboratory, doing a preimplantation genetic diagnosis, making sure there was no genetic defect, and then implanting the remaining cells, the embryo, in the mother, and more than 2,000 times worldwide now we have what appears to be a perfectly normal baby born.

I keep saying what appears to be because we haven't watched these babies for 60, 80, 90 years, however long they will live, to make sure there is no defect. But I would be enormously surprised, and so would the professional community, enormously surprised, if there are any defects. Because if there were, then every twin ought to have a big defect because they represent only half the cells from the original embryo.

In our conversations with a number of people, we were talking with Richard Doerflinger, who represents the Council of Catholic Bishops. And I really want to credit him with making an incredible contribution to this dialogue, because what he said was, ''ROSCOE, what you do with that first cell you take is not a preimplantation genetic diagnosis. What you do with that cell is to establish a repair kit.'' So that now any time during the life of this baby, 1 year, 10 years, 50 years, 80 years old, when they have a medical problem that could benefit from the development of tissues from embryonic stem cell line, it can be developed from their embryonic stem cell line because you have got this repair kit available for them.

What this did, Mr. Speaker, is to open up the possibility when we are using Federal funds of avoiding, I think, any ethical concern, because the parents will have already made two decisions: one, to do in vitro fertilization; and, secondly, to take a cell to establish a repair kit and maybe to do a preimplantation genetic diagnosis if they want to take a second cell. And frequently they get two cells rather than one from this early embryo, and it doesn't matter if you take one or two, the other cells go on to produce a perfectly normal baby.

So if this is a potential for the future, the stem cell lines could be achieved by simply asking the parents to donate a few cells from their repair kit. So now the decisions made to get to the repair kit have been decisions that parents make in what they think is the best interest of their child. They want to have one, they can't have one naturally, so they do in vitro fertilization, and they want to make sure that the child has the protection of a repair kit.

And, by the way, we kind of do that now when we freeze cord blood. Cord blood has nowhere near the potential of a cell taken from this early embryo, but it is that person, and for whatever you can get from it, at least there are going to be no rejection phenomena.

The next chart shows a bit of one of the pages of the white paper on the President's Council on Bioethics, and I have highlighted here. It may be some time before stem cell lines can be reliably derived from single cells. Again, this was written now in about late 2001 or 2002, but since that time we have had two researchers, Verlinsky and Landry, both of whom claim that they have developed a stem cell line from a single cell. That was what NIH thought might be difficult to do, but there are now two researchers who say they have done that.

They say it may be some time that stem cell lines can be reliably derived from single cells, extracted from early embryos, and in ways that do no harm to the embryo. Well, they have more than 2,000 babies born by extracting these cells. But, again, if we simply use surplus cells from a repair kit, we have avoided, I think, any meaningful ethical objection.

But the initial success of the Verlinsky group's efforts, I mentioned Verlinsky and now Landry more recently, and note here an asterisk. And they say, ''A similar idea was proposed by Representative ROSCOE BARTLETT as far back as 2001.'' And you can see it has been for 5 years since I have been pursuing this possibility.

The next chart and our last chart kind of is a summary, Mr. Speaker, of what we have been talking about. And what this does is to look at the classical development when you go to the eight-cell stage, and then it develops into a blastula, and you can now either implant that in the uterus, or you can kill it to get stem cell lines.

□ 1715

You can now either implant that in the uterus or you can kill it to get

stem cell lines. Ethically, that is not something that I am comfortable with. It is not something I think a majority of our people are comfortable with, or you can go through what we have just gone through, take a single cell from this blastom here and implant the remaining cells, let them develop, implant them and then develop a stem cell line from this single cell, then the altered nuclear transfer that we talked about.

This kind of summarizes the potential from those two techniques, and again, what we have done to make this ethical is altered nuclear transfer. We have shut off one of the genes in the cytoplasm so that the nucleus now cannot be induced to make all of the tissue necessary to produce a baby. It produces all of the tissues necessary for baby, but not the tissue necessary for growth of the baby in the womb, the amnion and the chorion.

The important thing, Mr. Speaker, is, and I want to be politically correct for just a moment here. It is not just that we want to do things that are politically popular. We certainly do not want to do things that are politically unpopular because we all like to get reelected and return here, but we want to do things which have medical meaning.

The Senate, I believe, very shortly is going to vote on the Castle bill. The President has said that he will veto that. Many people, and they come to our offices, these children with diabetes and so forth, people who have relatives who have Parkinson's disease or any one of the wasting diseases of the nervous system that might be treated with this, and they are incensed we are not doing something about this and using their money to develop what they think is enormous potential from these stem cell lines.

The President will veto because he is devoutly pro-life for which I respect him. He will veto the Castle bill. We need to have on the President's desk not just for political purposes, although I think that is important, but because of the enormous potential from embryonic stem cell lifelines, we need to have a bill on his desk that will permit the use, the ethical use, of Federal funds to produce these stem cell lines from which we might get enormous good.

The miracles of medicine have increased lifelines. I just passed my 80th birthday. I am wondering when I am going to enter mid-life. My grandfather would have never thought of entering mid-life after his 80th year, but we have really miracles of medicine today, and this provides miracles greater than we have seen.

Now we have enormous potential here, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, we have the political courage to do the right thing for the American people and get this bill, along with the Castle bill on the President's desk so that the President has a bill which promises the miracles, potential miracles of embryonic stem cell research ethically.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MANNY CORTEZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the late Manny Cortez.

I am profoundly heartbroken by the untimely loss of my dear friend who passed away last Sunday. I adored Manny Cortez and will be forever grateful for his help, his support, his love and his friendship. He was a wonderful human being and a true gentleman.

Manny was more than just family man and a dedicated public servant. He was a visionary who helped shape southern Nevada as we know it today and who worked tirelessly to turn Las Vegas into the world's most famous travel destination.

Manny earned worldwide respect as a leader for Nevada's tourism and hospitality industry. Under his leadership, the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority became the gold standard against which all others in the business are judged. His lasting legacy will shape southern Nevada as it continues to grow in the 21st century.

Whether as a public servant or as a private citizen, Manny was dedicated to making southern Nevada a better place to raise a family, run a business, or just to visit. Las Vegas would not be the city it is today without the hard work, vision and dedication of Manny Cortez.

My deepest sympathies go out today to the Cortez family. I know I speak for countless others when I say our community has lost not only a remarkable man, but a true leader who left his unique mark on southern Nevada and its top industry.

I am truly blessed to have been able to call Manny Cortez my friend.

More than any of his truly remarkable accomplishments that Manny could claim over the course of his political and professional career, I know that his family meant more to him than all the accolades or money in the world.

Come this November, I know he will be smiling, knowing that the same call to serve and the same desire to give back to the community that motivated him to seek and serve on the Clark County Commission was at the very heart of his daughter's campaign, Catherine's campaign for Attorney General of Nevada.

Manny Cortez was born on April 29, 1939, in Las Cruces, New Mexico, the oldest of two children of Edward Cortez, a baker, and the former Mary Tapia.

The Cortez family moved to Las Vegas in 1944. As a youngster, Manny attended St. Joseph's grade school and graduated from Las Vegas High.

Manny Cortez attended Nevada Southern University, which later became my alma mater, UNLV, and received an honorary degree from Community College of Southern Nevada.

Elected in 1976 to the Clark County Commission, he served four remarkable terms. During his tenure, he served as chairman of that body, as well as chairman of the Clark County Sanitation District and the Clark County Liquor and Gaming License board.

Manny was also on the governing boards of the University Medical Center, Las Vegas Valley Water District and on the Fiscal Affairs Board of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.

Prior to his election as a county commissioner, Manny served as administrator of the State of Nevada Taxicab Authority. His background included employment with the Clark County District Attorney's office and the Clark County public defender's office.

Manny began his service on the Las Vegas convention and Visitors Authority board of directors in 1983 and would go on to lead that agency at a time of the most rapid growth for southern Nevada, the Las Vegas strip and for our tourism industry.

By 1991, Manny had earned the title of president of the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority, the largest convention and visitors organization in the United States. That year, southern Nevada welcomed more than 21 million visitors. By the time of his retirement, that number had grown to 37 million visitors annually.

Travel Agent Magazine named Manny the United States Person of the Year for 1999, calling him ''one of the most astute marketers in the tourism industry.''

During his tenure as president of the convention authority, the organization came to be regarded as the travel industry's leading destination marketing organization.

Manny was a participant in the White House Conference on Travel and Tourism, and in 2003, the United States Department of Commerce appointed him to the then-newly created U.S. Travel and Tourism Promotion Advisory Board. His role on the board included representing Las Vegas and the United States travel and tourism industry.

Manny, and perhaps this is the most important thing, he is survived by a wife, Joanna, who was his beloved helpmate and friend for 45 years; daughter Cynthia Cortez Musgrove; and Catherine Cortez Masto; a sister, Patricia Snider; and two grandchildren, Andrew and Christina, all of Las Vegas.

There will never be a another Manny Cortez, but every time I return home to Las Vegas, his legacy will be on display for the entire world to see and admire.

On a very, very personal note, there is not anybody that was more important to the travel and tourism industry in Las Vegas Nevada than Manny Cortez. He was a dear friend and a mentor to many, many of us who are now serving in public office and have made a

contribution to Las Vegas. His untimely death was a surprise to all of us. We will mourn him, we miss him and we love him.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to come before the House once again and the 30-Something Working Group, as you know and the Members know, we come to the floor day after day to share with the Members what we are doing right and what we are doing wrong.

So many times we focus on this side of the aisle on the plans that we have here on the Democratic side of the aisle in helping Americans to continue to prosper, need it be they are in small business or they wake up and go to work every day, educating our children, making sure that we have a healthy and prosperous and safe America.

Before I get started, I know Mr. RYAN will be joining me momentarily, Mr. Speaker. I just want to share with the Members a few plans that we have on this side of the aisle that we would like to implement. The only thing that is stopping us from bringing these plans to the floor and implementing action, well, we are moving in the right direction with great force, is the fact that we are not the majority here, Mr. Speaker, to be able to bring these issues to the floor.

As you know, in the past, I have talked about energy. I encourage Members to go to housedemocrats.gov to pick up a copy of our energy agenda, talking about alternative fuel, talking about bringing about flex vehicles in the industry to be able to allow more Americans to purchase vehicles that are flex vehicles that they can use E–85 and gasoline.

Real security plan, it is there dealing with homeland security. We have already said on this side of the aisle if we are in the majority that we would implement all of the 9/11 recommendations to make America safer. This is a bipartisan commission, as the Members know, that was appointed, and this House was part of it, and they did outstanding work. Those recommendations have still not been fully implemented to protect America.

We have our initiative that we have been trying to promote for the last 3 to 4 months in a very forceful way, which is allowing working Americans to be able to earn more money. It has been 9 years, Mr. Speaker, since the American people have received an increase as it relates to the minimum wage. It is very, very unfortunate that we have Americans that are working for $5.15 an hour. The minimum wage has been the same since 1997, which is now approaching 10 years.

As you know, many Americans have suffered under the low minimum wage that we have now, that is throughout for individuals that are working every day, and I have a few facts here.

Of the last 50-years, I mean, this is the lowest it has been in the last 50 years. Also, 6.6 million Americans will benefit from an increase in the minimum wage, and something that I must add, the Republican leadership has said that they vow not to raise the minimum wage again this year or next year. So I think that is something that the American people need to pay very close attention to.

Three-quarters of the minimum wage workers are adults that are over the age of 20, many of whom are responsible for over half of the family's income. One day of work, it takes an entire day's wage for an earner to buy a tank of gas.

Also, studies have shown, Mr. Speaker, that zero jobs have been lost when the minimum wage has been increased.

Eighty-six percent of Americans do support an increase in the minimum wage. Twenty-one States have moved in the direction of increasing the minimum wage. I do not know what is going on here with the Republican majority in not moving in that direction to allow more American people to have money in their pocket to be able to provide for their families.

We have talked many times on this floor in the 30-Something Working Group about the new weight that has been placed on the heads of the American people as they start to send their young people to college.

□ 1730

Just yesterday we had a town hall meeting downstairs in this building, in HC5 here in the Capitol Building, with some young people who are third-party validators with the student loans they have out now, Mr. Speaker. And this is very serious, because now people are starting to prepare their young people to go off to college in the month of August and late July, many of whom are now having to take out these student loans at a very high interest rate. They are going to end up paying almost $100 more a month in interest to pay for their college, and I think that is something we need to pay very close attention to.

It is very unfortunate that on the majority side, Mr. Speaker, on the Republican side, all due respect to all the innovation that one tries to come up with on the other side of the aisle, it is costing the American people more, and it is putting our young people in debt in this country even before they can grab their college degree and earn a living. They are already, on average, somewhere around $25,000 or $30,000 in debt when they step across the stage. That is very, very unfortunate.

We cut student aid here. We increase student loan rates here. The States in turn have to cut, and the cost of college is increased. It increases on these individuals. It is an increase on these individuals.

I think it is also important, Mr. Speaker, for us to talk about the fact that we have the will and the desire on this side of the aisle to move America in the right direction. I talked about this last week, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is very, very important to bring this up here again today; that we are willing to move this country in the right direction, in a new direction, making sure that Americans have more opportunities.

I think it is important for us to point out the fact that on this side of the aisle we have committed again to raising the minimum wage. We have committed to helping this country become energy independent, investing in the Midwest versus the Middle East within 10 years. We have also committed on this side of the aisle, I mentioned it earlier, to implementing all of the 9/11 recommendations.

But one of our major commitments on this side, Mr. Speaker, and also to the American people, is that we have said that we are willing to bring this budget back into balance within a reasonable time; not that we are going to cut the deficit in half, or we are going to balance the budget, but we are going to be able to bring us out of this deficit spending that the Republican majority has led us into with record deficits as far as the eye can see.

We have the resume. On our resume we have the accomplishment of being able to do that. We have accomplished that before in the past, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is something that one needs to pay very close attention to.

When we say a commitment to making sure our fiscal house is in order, it is not a slogan. It is not something that someone says, well, the polls say you need to say you are going to bring spending under control. We have actually attempted to do that.

You have seen this chart before. We can't talk about it enough, because the facts are in. Regardless of the floor speeches that may go on on the Republican side of the aisle, I think it is important for us to outline the fact that we have put our legislation where our mouths are.

We have said that we want to see this House say that if you are going to spend, then spend in a way that almost every American family has to spend. If you are going to buy something, you have to know how you are going to pay for it. You can't put everything on a credit card. And what is unfortunate is that we have allowed other countries to be a part of our country financially not because the American people have made a bad decision, but it is because the majority and the White House have made some bad decisions.

Here I have, Mr. Speaker, a PAYGO rule that on this side we have adopted; that we are willing to pay as we go. If you are going to buy it, you have to show how you are going to pay for it. It is not that you spend or you buy and

then you borrow. JOHN SPRATT, who is the ranking member on the Budget Committee, on the 2006 budget resolution, and this is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, this is not something the 30-something Working Group put together, this is rollcall vote 87, March 17 of 2005. Republicans voted 228 against this pay-as-you-go amendment that we put forward.

Again, Mr. SPRATT and the ranking member's substitute amendment to House Concurrent Resolution 393, this is also rollcall vote number 91, March 25, 2004, 224 Republicans voting against pay-as-you-go on a rule we tried to put in place.

When I say try, Mr. Speaker, that is all we can do at this particular point because until Democrats are in the majority, we are not going to be able to put this country into the fiscal position it should be in.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, and I do say once again, I pull my chart out. This is almost my exhibit A here. Third-party validator. And the source that has given us this information happens to be the U.S. Department of the Treasury. Here we show that 42 Presidents over 224 years were only able to borrow from foreign nations, and this is money that the United States has borrowed from foreign nations in 224 years and 42 Presidents, $1.01 trillion. Through World War I, World War II, the Great Depression, a number of other conflicts, slowdowns in the economy, and other issues that have faced this country, 42 Presidents have only borrowed $1.01 trillion.

In 4 years, 4 years with President Bush, $1.05 trillion with the Republican Congress. Just in 4 years, Mr. Speaker. If someone came to me and said, KENDRICK, you have to throw all the charts out but one, if you just wanted one chart, this would be the one that I would pick, Mr. Speaker, because I think it reveals what has happened here in this House, how it has been so easy for the Republican majority to put runaway spending on a credit card and allowed foreign countries to be able to own a part of the American apple pie.

What is so very, very unfortunate here, as all of this borrowing has taken place, you would think that student loans would have a lower interest rate, you would think that alternative fuels would have an opportunity to be a part of the marketplace, and that we would be moving towards more cleaner-burning fuel. You would think that we would have a world-class health care system, and that companies as big as General Motors and as small as a mom-and-pop store that has five or six employees in it would be able to provide health care for their employees, and you would also think, Mr. Speaker, that a number of States would not be suing the Federal Government because of the underfunding of the Leave No Child Behind with all of the money that has been borrowed from foreign nations.

But what has happened is that the superwealthy in this country have gotten the biggest tax cut in the history of the Republic. What has also happened is that Republicans have been allowed to spend in record-breaking, I mean, just off the charts. For Republicans to come down here and blame Democrats for spending—I mean, really, I know it is kind of hard for them to keep eye contact with someone like me and those of us in the 30-something Group who knows better, who know what the facts show, that $1.05 trillion has been borrowed from foreign countries. They are weakening our country as they start to move and allow these other countries to be able to own so much of the American apple pie.

And I will close with this before I yield to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who came in before Mr. RYAN. I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, for us to look at it from this standpoint; that if you borrow money from someone, the relationship has changed. I heard someone from the White House say this morning on the Today Show we are the last standing superpower. Okay, well, you must be talking about militarily, because financially we are getting weaker every day under this administration's policy and the rubber-stamping of this Republican Congress.

I think it is important that everyone understands that we have borrowed money from countries that we have never borrowed money from before in a record-breaking way. The Republican majority has done so without our help, but because they are in the majority, that has happened, and now they are looking at us under a different light.

We still have budgets that are being passed here on this floor that is going to even make the American people more indebted to foreign nations, some that we have questions of their links to possible terrorism and other questionable measures.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My good friend Mr. MEEK really illustrates the point that we have been trying to drive home for all the time that I have been here now, and for several years before my arrival with the beginnings of the 30-something Working Group, and that is that with the illustration that you just had up there, that literally we have racked up as much debt under this President than all the Presidents combined, all 42 before this President.

That really is illustrative of the point we have been making; that America is truly going in the wrong direction, and that in order to right the ship, to start us on the path that Americans want us to be going down, we need to make sure that we elect Democrats in the fall that will no longer support the rubber-stamping that goes on in this institution on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. MEEK, I think what we try to do during our 30-something hour is show people what some of these more macroconcepts mean in terms of their daily lives. The economy, which the Republicans talk about so often, and actually, I guess, what it is, Mr. RYAN, is that they think that if they say it enough times, it will become true.

I have heard so many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, oh, the economy is great, the President said it, it is gangbusters, we are in the best shape we could possibly be in. Well, how is that possible if you have health care, gas, housing, and college costs that are all skyrocketing through the roof? I mean, the median family income has dropped every year of the Bush administration. The typical family is paying $1,200 more a year for health insurance, college tuition has gone up about 40 percent in real terms, gas prices have doubled to nearly $3 a gallon, housing is the least affordable it has been in 14 years, and real wages have been flat since 2001. And we have a chart that illustrates that graphically, but that is the economy that our constituents are living in.

Now, maybe our Republican colleagues are living in some kind of alternative bizarro world. Is there an alternative universe that I am not aware of that perhaps some of them are living? Because this is what reality is: College tuition, up 40 percent under the Bush administration; gas prices up 47 percent; health care costs up 55 percent; and median household income down by 4 percent.

That is good? I don't know. I bet if we looked up ''good'' in the dictionary it wouldn't reflect any of this reality. Just have a hunch that Webster wouldn't define ''good'' this way. It wouldn't look like that.

So I want, and I know we all want, to move this country in a new direction, and we have an agenda that would do that; that would deal with the health care crisis that we are in with 46 million Americans without health insurance, people who have to go to the emergency room for their primary health care. We would make sure that we increase the minimum wage, which hasn't been done since 1997. I mean, that is just unbelievable.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just read today in a paper from American Progress, Scott Lilly, former staff member here, who wrote on the minimum wage, and I think he said in there that the minimum wage has the lowest value since the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Fifty years.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. So it is unbelievable to think exactly where we are and the lack of leadership that we have here.

On that one poster you just had up, President Bush said the economy is benefiting all Americans. I find that interesting. I had some steelworkers in my office just today from all over Ohio, and they certainly don't think that the current economy is benefiting all Americans, that is for sure.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We are going to take up the estate tax tomorrow, and as much of a deal as our Republican colleagues have made out of this, it benefits about 5,000 people in the country. I mean, 5,000 people. And they are making this such a high priority. It is going to cost over $200 billion, and this is what they think is a priority, as opposed to dealing with health care, gas prices, college costs, and housing costs.

□ 1745

Yet another example is when they passed their tax reconciliation bill, their tax cut bill earlier this year. Just to give people an idea of what kind of benefit we truly doled out to most folks, if you made between $10,000 and $20,000, you would get enough back from the tax cut bill we passed earlier this year, enough back to buy a Slurpee.

There are a whole lot of things that are a priority in my life and the lives of my constituents that I want to make sure that I can buy, my constituents want to be able to buy, and a Slurpee is not really mentioned in the letters written to me in my office.

Now let's go down to the people making between $40,000 to $50,000 a year. That is a working family. They would get back enough to buy a gallon of gas. I think that probably most people would think if we are going to pass a tax cut measure, if we are going to really provide revenue and give folks back their hard earned tax dollars, it should be more than the value of a gallon of gas.

But if you are fortunate enough to make more than $1 million, you get back the equivalent of a Hummer. Now that is something that most people could probably write home about. But how many people in America make more than $1 million.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And in the context of this, where do we get the money to give the millionaire to get the Hummer, we don't have it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And tomorrow we are going to do more.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are borrowing this money. That is the kicker. As Mr. MEEK pointed out earlier in the hour, where we are getting the money from to borrow to give to the people who make more than a million a year, and now we have to pay interest on that money. This is what we pay in interest on the debt, just the red, $230-some billion compared to what we spend on education, homeland security and veterans.

So a disproportionate amount of our budget dollars go just to pay interest on the debt. We get no value from that. We are just giving the Chinese, the Japanese, the OPEC countries, our money that they will continue to try to invest and take jobs away from us. We do need to go in another direction.

I think this goes right to the heart. There are two belief systems here. There is the Republican belief system that says cut taxes for millionaires, give corporate welfare to the oil and health care industries, okay. That is their belief system. Let's make sure that the pharmaceutical industry has no ability or we don't have any ability to negotiate down the prices with them. That is their belief system.

But the Democratic belief system is that everybody needs to pay their fair share and make some sacrifice. Why is it just the middle class, the poor and the small business owner making all the sacrifice while the wealthiest people get their tax break.

Our belief system is that they need to pay their fair share, those making more than a million a year because they are benefiting from the largess of the United States of America, and we need to take that money and invest it into research and development, stem cell research, 21st century technologies, broadband for every household, making sure that our schools are functioning, No Child Left Behind is funded, and that we reduce the amount of interest that you have to pay on a college loan.

Mr. Speaker, what the Republicans are doing with college loans is ridiculous.

Now the Democrats want to cut student loan interest rates in half for both parents and students. The Republicans want to increase it and give tax breaks to millionaires. The Democrats are for raising the minimum wage. The Republicans will not bring a bill to the floor that actually passed out of committee that raises minimum wage.

The Republicans are for giving corporate welfare to the oil industry. The Republican Congress put that money in, $16 billion went to energy companies, corporate welfare at this time of great profits.

All of these things, it is about beliefs and we have our share of beliefs, they have theirs, and the American people are going to choose.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would just like to go back to energy prices and gas prices. Just to zero in on one of the things that is the most galling about the direction that the Republican Congress has taken us in, gas prices are up.

I am one of those minivan moms. I have little kids and when I go home, I am going to dance class and soccer games and shuttling them all over my district. It is a lot of driving. With three kids, you have to have a large enough vehicle to fit the car seats and the stuff and the athletic equipment and the dance bags, and so minivans are an essential piece of life when you are a mom or dad with little kids. It costs like $55 to fill up the gas tank of a minivan.

I have reached the conclusion that the only explanation for the continued direction that our Republican colleagues have taken us in when it comes to gas prices and refusing to deal with the energy crisis and refusing to adequately fund, if fund at all, alternative energy sources is because they obviously haven't filled their own tanks of gas since gas pumps looked like this.

This is a replica of a gas pump from the 1950s or thereabouts. I truly believe they must not pump their own gas, or the last time they did, pumps looked like this or they would be feeling the pain. You cannot stand there for as long as you stand there for squeezing the pump and watching the tally click by, $10, $20, $30, $40, $50. You can't do that, even if you can afford it, without it being somewhat painful.

Think about it, think about the mom or dad who is just barely making ends meet. They are barely making ends meet before gas went over $3 a gallon. When is enough enough? Where is the outrage? Where is the legislation? Where is the oversight? Why aren't they calling the CEOs of the oil companies and asking is it possible that they are not in collusion, that they are not conspiring to set prices the same. It is mind boggling. I don't understand why they don't care. That is clearly the message that is sent here.

What we would do, we would make sure that we could, within 10 years, be independent of foreign oil by pursuing alternative energy research like ethanol. Brazil has done it. This is our innovation agenda. For anyone on the other side of the aisle who wants to continue to perpetuate the myth that Democrats have no agenda, here is a big piece of it in several colors, not just black and white.

This innovation agenda includes a number of things, not the least of which is our ability to truly end our addiction to foreign oil which the President talked about in his State of the Union, and only talked about and did nothing to change it. Our innovation agenda would help us get there. It would also make sure that we give people universal access to broadband in 5 years. It also does a number of other things to take us in a new direction.

I know I have focused specifically in on one part of the problem, but because that is something that people deal with every single day or every couple of days when their gas light goes on and their tank runs empty, and I know you both agree with me that it is something that we need to put the magnifying glass on.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Knowing a lot of members on the other side of the aisle, I am not sure that they don't care, but clearly it is weak, passive leadership. We need strong leadership. We need not only a new direction, but strong, bold ideas that are going to take us forward. This whole idea, the whole political realm is about ideas.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle are dinosaurs. They are still working in the old oil days and those countries that are going to be on the cutting edge are going to be into these alternative energy sources. But you can't have weak, passive leadership that fails to step up to bat when the country needs them.

One gentleman who was in my office said we need leadership. We need you to help us. We are losing control. We feel less and less like we are in control. And the things that the Democrats want to implement are to make sure that people have control of their own lives to the extent that they can, and that is education, that is being healthy, that is making sure that there is opportunity through these investments and research and development that we want to do. We want to make sure that these ideas are getting out there through strong, bold leadership that is going to move the country forward. I know Mr. MEEK supports that. I have had conversations with him about that.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to be as calm as possible.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You are calm today.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, I am pleased because the Miami Heat has taken care of business in four games straight. There is going to be a great parade in Miami celebrating the Miami Heat's achievement of achieving the NBA championship, and that team consists of a lot of young guys and older guys that have really worked hard.

I would just like to say this is the first time I have given the Dallas Mavericks any charitable words since I have been here on the floor and in this building, that they played hard. It was a great series and I appreciate the folks that are in Dallas, Texas, for their sportsmanship and the fans. But in Miami, we are very, very excited about it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And that is not what he was saying last night about Dallas when we were watching the game.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let me just say this, I am saying that this whole thing is about sportsmanship and be able to enjoy and have a good time. It is a great lesson for young people about mental mistakes that people can make.

Life is like basketball, things happen and you have to adjust to those things. Folks were thinking I was going to talk for 30 minutes about the Miami Heat, but I don't want to waste the House time dealing with that, and they will be recognized later on. So we will move on.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I just wore the colors.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ wore the colors. I am not wearing the beads that I was wearing. We were down 0–2. I put the beads on and the Heat just went four games all the way.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thought we were going to move on.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let me say, Mr. RYAN, you were talking about leadership and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was talking about leadership. I think it is important when we look at leadership, that is not just in the White House. That is here in the U.S. House of Representatives, and it is very, very important that we have a body of Members here that have the will and the desire to lead.

As you all were talking, I was pulling out a couple of examples to show you a lack of leadership. Remember the Wizard of Oz when they said let it be green and let it be red and let it be blue, and that is fine for a movie; but that is not fine for the United States of America as it relates to policy in any area.

Let's start off at the top of the week when the White House said let's talk about the great things that are happening in Iraq or not happening in Iraq. It seems to be just the opposite at the end of the week of what is not happening in Iraq and what is happening in Iraq.

But the bigger question is what is happening here in this House. We spent all kind of time running back and forth into last week, Members coming down to the floor making speeches, getting all puffy in the chest and talking and carrying on about who loves the troops and who doesn't love the troops.

□ 1800

No, I love them more than you do. I have a tattoo, you know, that said I love the troops.

It is not all about how you say it. It's what you do. And the bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, nothing came out of the resolution that was passed. I mean, it is not like the resolution was passed and all of a sudden some great policy measure, some sort of major dollars going into veteran affairs or some direction to the Iraqi Government of how we really, where we really stand as it relates to it and relates to the war in Iraq. And I think it is important that, some of the things that I wrote down, Mr. Speaker is, following the Bush administration, and its rubber-stamp Congress has allowed the Bush administration to continue to carry out poor planning as it relates to the war in Iraq. Also, no plan for success. It is okay not to have a plan. Because we are in the majority, we are going to write a resolution that we are not going to even allow a Democrat to even put a period or a comma in, and because we are in the majority, we are going to endorse it, no oversight whatsoever from the U.S. House of Representatives. No oversight, Mr. Speaker. No accountability, no investigations of what is going on with the taxpayers' money that has been stolen in record numbers, no-bid contracts, $17 billion for Halliburton alone.

The Democrats, what do we want? We want accountability. We want to make sure that 2006 is a significant year as it relates to transition and plan for Iraq. We want to make sure that the Iraqi people know that they are going to have to take responsibility for their government more sooner than later. And as long as we start saying we are going to stay as long as we are going to stay, they are going to keep saying it is going to take us as long as it is going to take us. It is in the U.S. taxpayers' pocket, and the American troops that are there will continue to pay the price with life, limb and blood and time away from their families as long as the Republican rubber-stamp Congress continues to rubber-stamp whatever the White House has said.

Another point I wanted to make here. Some troops are on their fourth deployment. What does that mean if you are a soldier? That means you are going back for the fourth time. And it may be 12, 15 months. If you are a marine, many of the marines are definitely on their fourth deployment. A little shorter time, tougher duty, and it goes on and on and on.

Recruiting standards have been loosened. The National Guard units have just 34 percent of the required equipment that they need once they go back into the theater. And that is something that we have to pay very close attention to.

And the last point here as it relates to the no plan and the continue to throw the rock and hide your hand philosophy that this Republican Congress has is the fact that veterans' copayments are going up as it relates to prescription drug care. No plan for veterans when they come back with all of the issues that they are going to come back with to their families. We deserve to give them the attention that they need, and there is no plan for that.

So to come and do the John Wayne, if I could use his name as a tough guy, and to say that, oh, we are going to do this, and using slogans about how we need to, people, anyone that talks about anything about Iraq outside of I am with the President, they are not really with the American people.

Well, let me tell you something. I want a news flash to the members of the Republican side of the aisle. The American people are not feeling your rhetoric. And I think we will know in November about where we are because the American people are looking, Mr. RYAN and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for some leadership.

I think on the Republican side of the aisle, some folks need to go see the wizard, get some courage and some leadership, and to be able to say we are willing to work in a bipartisan way. I say this with great confidence because a lot of my Republican colleagues know it, and a lot of them tell me. You know, they say, KENDRICK, you know, you 30-somethings, you come kind of hard sometimes, but you know something, I can't get upset with you because it is true. Third-party validators know that it is true.

I am sick and tired of seeing these parents get on the Today Show in the morning, Mr. Speaker, and trying to bring some sort of understanding in their own mind of why we are there without a plan, and why are we sacrificing our troops on the front line when it is now taking, going on 3, 4 years to train Iraqi troops, when we have had individuals that were in sophomores in high school that have been trained and

sent into theater and now on their second deployment. It is just kind of hard to explain that for Mr. RYAN and I that are on the Armed Services Committee. It is just hard to understand that, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

So this game of saying that we are going to stay as long as we have to stay, don't ask any questions, I think those days are over. I think the American discourse is going to take over what this House has not done, and I know that they are going to speak in a very positive way towards the party that has the plan.

Now, we have plans and ideas on the table here in the House and in the Senate. But guess what? We are at least talking about a plan, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We are just not saying, oh, excuse me. What did they say at the White House? Oh, they want to continue a war without a plan? Okay. That is fine. We will just rubber-stamp that. And what else can we do for the President? So shall it be written, so shall it be done, at the price of the American taxpayer and the price of some families as it relates to never seeing their father or mother again.

So I think it is something that is very serious. I am making fun of the fact that there is a rubber-stamp Congress here, but I have to say, ladies and gentlemen, that it is a reality. It is a reality. No questions asked. Rubber stamp. And I hope that the American people pay very close attention to it.

So I am glad that the Democratic Caucus has put their foot down and have said that enough is enough. You won't hear me talk about why can't we work in a bipartisan way, because we have been saying it since I have been here going on now 4 years, Mr. Speaker. So the will and the desire is not on the Republican side to even work with the Democrats. So now you have to move in the campaign that we have now and moving this country in a new direction, and that new direction is going to be inclusion. We are going to include Republicans in a bipartisan way, and moving this country and all the things that we talked about, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ talked about, Mr. RYAN is talking about, and when folks can go on housedemocrats.gov and find our plan in moving this country in a new direction. We have the will and the desire, and we will definitely do it.

With that I would like to yield to Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You brought up the Republican lack of plan or planning or any agenda really. But I think we are living, as we said the last time we were here, we are living in the midst of an implemented neoconservative Republican agenda. Here it is. We are living in it right now.

You want to know what the Republicans will do? Go to the gas pump. Look at your health care bills. Look at your college tuition. Just look. Look at Iraq. Look at Afghanistan. This is the neoconservative agenda as ordered. This is exactly what they wanted to do. They have the House, they have the Senate, they have the White House, and here it is. Look no more.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You know, you are just absolutely right, because what we are talking about is the direction that we would take this country in if we were given an opportunity, that we would expand access to health care and make sure the 46 million people who don't have it now, that far more, if not all of them, would have it; that we would truly invest in exploring alternative energy resources so that oil was not our only option; that we would make sure, and we committed.

We had a town hall meeting with 30-somethings with Leader PELOSI and Ranking Member MILLER, had a town hall meeting just the other day where we talked about that on the first day that we take the majority back in this House of Representatives and Leader PELOSI becomes Speaker PELOSI, we would halve the interest rate on federally subsidized loans, literally saving potential college kids thousands and thousands of dollars.

But you know what? The attitude of the administration and the Republican leadership, Mr. MEEK, you said you are sick and tired. I think people are sick and tired of being sick and tired. And I think that Americans have reached that point.

And it never ceases to amaze me what their leaders, what the Republican leaders actually say. I mean, that they say out loud; never mind the thoughts they harbor, because you know we will obviously never, we can only guess what those are. But what they say is unbelievable.

A few days ago we sadly marked the death, we were talking about the war in Iraq and how they have no plan; that this is an interminable war that has no end in sight, no plan, no ability to phase ourselves out. The other day we marked the death of the 2,500th soldier, American soldier. And White House spokesman Tony Snow said this about that milestone. He said, ''It is a number, and every time there is one of these 500 benchmarks, people want something.''

Yeah. They want no more kids to die. They want no more of our American men and women to die needlessly without any possibility in the near future of knowing that they are coming home.

A number? Sure. There are plenty of numbers that we could throw out there, the numbers that people care about beyond just 2,500 of our soldiers being lost. For example, 18,490 American troops were wounded in Iraq. And we have third-party validation for all of these. About 40,000 Iraqis have been killed, beyond the American troops. $8.8 billion. Here are some more numbers: $8.8 billion is the amount of Iraqi reconstruction funds the military has failed to account for, according to the Department of Defense's inspector general; 68 journalists killed in Iraq; 2.2 million Active Duty soldiers and veterans at risk of identity theft. Actually that is more. Now with the theft of the computer it is 26.5 million; 382 days since Vice President CHENEY claimed the insurgency was in its last throes. Ask the parents of the two American soldiers that were kidnapped and killed by insurgents the other day if they think that the insurgency is in its last throes; 1,140 days since President Bush declared mission accomplished in Iraq; 37 million people living in poverty in the United States; 13 million children living in poverty in the United States; $8,375,365,051,008.48. That is the amount of the deficit, yet tomorrow we are going to consider an estate tax that benefits 5,000 people; 45.8 million Americans without health insurance, just to be exact; $16,000, which is the median debt of graduates of public colleges; $20,000 is the median debt of graduates of private colleges, yet after July 1, the interest rates for a college loan will be hiked up significantly, thanks to the Republicans' leadership here; $36 billion Exxon/Mobil's profits last year, more than any other corporation in history. Those are the numbers that the Republicans should find important.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, we spend so much time talking about the budget, and those are great numbers that you have shared here. And I see Ranking Member SPRATT here on the floor, JOHN SPRATT, who has done such an outstanding job on the budget. And as you know, I always hold this chart up about the foreign-owned debt and where we are going and what is being spent.

Mr. RYAN spoke to how we are paying more on the debt than we are paying on education, veteran affairs and a couple of other areas, too, homeland security. And I saw Mr. SPRATT, and I just couldn't resist, sir. I know that you were here to put in a RECORD statement, but can you just share, just kind of bring into focus what has happened here and what will continue to happen, if the Republican Congress continue to have their way?

Mr. SPRATT. There are lots of ways to present it, and you have got some ingenious devices there on the table. I found this back-of-the-envelope summary of how much we have increased the debt ceiling of the United States, the legal limit to which this government can borrow, which is set by statute, over the years that George Bush has been President of the United States.

When the Bush administration first came to the Congress back in 2001, with their proposal to do 1 trillion, 800 billion in tax cuts over a 10-year period of time, they told us we could do these tax cuts and still we won't be back here to ask for an increase in the debt ceiling, the legal lending borrowing limit, until 2008.

The next year, June 2002, hat in hand, they were back here at the Congress saying we missed it. We overestimated the surplus. The tax cuts have taken effect. We need a $450 billion increase

in the debt ceiling of the United States.

□ 1815

That was June of 2002. Within a year, May, 2003, they were back, and they were asking this time for a phenomenal sum of money, a $984 billion increase in the debt ceiling of the United States.

If you go back to 1981, just before I first came to Congress, when Mr. Reagan became President of the United States, the entire debt of the United States was less than $984 billion. In 1 year, they needed to raise the debt ceiling by that amount to accommodate the budgets of the Bush administration. Well, that was May of 2003.

Fourteen months later, November 2004, there was another $800 billion increase. And when we passed the supplemental for the budget this year, the supplemental spending bill, there was slipped into it a provision increasing the debt ceiling by $781 billion. And still pending there is another increase. It is hard to believe. Back of the envelope sums it up better than any possible way I could. When they passed the budget resolution in the House this year, it included an additional increase of $653 billion. If you add all of those debt ceiling increases together, you will find that the total amount of debt ceiling increase in the Bush administration comes to $3.7 trillion. $3.7 trillion, that is how much we have had to raise the debt ceiling, the legal borrowing rate of this government, in order to make room for the deficits caused by the Bush administration's budget.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. SPRATT, I am so glad that you are here because here I hold a letter that former Secretary Snow wrote you about the emergency situation we are in of raising the debt ceiling.

Again, Mr. Speaker, third-party validators. U.S. Secretary Snow, who is like the accountant, or used to be the accountant, of the United States of America, literally begging you, wrote you a letter and said, We have to raise this thing or I am going to have to shut down normal government operations.

Mr. SPRATT. That letter was in February.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That letter was in February. And then there is another one, Mr. Speaker, on March 6 that he wrote, again saying that we have to raise the debt ceiling.

So we have the Bush administration appointees. I use these rubber stamps here, Mr. SPRATT, as the rubber stamp Congress that we put here. So this wasn't a part of the letter, but we highlight here the begging, saying that they will not be able to pay into the G fund and other investments that they have to pay into to be able to assist. It is saying they are going to have to suspend investing in the Federal employees retirement fund.

So, Mr. SPRATT, I just wanted to bring that out, a third-party validator's saying that they have to raise the debt ceiling. But we spend a lot of time here, sir, as you know, in the 30-Something Working Group because we are working with the fact that young Americans and the future generations, what this is going to mean and what it is meaning right now to American families. And we also highlight the two amendments. This is almost like having the man that has made it happen here on our side of the aisle trying to move into a pay-as-you-go to stop exactly what you are pointing out there, sir.

Mr. SPRATT. Exactly. That simple rule worked better than any budget resolution, any budget rule we enacted during the 1980s and during the 1990s. I was here, involved in the process. I can stand witness to it. PAYGO worked.

But don't take my word for it. Last year, while he was still chairman of the Fed, Alan Greenspan testified before our committee three times, and on each occasion we asked him, What is your assessment of the budget process rules we adopted in the 1990s and let expire in 2002? He said, I was a cynic then. I thought it was a diversionary tactic. But I have to acknowledge that those budget process rules had an enormous impact on the success we achieved, moving the budget from $290 billion in deficits when George Bush left office in 1992 to $236 billion in surplus in the year 2000. PAYGO, he said, works. And he recommended that it be renewed, extended in its old form, affecting both tax cuts and entitlement increases. That was Alan Greenspan saying it accounted for a lot of the success of the budget discipline we displayed in the 1990s.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, Mr. SPRATT.

I yield now to Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the congressman. I have a question. I was in my office and I got a notice across my desk that perhaps tomorrow we may be debating the estate tax for millionaires.

And my question is that we can't get the minimum wage up that affects close to 7 million Americans that are working every day that can't make ends meet, but yet we are talking about an estate tax that is going to only affect about 6,700, the top 1 percent in the entire country. But my question is how are we going to pay for it? We are in a war that we are paying $450 billion for, and we are spending about $600 billion a month. So how are we going to pay for this?

Mr. SPRATT. The bottom line is we charge the tab to our children. We have a deficit today. This fiscal year the deficit will probably be somewhere between 300 and $350 billion. If we adopt additional tax cuts, they will go straight to the bottom line and only make the deficit larger.

Now, the tax cuts envisioned by this estate tax extension will come in the outer years because we are still increasing the exemptions and lowering the rate applicable to decedents' estates right now under old law. This will mean that in the first 10 years that this estate tax provision is fully implemented, the first 10 years when it is fully effective, the cost will be somewhere between 700 and $800 billion in revenues lost or foregone. Seven to $800 billion during that period of time. And that will be a period of time when the baby boomers will be beginning to retire in big numbers and starting to draw Social Security and Medicare, and we all know both of those programs are going to be strained under the load of the baby boomers' retirement.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Congressman, how long have you been here in Congress? Over what, 30 years? How long have you been a Member of Congress?

Mr. SPRATT. I have been here for 23 years

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Twenty-three years. And in that time period I know you have seen always checks and balances, whether it is the House, the Senate, or the administration. The problem that we are experiencing now is that we have every branch of government controlled by Republicans, whether it is the House, the Senate, or the administration. And so therefore there is no restraint. That is why 77 percent of the American people say that Congress is out of step with them.

Mr. SPRATT. No question about it. That is one of the problems you have with the line item veto. It says we need to let the President get involved even more. I voted for an expedited rescission, a line item veto before, here on this House floor. But really I think that Congress itself should turn to its own problems and start addressing those as opposed to going outside the Congress for solutions. We know what the problem is. We do not have a budget resolution this year adopted by both Houses. One of the things we learned in the 1980s and again in the 1990s was that you need a multi-year plan. Typically a 5-year plan. Not just a 1-year budget but a 5-year budget so you can see the implications on the tax side and on the spending side of what everything you are doing does to the bottom line. And we do not have a 5-year budget at this point in time. And the budget process rules like the PAYGO rule and the discretionary spending caps that we adopted in the 1990s no longer apply. The law elapsed. The Republicans allowed it to elapse and did not renew it. And consequently we do not have those disciplines that we had in the 1980s and 1990s that finally brought the deficit to heal and, furthermore, in the year 2000, put it in surplus to the tune of $236 billion. The last full fiscal year of the Clinton administration, that is where it was, $236 billion in the black.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I want to thank the leadership that we

have here that come and discuss these issues. And it seems that the major problem that we have in this country is that we do not have any checks or balances. The House, the Senate, and the administration are all controlled by Republicans. So if you don't have any checks and balances, we will have zero balance in the bank account.

Mr. SPRATT. As a matter of fact, our Republican colleagues control the House. They have a majority in the Senate, and, of course, they control the White House. So they cannot escape responsibility for these fiscal results.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Thank you for giving me an opportunity to join you all this evening.

Rubber Stamp Republicans: There is a very good reason why 77 percent of the American public does not believe that the United States Congress represents their interests. Instead of debating a fair minimum wage bill, tomorrow we will be debating the Repeal of the Estate Tax for millionaires!

Instead of dealing with high gas prices, Republicans want to talk about gay marriage. Instead of providing the services that the veterans need when they return from Iraq, the Republicans want to talk about flag burning.

Just last week, seven House Republicans joined Democrats in supporting an increase in the minimum wage, but yesterday, when the measure came up in the CJS appropriations bill, they suddenly changed their minds, joining the rest of the Republicans in ignoring the needs of seven million hard working minimum wage workers.

So while ignoring the needs of hardworking low-income workers, House Republicans once again will vote to reward those who least need help!

Just as they rewarded Halliburton, they continue to award big oil companies huge tax breaks at the expense of hard working Americans paying over $3 per gallon!

The White House is collecting our phone records and tapping our phones, yet has no interest in investigating the abuse and fraud by Halliburton in Iraq.

It is high time our country needs a change in direction! We need new energy policies, Iraq policy, higher education policy, health care policy, transportation, national security, and the list goes on and on and on! And this needs to be done in a fiscally sound way, not in a way that puts our children into more debt than they're piled in already.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much, Mr. SPRATT and Ms. BROWN. We are so glad to have you here with the 30-Something Working Group.

Mr. SPRATT. Does that mean I get to join the 30–Something Working Group?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We will adopt you as a member.

And we would like to remind the Members, Mr. Speaker, that all of the charts and documents that we have talked about tonight are on our Web site, housedemocrats.gov/30something.

THE STRENGTH OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHL of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the responsibility and the privilege to speak to you in this House and to represent my constituents here.

I came over here to raise the issue on a number of bits of subject matter. And as I sat and listened, of course, the subject changed a little bit as I listened to the group here on the other side. And I think that it is important to edify Americans as to the difference between Republicans and Democrats. And I am just really grateful that when I was born and I was reared in a family, I began to build a certain attitude about life. And as that attitude unfolded, I was taught from the beginning to fend for yourself. You are going to have to get out there and make something out of yourself in this lifetime because nobody is going to do it for you. Your ship will never come in. Take control of your life. So at an early age, I realized that when I was born, my glass was half full and it was my job to get out of bed, go to work every day, and go ahead and fill that glass up.

I was not raised with an attitude and neither did I gather an attitude that my glass was half empty. I was always grateful that I was born here in America. And when I would ask my parents, what is the best country in the world to come from? They would always answer, The United States of America is the best country in the world. Eat your cold mashed potatoes. There are people starving in China.

That is kind of the composite of the upbringing that I had. But grateful for this Nation, and I would always ask why, what is the difference? And probe into these other countries. And, of course, the people starving in China part was what we talked about then. But country after country in the aftermath of World War II, we were the only surviving industrial nation, and this Nation that had preserved freedom for the world, for the entire globe, and had we not done that, we would not be standing here today speaking in English, for example, Mr. Speaker, but speaking in a free way with free ideas and having this free exchange.

I stand at the same spot on which Tom DeLay gave his last speech here in this Congress. And he made a point that I think is an important one. And that is that, yes, there is partisanship and, yes, we have sharp disagreements. We have those disagreements because we have a Constitution that protects our right to do so. But he made a point that was, you show me a Nation that does not have partisanship and I will show you a tyranny. So when we disagree, we need to be grateful that we can disagree, and we should base that on fundamental philosophical differences and highlight those.

But there is a difference in human nature. Part of human nature is like me that sees our glass half full. Part of human nature is like the people on the other side of the aisle that see their glass and the glass of their constituents as half empty. And that is all right if you look at it from that perspective. But then you have to take it to the next level. And the next level is those that see their glass half full set about going to work to fill it, and we pull each other up the ladder because we know that as we all go out and work and produce and market and save and invest that that helps everyone, that this economy grows. This is not a zero sum game. It is not a goose that has so many golden eggs in it where we can just simply slaughter the goose and harvest the eggs. It is an economy that needs to have inputs. It needs to have capital investment, both intellectual capital and real dollars in a real way. We need to have entrepreneurs. We need to keep generating new ideas. This organism of our economy, has a lot of components in it, and it needs to be working and churning. And when we go in there and we tap into this organism of our economy and we start to take from it and not put into it, then it slows down the growth of our economy and it grows slowly.

But this was an economy that when Ronald Reagan was sworn in outside this building in 1980, the Dow Jones was below 1,000. I do not remember the exact number, but I know it was below 1,000. Today it is at 11,000. That is a good measure of what has happened with our economy, and that should be something that should tell, Mr. Speaker, the American people that when your glass is half full and you go to work to fill that glass up the rest of the way and you help your brethren up the ladder along the way that the sum total of the size of the pie, which is divided up amongst now 300 million Americans, gets greater and greater and greater, and that means when the pie is bigger, the size of the pieces can be bigger for each individual that is involved. This is not a matter of taking from the rich and giving to the poor. This is a matter which the argument that I am hearing really slows down this economy and that when you tax someone for the labor they do, you punish them for that labor.

Ronald Reagan also said what you tax, you get less of.

□ 1830

So we have a first lien on all productivity in America. The Federal Government has the first lien on all productivity in America. So we tax production. We tax earnings, savings and investment. We tax Social Security, we tax your pension, we tax your capital gains, your income tax, your corporate income tax, your partnership income tax. Also we tax your earnings on investments and your Alternative Minimum Tax. All those things are taxed.

Well, when there is a tax applied to anything, it is a disincentive to

produce. So the first lien on all productivity in America slows down the productivity in America, but it does gather dollars from those wages to run the Federal Government.

Now, if you think your glass is half empty and it is not a growing economy, but simply something, a same size pie every year that gets divided up differently depending on who has the political power, not depending on who produces into this economy, eventually what you are doing is you are killing the goose that lays the golden eggs, harvesting the eggs and thinking somehow there is going to be another goose come along.

Mr. Speaker, it will not. There will not be another goose come along. This is the one we are going to have to nurture. This economy that is growing, the one producing the golden eggs that are popping out here, it is because people have invested capital and taken risks and put in sweat equity and had a vision and made a sacrifice with their time and their dollars, and sometimes from their families, to make their businesses run or to go to their jobs to help their companies operate, or sit in the basement or up in the attic working sometimes working on inventions that become creative inventions that increase and contribute to this dynamic economy that we have.

So much was said about the national debt. My glass is half full and I am going to work to fill it up. Most Americans are doing that. That is why Republicans have control of the House, the Senate and the White House.

Some folks believe their glass is half empty, and if they sit around with their tin cup, then let me tell you, that cup will never be full. You have to take charge of your life.

Now, that doesn't mean that we don't have compassion. In fact, everybody in America has access to high quality health care. We have the highest percentage of personal ownership of their homes ever in the history of the United States, and, I would submit, in the history of the world. That home ownership was at 68 percent the last time I checked. If you go into the poverty regions, you have a higher home ownership there than ever before. This administration has been great for people who are on the lower income side of this, and I have got a proposal I will talk about that will make it even better yet.

But I want to give everybody hope, Mr. Speaker. I want to give them all hope that there is a reason to get out of bed to go to work and make your life better.

In fact, to solve the pathologies in the United States, it is a pretty simple equation, and that is simply this: For people who are going to have children, to get married and stay married, get a job and keep a job. Statistically that solves almost all of society's pathologies.

It is not a complicated equation. We need to encourage people to go to work. Most do. Out of 300 million people in America, there are 7.5 million on the unemployment rolls. Those numbers have been actually inching down as new jobs have been created.

There is about another 4.3 million that are on welfare, and another 5.3 million that have exhausted their unemployment benefits that are still looking for a job but are not technically listed on the unemployment list.

That as a percentage of America isn't particularly large, but altogether, between the ages of 16 and on up through retirement, there are 77.5 million nonworking Americans in this society. We have a large labor force there that we can go to when we need that labor force. But we have made good progress with the unemployment lists also there.

We haven't reached the lowest unemployment. I would point out that when people say we are at full employment at 5 percent unemployment, or 4.7 percent unemployment, I don't accept that number. The lowest unemployment that I can find statistically throughout, at least the last 100 years or so that we have kept records, is 1.2 percent unemployment, and that was during World War II. So I qualify that statement.

But that was when we had all hands on deck. If we really get in trouble, we can be all hands on deck again. We haven't needed to do that. So, we do have a large labor force that is here and we can draw from that.

But as I listened to the Members on the other side of the aisle, the group that has consistently been down here using the word ''Republican'' as if it were a four letter word, I don't know how to spell it with only four letters, but I know how they say it when it sounds like a four letter word. They talk about the national debt, they talk about a balanced budget and they talk about the balanced budget under Bill Clinton.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, there was a balanced budget under Bill Clinton, but there were budgets that were sent to President Clinton that were vetoed because he sent them back and demanded more spending, over and over again.

This government was shut down by a veto of Bill Clinton, not because he was insisting that we should balance the budget. He was insisting that he wanted more money. That was the issue here back during the Clinton years. I will admit that there was a partisan divide going on during that time, and I will say that the Republicans in this Congress presented those first balanced budgets that we had seen in decades, and they insisted that the budgets be balanced, and that is what happened. It wasn't because Bill Clinton was ponding on his podium asking for balanced budgets. He was demanding more spending.

Now, a decade later, I hear Members of his party come here on the floor it take credit for the balanced budget during the Clinton years, when, yes, he signed them all right, he did not have a lot of choice, but this Congress, this Republican Congress, made him balance the budget. In fact, they balanced the budget and they required him to sign it.

Then, in the aftermath or in the latter months of the Clinton administration, we had this thing going on called the dot.com bubble. I don't know if we realized it was a dot.com bubble until it burst. But when you think about it, it had to happen. In fact, my instincts were telling me that it was this; that we had technologically, because of great inventions by Americans and the stimulation that we have here and the structure that rewards productivity, invented the technology that allowed us to store and transfer information more effectively, more efficiently and cheaper than ever before.

It was an amazing ride to see that dot.com bubble go up in our stock markets, because the people were investing in these dot.com companies on the anticipation that there would be a financial reward on the other end that would be in proportion to our ability to store and transfer that information more cheaply than ever before.

Well, it didn't work out quite that way, Mr. Speaker, because information has value, but it isn't measured just by the amount of information. It is measured by its commercial value, and information as a commercial value has to allow you to produce a good or service and that deliver that good or service more efficiently than before, otherwise as a business you don't have an interest for paying for that information.

In the case of the Internet would be a good example, it is also marketable that you can get people to pay for their Internet service so that they can have recreational information on the Internet service. So you can use that Internet for business purposes and you will pay for that, and people also pay for it for recreational purposes. That is the only two ways that information has a value in the marketplace. So we overspeculated on our ability to store and transfer information more cheaply and more efficiently than ever before, and that was the dot.com bubble.

Well, the lawsuit on Microsoft I believe was the lance that pierced the dot.com bubble. It would have burst anyway, because it was a growing bubble that was speculation. But when that lawsuit came and the lance of the lawsuit against Microsoft pierced the dot.com bubble, then we saw the stock market begin to contract. In fact, a lot of us will say we were moving into a recession, and I will say we were, and that was at the end of the Clinton administration.

On top of that, we inaugurated President Bush out here on the West Portico. When that happened, he was in the middle of this bursting of the dot.com bubble and the decline in our stock market and our economy.

We hardly got a handle on what was happening there, and along came September 11, the terrible damage to our financial institutions in the heart of New York City at ground zero, the Twin Towers, and, of course, the attacks on the Pentagon and the crash of the plane in Pennsylvania. That was an attack on our financial centers that sent it into a further downward spiral.

So we had two things working against this economy: The formerly balanced budget, running into the dot.com bubble that shut down the revenues here and dramatically reduced our revenues here in the Federal Government, and on the heels of that came the September 11 attack and the impact on our financials in the United States of America was dramatic.

Then on the heels of that we had to create a Homeland Security Department, that spent billions of dollars to protect 300 million Americans, and has done so very effectively. We have not been attacked on our own soil since that time in any effective way. And additionally, we had to appropriate money because we went to war in the global war on terror.

All of those things stacked against this economy, and, do you know, we are growing back out of this thing, because there was vision on the part of President Bush, there was vision on the part of his financial advisers and vision on the part of the leadership in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, that had the fortitude to come to this floor and propose tax cuts that stimulated this economy.

If President Bush had not had the vision and the courage to do that, if this Congress hadn't had the vision and courage to step forward and propose and initiate these tax cuts, the Bush tax cuts, as we know them now, we would have seen a depression, not just a recession, but a depression in this economy, Mr. Speaker, and that would have been the price we would have paid if we would have stuck with, I will say the philosophy that we have heard over here on how we ought to be running a balanced budget.

The people on the other side of the aisle, if they had been in the majority in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, would have proposed tax increases. They would have said, well, first of all, let's not take on these global terrorists. Let's figure out a way that we can curl up into a national fetal position, and perhaps we could have just put enough guards at every school and every bus stop and every theater and every church and maybe even every home and turned America into one great big, huge Israel, and somehow or another cowered away and apologized to the terrorists, and maybe they wouldn't have attacked us again. But they would have. They attacked us in the first place, didn't they?

So under the leadership of the other side of the aisle, there would not have been a proactive tip-of-the-spear effort in Afghanistan, there would not have been a proactive tip-of-the-spear effort in Iraq. They would have turned the United States into one huge Israel, and that would be a defensive posture with enemies all around, wondering where they are going to come from next.

That is not the way I want to live, Mr. Speaker. I refuse to live that way. I insist that we exercise our rights to live in freedom, and freedom requires risk, it requires sacrifice, and there is danger involved. But it is worth it. It is worth it from the time Patrick Henry articulated it so well, it is worth it from the time that it has been articulated so well by my colleagues on this floor on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, and I am honored just to be a part of that.

But we took on the war on terror. And it is interesting to me that before our troops went into Afghanistan, there was much objection to the foolhardy nature of mounting a military operation in a country that had never been invaded successfully and occupied before in all of history. And yet that took place successfully on the part of our United States military, working with our coalition forces, many of our coalition forces.

They said it couldn't be done. They said it was another Vietnam. They said the passes in the mountains would be impassable, and no one could sustain a military operation through there because they would be ambushed over and over again, and that the people in Afghanistan couldn't handle freedom. They had never had that freedom before. They had never voted there before. This wasn't the kind of people that could handle freedom.

Well, they were right about one thing, Mr. Speaker. They had never voted there before. But there were American soldiers and American Marines that were on the ground guarding the travel routes to the polling places, guarding the polling places, and I am very proud of the Iowa National Guardsmen that were there at that time on that soil that provided an opportunity for the Afghani people for the first time in the history of the world since Adam and Eve to go to the polls and choose their leaders and direct their national destiny of 25 million people, a huge accomplishment when that liberty bell rang across the globe. And the inspiration that comes from that carries over to the issue of Iraq, Mr. Speaker.

Now, this issue with Iraq, it is the same size country; 25 million people in Afghanistan, 25 million people until Iraq. The complaint I hear on the other side of the aisle is that Secretary Rumsfeld and President Bush didn't listen to the military advisers because the people on the other side of the aisle found a general that disagreed. I don't know if it was a Sunday afternoon or Monday morning quarterback, but they found a general that disagreed.

Well, I understand there are about 9,000 generals in our military, and if you can find one that disagrees, in fact, I saw six that disagreed, and it takes a long time to gather those kind of people.

I will bet that some of those people will show up in the campaigns for the Presidency working for candidates by the year 2008. I expect I will see some of those generals that claim that they counseled for the opposite, working with and for Presidential candidates, for Democrats on the other side of the aisle. I am not suggesting that they have a motive, I am just suggesting that they have a different philosophy about the future of America, even though they are generals and even though they are literally a handful out of the 9,000 generals that we have.

□ 1845

But the advice that the President followed and the advice that Secretary Rumsfeld followed was the same people advising in Afghanistan for the most part as advised in Iraq. The same number of people, Mr. Speaker, 25 million people in Afghanistan, 25 million people in Iraq.

We heard the same arguments:

It's another Vietnam.

It's a quagmire.

You never can do that.

No one could go into Iraq and invade and occupy that country.

We didn't, really. We liberated them. We had an armored column go across Iraq to Baghdad in less time than ever in the history of the world. Baghdad, itself, was the largest city ever in the history of the world to be invaded and occupied by a foreign power. Absolutely a true statement. Berlin was the next largest that I could find, and that was far smaller than Baghdad.

But they only occupied it for a split second as they erroneously put up the American flag and then realized, This is the wrong message to send to the Iraqi people. We're here to liberate you. And they ran the Iraqi flag back up the flagpole. You haven't seen an American flag fly around there since then because the Iraqi people are liberated. They give me smiles, and they give me thumbs up when I go to that country because they are still grateful.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania that has been on the floor so many hours here in the last couple of weeks, he finds a different view. You can find whatever it is that you want to support your argument, Mr. Speaker. But in this case, I stand with our soldiers. I stand with our marines. I stand with the judgment that said, go to Iraq. And, in fact, there have been some announcements today that I could take up in a little bit.

I am very happy at this time to yield so much time as he may consume to my friend Mr. EHLERS for any remarks he may choose to make.

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding.

I didn't want to interrupt your beautiful soliloquy, it was fascinating, but I came to the floor because I heard those who were speaking before you, and I

couldn't believe what I was hearing. They were members of the other party describing in great detail how horrible Republicans are.

Now, I don't know who they were talking about. They weren't talking about you. They weren't talking about me. They are not talking about any of my other Republican colleagues here. But you would literally think the world was ending.

I have to tell you, Mr. KING, how refreshing it is to come to the floor and hear you give this beautiful speech without condemning the other party, but simply outlining where you are coming from in a very careful, thoughtful way. I really, truly appreciate your expression of your beliefs about where the country should go and what is happening, without throwing rocks or mud or condemning anyone else, but simply outlining very beautifully what you believe.

Now, if I may, I would just like to add a few comments. You live in northwest Iowa. I was born in southwest Minnesota, just a few miles from there. I think we have come from the same framework. Maybe that is another reason why I appreciate so much what you have been saying.

You said when you were born, your glass was half full. Mine actually was about one-eighth full, simply because I grew up in a family with considerable poverty, poverty of money, but great richness of persons, of my parents and my siblings, great richness of faith. Frankly, that has always meant more to me than money. I am not a rich man. I never had very high incomes. The highest income I ever received is from the Congress of the United States.

My point is that there is more than money to this life. That is what you were illustrating as well. My cup was one-eighth full, also, because I had serious illness, and I wasn't ever able to go to school. I was home-schooled before there was such a thing as home schooling. Through the love of my family, the encouragement of my family and friends, I survived that situation, and I did well in college, I did well in graduate school, and I ended up getting a Ph.D. in nuclear physics and teaching physics until I ended up in the political arena.

So even though the glass was one-eighth full, it is overflowing and has been overflowing most of my life because of these circumstances.

If I may add one final thought in response to the comments you made about the dot.com bubble. There is no question about it. That dot.com bubble really was a tremendous economic boom to this country. If you look back over the past 50 years, most of the economic growth has come from our investment in science and in scientific research. The dot.com bubble is a good example of that. Development of the Internet. It is amusing because I was using the Internet before the rest of the world knew it existed. It was a wonderful thing. But we were using it as scientists to transmit voluminous amounts of data back and forth around the world. And then someone gets the bright idea, hey, I bet the public would like to use this, too, and that was the start of the dot.com boom.

As a scientist, I believe it is absolutely essential for our Nation to continue supporting research, the basic research. In the old days of monopolies, AT&T had Bell Labs. They could do the research. IBM had their labs. They did research. In today's globally competitive world, that is not possible. The government has to do the basic research, and from that industry develops the products that become very, very useful to us.

And so I appreciate the point you made about that. I just want to emphasize, let's support the research that will continue having this country be the leader throughout the world in developing these products. I often find people saying, what do you need that research for? I remember when I was a graduate student, one of my colleagues at Berkeley developed nuclear magnetic resonance. It was a wonderful thing to investigate matter with. That is what he was doing. But, lo and behold, that is the basis of the MRI machine which has been the most powerful diagnostic tool that medicine has ever seen. Similarly with the CAT scan, developed out of some work we were doing at Berkeley. X-rays, discovered by a physicist. All basic research with very direct, practical implications for the world today.

I know this is a sidetrack from the point you were making, but this is what makes America great: the creative ability that we have. We worry about losing jobs to other countries, but our creative instinct is what is going to help us win that battle. We don't have the low wages they do. I am glad we don't. But the point is because of our creative juices in this country, we come up with these great ideas. The greatest country that this planet has ever seen, the greatest ideas of freedom for everyone, and the creative ability to meet the challenges and meet the needs of the people of this world today.

I thank you for yielding some time. I just wanted to add those few thoughts to your beautiful comments. Thank you very much.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, my friend, Mr. EHLERS. I appreciate your input on that. I would say with regard to that, that I believe that there is a unique American character, a unique American culture; there is a vibrancy within this overarching American culture that causes us to sometimes challenge the rules, sometimes look into the science, sometimes wonder why cannot that be, why can't we accomplish that. There is a creativity that comes within this culture, this vibrancy that we have, and it is based and rooted in our freedom and in our property rights and in the reward that comes from that, when, say, a Bill Gates comes up in our lifetime and in a matter of a couple of decades turns himself into the richest man in the world. And what a thing he has done for the standard of living and the quality of life for everybody on this planet.

Mr. EHLERS. If I may, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would yield.

Mr. EHLERS. I would just like to add a little comment to that because I speak to a lot of high school students. Of course, as you know, they look down on nerds. And so I start out by asking them, What type of person is the richest man in the world? That comes out. I say, He's a nerd. I say, And I'm a nerd.

Isn't there a message here? Nerds can succeed in this world. And then I tell these high school kids, look, it is very important to think about the courses that you are taking in high school, because that is going to determine your life. And then the coup de grace, and, of course, I am partial to this. I used to always tell them, If you aren't a nerd, you're going to end up working for a nerd. So I tell them to get busy, study their math and their science, and they will be successful in this life, too, in many ways.

Thank you very much.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, you and Mr. Gates both are giving nerds a good name.

Taking up from there, the issue of the balanced budget by the people on the other side of the aisle. I spoke to what happened here in the nineties to balance the budget and what happened to the economy when the dot.com bubble burst and the 9/11 attacks came, and we had to invest billions and billions into homeland security and invest billions and billions into the overall global war on terror. Things will go fast on you in a hurry when you have got to do quick reaction, but the tax cuts have brought a lot of that back. We are moving in the right direction.

I am willing to balance this budget. The people on the other side of the aisle are willing to balance the budget if they can raise somebody else's taxes, not their constituents' taxes, but perhaps my constituents' taxes. But I would balance this budget. It is a simple equation. And we always should know what it takes to balance the budget and know whether we are willing to do so or not and have a debate here on this floor, Mr. Speaker. That really hasn't happened a lot of times.

But I would submit that if we were to balance this budget, this one that we are in the process now with doing our appropriations bills for the 2007 fiscal year, what it would take is, we have the entitlement spending for Social Security, for Medicare and Medicaid. That goes on. Unless we change the policy there, those expenses are already locked in, and they grow year by year. Interest is something that as long as there is debt, there will be interest. That is also locked in, and it will grow. Those are the entitlements, the automatic spending, if you will. We

also have defense spending, which is necessary.

I would take that defense spending off the table as far as something that I am willing to cut. I want to make sure that our military have all the best equipment, the best training, the best protective devices, and that they are properly taken care of and well fed and well housed. I believe we are doing that better than any military ever in the history of the world.

So what is left is called discretionary spending, these items where we could actually go in and cut some of this spending, this spending that is not on autopilot, and what it would take to balance the fiscal year 2007 budget, when you take nondefense discretionary spending, and that is that smaller piece of the pie, and I have forgotten exactly the percentage that is, but take what we spent in 2006 and cut it 5 percent. If we simply spent 95 percent of the money that we spent on nondefense discretionary spending, that part that we can actually control, if we cut that 5 percent and spent 95 percent of what we spent in 2006 for 2007, we would have a balanced budget, Mr. Speaker. In fact, we might have a balanced budget with a little bit less than that because our revenue has been coming in more than we anticipated, significantly more, because the economy is doing better than we anticipated. That is part, also, of the climate that we are working in. And part of it is also because the dynamics of the Bush tax cuts. The two rounds of Bush tax cuts are the reasons why the economy is going better than we anticipated.

So we will get there over time. I think we should be more aggressive in cutting our spending. I have been working to do that. Many of us have. We don't have the votes in this Congress to do that. But the people on the other side of the aisle are not willing to cut a dollar anywhere. They are only willing to raise taxes on somebody else's constituents. And then they say, Give me a balanced budget. That equation doesn't work, Mr. Speaker.

The equation that will work is cut the spending. It is the spending, not the taxes. If you raise the taxes, you lower the overall revenue because people will stop doing business. What you tax, you get less of. That is the equation.

And the concern about the national debt, let's get to this balanced budget. In fact, let's get to a surplus budget, and let's start paying down the national debt. We did some of that in the middle nineties. If we can do that, we can work this national debt down. It is not a matter of the difference so much of which country that might be holding that United States paper. You see that on the map that Japan holds a lot, China holds a lot, but that is not the issue so much as it is the size of that debt and the willingness to pare down our spending, and the willingness to stop creating new programs and eliminate the programs that are no longer necessary and get rid of this unnecessary funding for the programs that would embarrass a person to have to vote for them and rolling them up into an omnibus spending bill or into a conference report without having a chance to strike them out by line item.

□ 1900

Those are the things we need to do, Mr. Speaker, and so we can get to a reduction of our national debt. We are going to have do that with a dynamic economy and reducing the growth in our spending.

I would submit also that we need to do some overhaul in Medicare and Medicaid and in Social Security, and this is another way that we get a handle on this budget. Otherwise, Social Security grows and becomes out of control. It was not the people on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, that pulled down the effort to overhaul and reform Social Security and give people control of some of their own retirement funds. It was the people on that side of the aisle, and that is another reason why we do not have control over this budget. But it is not imminent, and if it is not in imminent threat, that means that politics and this democracy as some call it, I call it a constitutional republic, will not operate unless there happens to be an imminent need and urgency to get that accomplished.

Let me also, Mr. Speaker, speak about the balance of trade, and we have a negative balance of trade. A year ago it was a minus $617.7 billion. We got the report out near the end of February this year, and I do not have the exact number in front of me, but it was in the neighborhood of minus $725 million, growing at the rate of about 20 percent a year increase in the negative balance of trade, meaning that we are buying more goods from other countries, goods and services from other countries, than we are selling to them.

We are to the point even where agriculture, which always used to be a big surplus for us, is narrowing down to where there is hardly a margin at all for agriculture, and the way it is going it is probably going to be a trade imbalance. It could be in the red just for agriculture in a few years at the rate that it is going.

But if we are down to minus $725 billion a year in this balance of trade, that means that we are buying $725 billion more of goods and services from foreign countries than we are selling to them, and that has got to be turned around. That is a sign that we are not manufacturing as much as we should, we are not marketing as much as we should, and it should tell us that we need to do some things with our tax structure so that we can adjust our taxes and provide those incentives to be able to produce and market in foreign countries in a more competitive fashion.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I will come back to that in a little bit, but before I had the colloquy with Mr. EHLERS, I was talking about Iraq and about Afghanistan and Iraq and the global war on terror. I would like to take us back to that, that global war on terror, and specifically the battlefield, the theater of Iraq, which is a major component of that. We know that that is the central battle in the war on terror.

We know that Zarqawi wrote a letter a couple of years ago that was about 17 pages long, as I read it, and he said in there that they were having a great trouble, that Iraq was essentially their last need out; that they did not have mountains or forests to hide in; that they had to find a way that they could hide in the homes of the Iraqi people; and that the Iraqis that were willing to take them in, the terrorists, the al Qaeda that had been operating in Iraq now since liberation of Iraq, the Iraqis that were willing to take them into their homes, which is the only place to hide, you do not hide so well out there in the desert, were as rare as red sulfur. Mr. Speaker, as rare as red sulfur. Now, I am going to have to do some research sometime to determine how rare red sulfur is, but I expect that is quite a rare commodity and the Iraqis who would take them are rare.

Well, they are even more rare today than they were then when Zarqawi not too long ago, a couple of weeks ago, was sent to meet his Maker by two bombs from two different F–16s. When he was sent to meet his Maker in the rubble of the so-called safehouse, now there is an oxymoron is it not, Mr. Speaker, a safehouse that Zarqawi was hiding in turned out to not be so safe because intelligence had gotten information to our military and our military had targeted the house and dropped a couple of bombs in on him, killed Zarqawi. In the rubble were computer hard drives and paperwork and a lot of intelligence, and a lot of intelligence has led us to other intelligence, and a lot of other intelligence that we had were dots out there that got connected by the intel that was within this so-called safehouse that was turned into rubble.

From all of that intelligence, the body of that intelligence as it has been released to the public and our intelligence people have pored down through it, the body of that intelligence says that al Qaeda and the terrorists in Iraq are in a very difficult situation. They are having trouble recruiting fighters. They are having trouble getting military supplies and munitions. They are having trouble with their communications. Their operations are being disrupted, and that the effectiveness of the coalition forces, and I will say in particular American forces, and especially the effectiveness of the Iraqi troops that are now in uniform defending Iraqis and taking on these terrorists in the midst have al Qaeda in disarray.

All of the information that came, all of the data came, all of the intelligence that came, all pointed to the same

thing. This is a desperate enemy and a desperate condition with a very limited amount of supplies to work with, a limited amount of recruitment ability to be able to recruit troops and a limited ability to affect life in Iraq.

We are winning, Mr. Speaker, and it has become very clear as the intelligence unfolded.

I would point out also that Saddam's trial is nearing its end, and we are going to see a verdict in Saddam Hussein pretty soon, and it has been drug on now for about 8 months. That is plenty long, but in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that we are going to get a verdict. I happen to know that if he is found guilty of crimes against humanity that in that section of the Criminal Code of the Iraqi law, and I have actually sat there with the judges in Baghdad and discussed this with them, and they spoke English to me so I could understand it directly and not be dependent upon an interpreter, but in that section of Iraqi law, crimes against humanity only provide for one penalty. If you are guilty, there is only one penalty, and that penalty is death.

Now, there have been three of Saddam's attorneys that have been murdered throughout the process of this, and some of the other people involved in this have been as well, but the punishment that may come if Saddam is found guilty is only one punishment. He has been, of course, an active person there, I will say, since there is a case before the court in Iraq. We know the evidence, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to let the evidence speak for itself at this point.

But I would say that Iraq is coming along. They are making good progress. They now have a sovereign government. They now have a full cabinet. They now have a prime minister. When you get a sovereign government, they can make decisions. They can make decisions about like what to do if Saddam is found guilty, whether they will bring another trial for other crimes against humanity, whether they will mete the punishment should he be found guilty, what they should be doing for their citizens.

I hope they do this: open a bidding process globally so they can bring in oil companies that have the capital and the technical ability to sink more wells into the vast oil fields in Iraq and build some pipelines and some refineries and get more oil coming out of that country so they can get cash coming in.

It is a shame to have $70 oil in a country that is starved for cash and that has oil sitting underneath its sandy desert and not having that turning into cash at $70 a barrel for them. I want to see that happen. This was not American blood for oil, but this was American blood, coalition blood and Iraqi blood for freedom, for freedom, Mr. Speaker, and they will have the freedom to do with their oil as they choose and to cash the checks for that oil, and they need to get it flowing out of there. That would be the first order of business besides the security issues that come before this government, if I were the prime minister or in the parliament of Iraq.

So this military security situation is making good progress, and the intelligence that we have gathered and after the death of Zarqawi, their leader, and they have taken on a number of their leaders in the first and second tier who were very close to Zarqawi, but after that, all the intelligence says they are in desperate condition.

Now, why would we do what has been proposed here on the other side of the aisle, why would we pull out? Why would we cut and run? Why would we want to redeploy to the horizon, Mr. Speaker, when this war is making progress and we have people who have this opportunity to be free?

I sat down with Benazir Bhutto shortly after the September 11 attacks, and she happened to be giving a speech in my district at the Buena Vista University in Clear Lake, my hometown. Benazir Bhutto is the former prime minister of Pakistan. She served at two separate segments of time there in Pakistan and is a very respected leader of the Pakistani people and has a sound judgment, which is the reason that she has been able to be in power in Pakistan.

I asked her a question and I was trying to understand at the time our enemy, how do we conduct a war that we could finally get to the point where we can declare victory, what would victory look like and how do we get to that point so we could declare victory. We need to define it and we need to get there.

We were talking about radical Islamists, that perhaps 10 percent of the Muslim world are lined up against Muslims, as well as Christians and Jews and an attack on Western civilization to some degree, and how do we finally defeat them. Her answer was, this hatred comes out of having no hope. It comes out of not having an opportunity to build a better life for their families, for their homes and their communities. She said, you have got to give them freedom; you have got to give them a chance at, she used the word, democracy.

If they have that freedom, like we have here, then they turn their focus to hatred and murder and barbaric slaughtering like they did of our two soldiers a couple of days ago in Iraq. They turn that hatred over, and they put their efforts towards their families, their community, their churches, their mosques, their countries. When that happens, that energy that is within all of us is used for a constructive good. There is a culture change. That culture of hatred that breeds terror that is in the heart of poverty and hopelessness that is in many of the cities, especially in the Arab world, can be replaced by freedom and hope and prosperity.

That is the definition for victory, Mr. Speaker. That is the definition that was given to me in a very private conversation, without any reservations I would add, by Benazir Bhutto. I appreciate that from her. I respect that from her, and I think she laid that out in a way that indexes in, links in very well with the Bush doctrine.

President Bush understands this. He came out with this philosophy within weeks of September 11, and he stuck by this philosophy all along. He has defined victory. He is leading us to victory. We need to stand with him on that issue, and I do, and standing with the President also stands with our soldiers and marines, and it stands with them and it stands with their mission. Those two things, Mr. Speaker, are linked together.

If you are going to support your marines, you also have to support the mission that they are on because some of them have given their lives. Some more of them will give their lives for global freedom and for the freedom and safety of the American people. They have to believe in their mission. I believe in their mission. The President believes in their mission. The American people believe in their mission, and some of the people on the other side of the aisle do not, and they claim that they can support the troops and oppose the mission.

I would think that there is not a soldier in this country that would say send me off on a mission that you do not support but tell me you support me. No one could be asked, and you cannot ask anyone to put their life on the line for a mission that you do not believe in. That is the crux of this debate: Do you support the troops and the mission. And that is not negotiable.

Then, as I talked about balancing this Federal budget, there is also this imbalance in trade that I was talking about, $725 billion imbalance in trade. What we need to do with that, Mr. Speaker, is fix that. We need to fix that by changing the tax policy. The tax policy that we have now taxes all productivity in America. I spoke about that a little bit earlier, and in fact, we can change that around totally and utterly.

I came to this conclusion in 1980 after the IRS had audited me one too many times in a row. When they did that, I went back to work after 4 days of pulling papers out of my files and handing them over to the IRS and sitting there throughout this audit. When it was finally done, it cost me some money, and I believe to this day I did everything exactly legally and technically correct. It was my intent to do so, but they I believe had to justify their 4 days in my office. So they made a Monday morning quarterback decision, and I had to accept the result of that if I were going to stay in business because I could not take anymore capital out of my business or anymore time away from our productivity to go fight the behemoth system of the Federal Government.

So I went back to work, and as I went back to work I began to start with this conclusion: I would like to eliminate the Internal Revenue Service. I would like to eliminate the IRS code. I would like to see to it that no one has to go through what I went through ever again.

□ 1915

I would like to have people have a voluntary tax system so that they can decide when they pay their taxes. And as I worked this system out, Mr. Speaker, and I really put together a fairly complete proposal on my own as I was sitting in the seat of a bulldozer meditating for 10 or 12 hours a day, and there is plenty of time to think there, I thought about this policy, and this policy today is called H.R. 25, The Fair Tax.

Now, I couldn't find anybody that knew anything about this issue in 1980, but as I worked my way through that, throughout that decade, I found a little more information and a little more information, and by about 1991, I found a book written by Daniel Pilla, a former IRS agent, called Fire the IRS. He had worked for the IRS for years, and in that book he had done the data, had pulled the data together and done the research that supported the conclusions that I had drawn just simply from working my way through this policy. I didn't do the math, but he did. He did the analysis, and his analysis fit my philosophy.

We linked together at that point. I don't know if Daniel Pilla ever recognized that, but I want to thank him for the work he did on that book. It was inspiring to me and confirmed my conclusion and helped move me into public life.

I believe that we should take all tax off of productivity. I think as a fundamental change, if we do that and put it on consumption, then people can volunteer to pay taxes. They will do that when they make a decision to purchase. We take all the Federal tax off of all productivity. That means you get to keep all the money you earn, with the exception of whatever State taxes might be there.

People in America would get another 56 percent more into their paycheck. If they got a $1,000 check for that week, they would have $1,560 more they would get to take home. If it was a $100 check that week, it would be $156 more they would take home. That extra money, that 56 percent more, is money that would be saved and some would be spent, but people would make a decision on paying their taxes themselves without having the IRS stand there, or more figuratively Uncle Sam standing at the time clock on Monday morning.

You know, America gets up, takes a shower, shaves, goes to work, and walks through to punch the time clock, and as soon as they punch that time clock, Uncle Sam's hand goes out. He's going to take every dollar that you make that day until he is satisfied. When he is satisfied, he puts that money in his pocket, Mr. Speaker, and then you can go to work for the State for a little while. They put that in their pocket, and then you are on your own for the rest of the day.

But we can change that entire dynamic where Uncle Sam is no longer standing there. The image won't be of Uncle Sam by the time clock any longer, it will be the image of your being able to get all the money you earn and then be able to decide when to pay taxes with it.

Alexander Tyler said, when a majority of the people figure out that they can vote themselves benefits from the public Treasury, on that day democracy ceases to exist. Well, we are very close to that because 44 percent of Americans don't pay any income tax right now.

I heard a number the other day, and I have to qualify it because I haven't verified it yet, but it was that 3 percent of the people pay 97 percent of the taxes. I don't know if that is true, but the philosophy is there. A small percentage of people at the top of the income bracket are paying a large percentage of the income tax on the other side. And many, many people, millions of people are absolved from tax liability whatsoever.

They are not paying taxes, but they are voting, and they are writing letters to their Congressmen and putting demands on government to provide them services. So their incentive is to push people to grow government and to lay back and use more government services, rather than have the incentive be to go out and go to work and grow the size of their own pie, fill their cup, so to speak, feed the goose that lays the golden eggs.

That is what we need to do, Mr. Speaker. We are underproducing in this country. What kind of a Nation would be having a debate about an immigration policy that would take in, they are saying with a straight face, 10- to 12 million people?

I remember when under the Clinton administration, prior to the 1996 elections, they accelerated the naturalization process for a million people, a lot of them in California. Some of them made their way to Iowa, and some of them made it clear what they thought their agreement was, and I will speak about that another time perhaps, Mr. Speaker, but a million people came in prior to the 1996 Presidential elections.

I was appalled that a million people could come into the United States like that, without having a real policy established here in this Congress, but just simply let across the border, naturalized, legalized, and given an opportunity to vote. But we are, and as appalled as I was by a million people in 1996, the United States Senate now is speaking openly about 10- to 12 million people, and I think they know what I believe and what my senior Senator believes, and that is that the number is not 10- or 12 million, it is more like 20- or 22 million, or a number greater than that. And we are talking seriously, Mr. Speaker, about legalizing all of those people that are here in the United States, or all but a relative handful of the people here in the United States illegally.

Now, the justification for it would be because we don't have enough Americans that are willing to do the work that needs to be done. Mr. Speaker, I object to that kind of thinking and that kind of talk. It is an insult to the hard-working Americans that are out there, those that took pride, like Mr. EHLERS, who grew up with his cup one-eighth full. I said mine was half full, and not because of wealth, because we weren't well off, but because of family, and because of our work ethic, and the culture that I grew up in was a tremendous head start to be anchored in that way.

But here we sit now with the argument that Americans won't do this work. Well, they may not do it for 4 bucks an hour. No, Mr. Speaker, in fact, they may not do it for $5.15 an hour. But there is supply and demand in the labor force, and the labor in this country has been altered and distorted by 10- or 12- or 20 million people in this country. And all of them are not working, it is a percentage of them. That number is somewhere over 50 percent, or about seven-twelfths would be one way of looking at that.

All of them are not working, but perhaps 6.3 to 7 million, according to a CIS study, are working. And so let's say it is 7 million people. I referenced earlier in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that there are 7.5 million unemployed in America. There are another 5.3 million that have exhausted their unemployment benefits that are still looking for a job. So you get up there to 12.8 million. That is already more people on unemployment, at least by the statistics the Senate is dealing with, who are here illegally. It is almost two to one for those working that are here illegally.

And then, if we look at those who are on welfare, there are about 4.3 million of those. If we take a look at teenagers, and teenagers need to be busy. One of the good things about raising kids is if you can keep them busy, if they have energy and you keep them busy, they will be all right, but you have to work them a little to do that. And so of those between the ages of 16 and 19, there are 9.3 million of them who are not in the workforce in any way, not even part time, not even flipping burgers down at the hamburger stand or picking up a check whatsoever. 9.3 million. Some of them presumably could be hired to do some of the work they claim Americans aren't doing.

Then if you look at the, I will say the young senior citizens, between the ages of 65 and 69, there are about 4½ million of those. Some of those would like to be working, but we have a few disincentives in place so that they do not. That is a universe to go and hire from; 7.5

million and 5.3 million and 9.3 million, and then the 4.5 or so million that are the young seniors.

But in between the ages of 20 and 64, that real working age, none of those people have been addressed yet, except for the welfare folks that I am talking about. There are 51 million not working Americans there.

But even if I pare this down and take those that are over 70, actually I haven't spoken to those at all, but those over 70 out of it, those over 65 out of it, and if we go down and take those under the age of 16 out of this equation, and we roll this all back together and think what is the universe, what is the size that we hire from for our workforce, that force, Mr. Speaker, that workforce is about 61 million.

That is a reasonable number to look at. And we are trying to hire perhaps 7 million people to replace? If we did that, we would hire maybe one out of nine of the nonworking people that are of primary working age in the United States. We surely should be able to do that.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we could also replace some of these jobs with technology, but we will not do that as long as there is a very cheap labor supply to go to. Cheap labor causes employers to de-adopt technology, and that is a retrogression of our economy when that happens. We need to be driving technology not de-adopting technology. That technology would reduce some of the demand for that labor.

No one, no one I know of, has addressed the subject of how much of this 7 million people that are doing this work, which is only 2.2 percent of the gross domestic product, in other words the illegals are about 4.6 or 7 percent of the workforce, and they are about 2.2 percent of the productivity, that workforce is not all necessary work, Mr. Speaker.

I will conclude this statement on another evening, but I appreciate the privilege to address the House, Mr. Speaker.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5638, PERMANENT ESTATE TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2006

Mr. PUTNAM (during Special Order of Mr. KING of Iowa), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–517) on the resolution (H. Res. 885) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5638) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the unified credit against the estate tax to an exclusion equivalent of $5,000,000 and to repeal the sunset provision for the estate and generation-skipping taxes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4890, LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO ACT OF 2006

Mr. PUTNAM (during Special Order of Mr. KING of Iowa), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–518) on the resolution (H. Res. 886) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4890) to amend the Congressional and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of budget authority, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CLYBURN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CARTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 28.
Ms. HARRIS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Thursday, June 22, 2006, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the fourth quarter of 2005 and the first and second quarter of 2006, pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. MIKE THOMPSON, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 26 AND JAN. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Mike Thompson	1/26	1/28	Kuwait		812.00		(3)				812.00
	1/28	1/29	Iraq				(3)				
	1/29	1/30	Germany		304.00		(3)				304.00
Committee total					1,116.00						1,116.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

MIKE THOMPSON, Chairman, May 23, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. MIKE THOMPSON, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 26 AND JAN. 30, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Mike Thompson	1/26	1/28	Kuwait		812.00		(3)				812.00
	1/28	1/29	Iraq				(3)				
	1/29	1/30	Germany		304.00		(3)				304.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. MIKE THOMPSON, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 26 AND JAN. 30, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Committee total					1,116.00						1,116.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

MIKE THOMPSON, Chairman, May 3, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. DENNIS KING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 21 AND JAN. 28, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Dennis King	1/22	1/28	Republic of Korea	2,111,480	2,148.00		4,310.62				6,458.62
Committee total					2,148.00		4,310.62				6,458.62

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

LANE EVANS, Chairman, Feb. 27, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. WILLIAM VAN HORNE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 21 AND FEB. 25, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
William Van Horne	2/21	2/25	Austria		528.00		5,704.72		404.53		6,637.25
Committee total					528.00		5,704.72		404.53		6,637.25

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

WILLIAM VAN HORNE, Mar. 13, 2006.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. SUSAN OLSEN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 4 AND MAR. 9, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Susan Olson	3/05	3/09	Belgium		1,528.00		6,408.31				7,936.31
Committee total					1,528.00		6,408.31				7,936.31

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOEL HEFLEY, Chairman, Mar. 22, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. TIMOTHY SCOTT BERGREEN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 8 AND APR. 15, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Timothy S. Bergreen	4/8	4/15	China		1,492.00		7,228.70				8,720.70
Committee total					1,492.00		7,228.70				8,720.70

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

———Apr. 24, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. CHRISTOPHER McCANNELL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 8 AND APR. 15, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Christopher McCannell	4/8	4/15	China		492.00		7,228.70				8,720.70
Committee total					492.00		7,228.70				8,720.70

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

———May 22, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. MICHAEL W. SHEEHY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 9 AND APR. 14, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Michael W. Sheehy	4/09	4/11	United Kingdom	503	1,574.00					503	1,574.00
	4/11	4/13	Qatar	1,390			9,405.74			1,390	9,405.74
Committee total					1,574.00		9,405.74				10,979.74

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MICHAEL W. SHEEHY, May 9, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. CHRIS CONNELLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 18 AND APR. 22, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Chris Connelly	4/18	4/21	Austria		528.00						528.00
	4/21	4/22	Czech Republic		370.00						370.00
Committee total					898.00						898.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

——— May 4, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, REV. DANIEL P. COUGHLIN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 18 AND APR. 24, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Daniel P. Coughlin	4/18	4/22	Italy		738.00						738.00
	4/22	4/24	Germany		368.00						368.00
Committee total					1,106.00						1,106.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL P. COUGHLIN, May 4, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ITALY, SUDAN, SOUTH AFRICA, GHANA, LIBERIA AND CAPE VERDE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 16 AND FEB. 24, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00		(3)			183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00		(3)				288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38		(3)			4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00		(3)				119.00
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00		(3)			11,700	130.00
Hon. Joe Wilson	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00		(3)			183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00		(3)				288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38		(3)			4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00		(3)				119.00
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00		(3)			11,700	130.00
Hon. Jim Clyburn	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00		(3)			183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00		(3)				288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38		(3)			4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00		(3)				119.00
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00		(3)			11,700	130.00
Hon. Mel Watt	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00		(3)			183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00		(3)				288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38		(3)			4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00		(3)				119.00
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00		(3)			11,700	130.00
Hon. Maxine Waters	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00		(3)			183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00		(3)				288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38		(3)			4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00		(3)				119.00
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00		(3)			11,700	130.00
Hon. Carolyn Kilpatrick	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00		(3)			183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00		(3)				288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38		(3)			4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00		(3)				119.00
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00		(3)			11,700	130.00
Hon. George Miller	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00		(3)			183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00		(3)				288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38		(3)			4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00		(3)				119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia				(3)				
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00		(3)			11,700	130.00
Hon. Barbara Lee	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00		(3)			183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00		(3)				288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38		(3)			4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00		(3)				119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia				(3)				
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00		(3)			11,700	130.00
Hon. Jan Schakowsky	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00		(3)			183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00		(3)				288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38		(3)			4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00		(3)				119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia				(3)				
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00		(3)			11,700	130.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ITALY, SUDAN, SOUTH AFRICA, GHANA, LIBERIA AND CAPE VERDE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 16 AND FEB. 24, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Michael Capuano	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00		(3)			183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00		(3)				288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38		(3)			4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00		(3)				119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia				(3)				
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00		(3)			11,700	130.00
Hon. Donald Payne	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00		(3)			183.56	218.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38		(3)			4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00		(3)				119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia				(3)				
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00		(3)			11,700	130.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
Hon. Joe Wilson	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
Hon. Jim Clyburn	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
Hon. Mel Watt	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
Hon. Maxine Waters	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
Hon. Carolyn Kilpatrick	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
John Lawrence	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
Gregory Simpkins	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
Deborah Spriggs	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
Jennifer Crider	2/17	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
Michael Sheehy	2/18	2/18	Italy	183.56	218.00					183.56	218.00
	2/18	2/20	Sudan		288.00						288.00
	2/20	2/22	South Africa	4,660	766.38					4,660	766.38
	2/22	2/23	Ghana		119.00						119.00
	2/23	2/23	Liberia								
	2/23	2/24	Cape Verde	11,700	130.00					11,700	130.00
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

NANCY PELOSI, Chairman, Mar. 22, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NATO PARLIAMENTARIAN ASSEMBLY MEETING IN BRUSSELS, BELGIUM AND NATO P.A. MEETING WITH ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PARIS, FRANCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 17 AND FEB. 23, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Joel Hefley	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Hon. John Boozman	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Hon. Ben Chandler	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Hon. Jo Ann Emerson	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/22	France		469.00		3,381.41				5,930.41
Hon. Randy Forbes	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Hon. Paul Gillmor	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Hon. Dennis Moore	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Hon. Mike Ross	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Hon. John Tanner	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Hon. Ellen Tauscher	2/17	2/22	Belgium		2,600.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		3,242.05				5,842.05
Hon. Tom Udall	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Susan Olson	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Melissa Adamson	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Andrew Beck	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Kathy Becker	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Paul Gallis	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Debbie Gebhardt	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Kay King	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Fran Marcucci	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Patrick Prisco	2/17	2/20	Belgium		2,080.00		(3)				

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NATO PARLIAMENTARIAN ASSEMBLY MEETING IN BRUSSELS, BELGIUM AND NATO P.A. MEETING WITH ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PARIS, FRANCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 17 AND FEB. 23, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	2/21	2/23	France		938.00		(3)				3,018.00
Delegation Expenses:											
Representational Functions									4,071.96		4,071.96
Miscellaneous									1,279.50		1,279.50
Committee total					59,473.00		6,623.46		5,351.46		71,447.92

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

JOEL HEFLEY, Chairman, Mar. 28, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO EAST TIMOR AND INDONESIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 19 AND FEB. 24, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Jim Kolbe	2/19	2/22	Indonesia		1,093.00		(3)				1,093.00
Hon. Lois Capps	2/19	2/22	Indonesia		1,093.00		(3)				1,093.00
Hon. Adam Schiff	2/19	2/22	Indonesia		1,093.00		(3)				1,093.00
Hon. Allyson Schwartz	2/19	2/22	Indonesia		1,093.00		(3)				1,093.00
Hon. Robert Lawrence	2/19	2/22	Indonesia		1,093.00		(3)				1,093.00
Hon. Jim Kolbe	2/22	2/23	East Timor		193.40		(3)				193.40
Hon. Lois Capps	2/22	2/23	East Timor		193.40		(3)				193.40
Hon. Adam Schiff	2/22	2/23	East Timor		193.40		(3)				193.40
Hon. Allyson Schwartz	2/22	2/23	East Timor		193.40		(3)				193.40
Hon. Robert Lawrence	2/22	2/23	East Timor		265.40		(3)				265.40
Committee total											6,504.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Mar. 15, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO BELGIUM (BRUSSELS) AND AUSTRIA (VIENNA), HOUSE REPRESENTATIVES, EXPANDED BETWEEN FEB. 19 AND FEB 25, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings	2/19	2/22	Belgium	964.93	1,146.00					964.93	1,146.00
	2/22	2/25	Austria	442.46	528.00					442.46	528.00
Fred L. Turner	2/19	2/22	Belgium	964.93	1,146.00					964.93	1,146.00
	2/22	2/25	Austria	442.46	528.00					442.36	528.00
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Mar. 2, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO BRITISH AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY GROUP MEETINGS IN LONDON, ENGLAND, UNITED KINGDOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 23 AND FEB. 27, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Thomas E. Petri	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		2,112.00		3,586.50				5,698.50
Hon. Todd Akin	2/23	2/26	United Kingdom		1,653.80		559.58				2,213,38
Hon. John Boozman	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Hon. Ben Chandler	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Hon. Randy Forbes	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Hon. Paul Gillmor	2/23	2/26	United Kingdom		1,374.60		3,666.93				5,041.53
Hon. Joel Hefley	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Hon. Dennis Moore	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Hon. Mike Ross	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Hon. John Tanner	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Hon. Tom Udall	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Hon. Edward Whitfield	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		2,112.00		$7,253.43				9,365.43
Debra Gebhardt	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Melissa Adamson	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Kathy Becker	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Dr. Paul Gallis	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Dr. Kay King	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Fran Marcucci	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Susan Olson	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Patrick Prisco	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Andrew Beck	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,832.80		(3)				1,832.80
Representational									1,370.75		1,370.75
Committee total					38,410.00		15,066.44		1,370.75		54,847.19

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

THOMAS E. PETRI, Chairman, Mar. 27, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO UNITED ARAB EMIRATES AND AFGHANISTAN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 24 AND MAR. 1, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Robert Lawrence	2/25	2/25	UAE		424.21		2,238.06				2,662.27
Thomas Ross	2/24	2/25	UAE		424.21		3,397.00				3,821.21
Robert Lawrence	2/26	3/01	Afghanistan		360.00		3,080.19				3,440.19
Thomas Ross	2/26	3/01	Afghanistan		360.00		3,640.44				4,000.44
Committee total											13,924.11

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Mar. 15, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO VALLE DE BRAVO, MEXICO, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 2 AND MAR. 4, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Jim Kolbe	3/2	3/4	Mexico		600.71						600.71
Hon. Michael McCauil	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62						643.62
Hon. David Drier	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62						643.62
Hon. Donald A. Manzullo	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62						643.62
Hon. William D. Delahunt	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62						643.62
Hon. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	3/2	3/4	Mexico		600.71						600.71
Hon. Phil English	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62						643.62
Hon. Jerry Weller	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62				200.00		843.62
Hon. Susan Davis	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62						643.62
Hon. Luis Fortuno	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62						643.62
Patrick Baugh	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62						643.62
Eric Jacobstein	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62						643.62
Bar Forsyth	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62						643.62
Jim Farr	3/2	3/4	Mexico		600.70						600.70
Ted Brennan	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62						643.62
Linda Solomon	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62						643.62
Jean Carroll	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62						643.62
Brad Smith	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62						643.62
Jonathan Day	3/2	3/4	Mexico		643.62						643.62
Delegation expenses									3,879.38		3,879.38
Interpreters									3,552.00		3,552.00
Committee total				12,100.24					7,631.38		19,731.42

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JIM KOLBE, Chairman, Mar. 30, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO MOROCCO, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 20 AND MAR. 25, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Robert Lawrence	3/20	3/25	Morocco		1,490.00		6,024.32				7,514.32
Thomas Ross	3/20	3/25	Morocco		1,490.00		6,024.32				7,514.32
Committee total											15,028.64

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Mar. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GREECE, INDIA AND VIETNAM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 8 AND APR. 15, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Hon. Michael G. Oxley	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Hon. Frank D. Lucas	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Hon. Ray LaHood	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Hon. Paul Ryan	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Hon. Randy Neugebauer	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Hon. Dan Boren	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Hon. Bill Livingood	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Scott Palmer	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Ted Van Der Meid	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Margaret Peterlin	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Seth Webb	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Rachel Perry	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
John Russell	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Steve Stombres	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Martha Morrison	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Steve Rusnak	4/08	4/09	Greece		296.00		(3)				296.00
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Hon Michael G. Oxley	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Hon Frank D. Lucas	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Hon. Ray LaHood	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Hon. Paul Ryan	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GREECE, INDIA AND VIETNAM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 8 AND APR. 15, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Randy Neugebauer	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Hon. Dan Boren	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Hon. Bill Livingood	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Scott Palmer	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Ted Van Der Meid	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Margaret Peterlin	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Seth Webb	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Rachel Perry	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
John Russell	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Steve Stombres	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Martha Morrison	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Steve Rusnak	4/09	4/12	India		1,293.20		(3)				1,293.20
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Michael G. Oxley	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Frank D. Lucas	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Ray LaHood	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Paul Ryan	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Randy Neugebauer	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Dan Boren	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Hon. Bill Livingood	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Scott Palmer	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Ted Van Der Meid	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Margeret Peterlin	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Seth Webb	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Rachel Perry	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
John Russell	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Steve Stombres	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Martha Morrison	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Steven Rusnak	4/12	4/15	Vietnam		821.00		(3)				821.00
Committee total											43,383.60

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Janice Helwig		1/10	United States				5,000.54				5,000.54
	1/11	3/31	Austria		20,556.00						20,556.00
	1/31	2/03	Albania		792.00		1,138.87				1,930.87
Committee total					21,348.00		6,139.41				27,487.41

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan				(3)				
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq				(3)				
	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00
Hon. Jean Schmidt	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan				(3)				
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq				(3)				
	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00
Hon. Stephanie Herseth	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan				(3)				
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq				(3)				
	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00
Hon. David Scott	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan				(3)				
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq				(3)				
	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00
Hon. Frank Lucas	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan				(3)				
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq				(3)				
	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00
Hon. Jerry Moran	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan		—		(3)				—
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq		—		(3)				—
	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Josh Maxwell	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan		—		(3)				—
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq		—		(3)				—
	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00
John Haugen	1/9	1/11	Bulgaria		542.00		(3)				542.00
	1/11	1/12	Pakistan		313.00		(3)				313.00
	1/12	1/12	Afghanistan		—		(3)				—
	1/12	1/15	Kuwait		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq		—		(3)				—
	1/15	1/16	Spain		417.00		(3)				417.00
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	2/17	2/21	France		1,812.00		(3)				1,812.00
	2/21	2/21	Belgium		—		(3)				—
	2/21	2/22	Estonia		242.00		(3)				242.00
	2/22	2/24	Latvia		534.00		(3)				534.00
	2/24	2/26	Poland		544.00		(3)				544.00
Hon. Collin Peterson	2/17	2/19	France		906.00		(3)				906.00
	2/19	2/21	Belgium		—		764.00				764.00
	2/21	2/22	Estonia		242.00		(3)				242.00
	2/22	2/24	Latvia		534.00		(3)				534.00
	2/24	2/26	Poland		544.00		(3)				544.00
Hon. Mike McIntyre	2/17	2/21	France		1,812.00		(3)				1,812.00
	2/21	2/21	Belgium		—		(3)				(3)
	2/21	2/22	Estonia		242.00		(3)				242.00
	2/22	2/24	Latvia		534.00		(3)				534.00
	2/24	2/26	Poland		544.00		(3)				544.00
Josh Maxwell	2/17	2/21	France		1,812.00		(3)				1,812.00
	2/21	2/21	Belgium				(3)				
	2/21	2/22	Estonia		242.00		(3)				242.00
	2/22	2/24	Latvia		534.00		(3)				534.00
	2/24	2/26	Poland		544.00		(3)				544.00
Shelley Husband	2/17	2/21	France		1,812.00		(3)				1,812.00
	2/21	2/21	Belgium				(3)				
	2/21	2/22	Estonia		242.00		(3)				242.00
	2/22	2/24	Latvia		534.00		(3)				534.00
	2/24	2/26	Poland		544.00		(3)				544.00
Hon. Steve King	2/19	2/23	Brazil		506.00		(3)				506.00
	2/23	2/26	Argentina		517.00		(3)				517.00
Hon. Collin Peterson	2/19	2/23	Brazil		506.00		(3)				506.00
	2/23	2/26	Argentina		517.00		(3)				517.00
Committee total					36,720		764.00				37,484.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, Apr. 26, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Mike Ringler	1/9	1/13	New Zealand		1,100.15						1,100.15
	1/13	1/17	Antarctica								
	1/17	1/22	New Zealand		1,474.69						1,474.69
Commercial airfare							7,598.26				7,598.26
Misc. transportation costs							20.00				20.00
John Scofield	1/09	1/13	New Zealand		1,100.15						1,100.15
	1/13	1/17	Antarctica								
	1/17	1/22	New Zealand		1,474.69						1,474.69
Commercial airfare							7,626.26				7,626.26
Ann Marie Goldsmith	1/09	1/13	New Zealand		1,100.15						1,100.15
	1/13	1/17	Antarctica								
	1/17	1/22	New Zealand		1,474.69						1,474.69
Commercial airfare							7,626.26				7,626.26
Michelle Burkett	1/09	1/13	New Zealand		1,100.15						1,100.15
	1/13	1/17	Antarctica								
	1/17	1/22	New Zealand		1,474.69						1,474.69
Commerical airfare							7,626.26				7,626.26
Hon. Jim Kolbe	1/02	1/04	Senegal		647.00						647.00
	1/04	1/06	Benin		455.97						455.97
	1/06	1/09	Sudan		358.00						358.00
	1/09	1/11	Uganda		900.00						900.00
	1/11	1/13	Ireland		893.72						893.72
Commerical airfare							5,458.73				5,458.73
Misc. embassy costs									4,159.47		4,159.47
Hon. Denny Rehberg	1/02	1/04	Senegal		647.00						647.00
	1/04	1/06	Benin		455.97						455.97
	1/06	1/09	Sudan		358.00						358.00
	1/09	1/11	Uganda		900.00						900.00
	1/11	1/13	Ireland		893.72						893.72
Commerical airfare							5,458.73				5,458.73
Misc. embassy costs									4,159.47		4,159.47
Rob Blair	1/02	1/04	Senegal		647.00						647.00
	1/04	1/06	Benin		455.97						455.97
	1/06	1/09	Sudan		358.00						358.00
	1/09	1/11	Uganda		900.00						900.00
	1/11	1/13	Ireland		893.72						893.72
Commerical airfare							5,458.73				5,458.73
Misc. embassy costs									4,159.47		4,159.47
Loretta Beaumont	1/10	1/20	Congo (Brazzaville)		1,240.00						1,240.00
							13,740.63				13,740.63
Hon. Dave Weldon	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/29	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/29	12/29	Iraq								
	12/30	12/30	Kuwait								
	12/30	12/31	Pakistan		804.00						804.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	12/31	1/02	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/02	1/03	Pakistan		178.00						178.00
	1/03	1/04	Ireland		315.81						315.81
									79.85		79.85
Chris Topik	1/19	1/23	Samoa		512.33						512.33
	1/23	1/26	Fiji		738.00						738.00
Hon. Frank Wolf	1/14	1/17	Egypt		867.00						867.00
	1/17	1/19	Lebanon								
	1/19	1/20	France		375.54						375.54
Return of unused per diem					−257.00						−257.00
Paul Terry	1/10	1/12	Kuwait		812.00						812.00
	1/12	1/17	Qatar		1,169.00						1,169.00
							9,856.95				9,856.95
Hon. Harold Rogers	1/18	1/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
Hon. Martin Sabo	1/18	1/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
Hon. Tom Latham	1/18	1/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
Hon. David Price	1/18	1/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
Ben Nicholson	1/18	1/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
							1,663.00				1,663.00
Beverly Pheto	1/18	1/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
							1,663.00				1,663.00
Hon. Bud Cramer	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.00						834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.00						268.00
John Shank	1/16	1/16	United States		78.00						78.00
	1/17	1/19	Korea		716.00						716.00
	1/19	1/22	Japan		1,224.00						1,224.00
Commerical airfare							2,868.86				2,868.86
David Morrison	1/16	1/16	United States		78.00						78.00
	1/17	1/17	Korea		716.00						716.00
	1/19	1/22	Japan		1,224.00						1,224.00
Commerical airfare							2,819.26				2,819.26
Hon. Jim Kolbe	1/24	1/29	Switzerland		1,860.00						1,860.00
Commerical airfare							3,008.16				3,008.16
Gregory Lankler	1/30	2/1	Qatar		669.14						669.14
	2/1	2/2	Iraq		156.00						156.00
	2/2	2/3	Qatar		312.00						312.00
Commerical airfare							7,417.08				7,417.08
Hon. John T. Doolittle	2/3	2/3	United Kingdom		440.00						440.00
	2/4	2/5	Iraq								
	2/5	2/6	Israel		362.00						362.00
	2/6	2/7	Italy		363.00						363.00
Commercial airfare							3,328.00				3,328.00
Hon. Nita Lowey	2/18	2/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
	2/21	2/22	Ecuador		256.00						256.00
	2/21	2/25	Bolivia		494.99						494.99
Misc. embassy costs									2,007.47		1,532.47
Commercial airfare							4,982.50				4,982.50
Nisha Desai	2/18	2/21	Colombia		702.00						702.00
	2/21	2/22	Ecuador		256.00						256.00
	2/21	2/25	Bolivia		494.99						494.99
Misc. embassy costs									2,007.47		1,532.46
Commercial airfare							3,672.00				3,672.00
Hon. Jim Kolbe	3/12	3/13	France		921.00						921.00
							6,680.00				6,680.00
Craig Higgins	3/12	3/13	France		921.00						921.00
										26.00	26.00
							6,680.00				6,680.00
Carol Murphy	3/20	3/21	Greece		178.00						178.00
	3/21	3/22	Tunisia		215.00						215.00
	3/22	3/24	Italy		1,269.00						1,269.00
							6,115.08				6,115.08
Tim Peterson	3/20	3/21	Greece		178.00						178.00
	3/21	3/22	Tunisia		215.00						215.00
	3/22	3/24	Italy		1,269.00						1,269.00
							6,058.08				6,058.08
Walter Hearne	3/20	3/21	Greece		178.00						178.00
	3/21	3/22	Tunisia		215.00						215.00
	3/22	3/24	Italy		1,269.00						1,269.00
							6,058.08				6,058.08
Hon. Mark Steven Kirk	3/24	3/25	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	3/25	3/26	Iraq								
	3/26	3/27	Jordan		273.00						273.00
Committee total					51,925.63		133,483.91		16,599.19		202,008.73

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JERRY LEWIS, Chairman, Apr. 27, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATION STAFF), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 2006.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Marilyn J. Harris	2/22	2/24	Germany		737.50		7,987.32		88.12		8,812.94
	2/25	2/26	Sierra Leone		434.00				319.00		753.00
	2/27	3/1	Senegal		561.00				12.14		753.00
Scott J. Kish	2/22	2/24	Germany		737.50		7,987.32		104.22		8,829.04
	2/25	2/26	Sierra Leone		434.00				319.00		753.00
	2/27	3/1	Senegal		561.00				28.24		589.24
Robert H. Pearre	2/22	2/24	Germany		737.50		8,027.32		85.26		8,850.08
	2/25	2/26	Sierra Leone		434.00				319.00		753.00
	2/27	3/1	Senegal		561.00				100.16		661.16
Jennifer L. Rinaca	2/22	2/25	Italy		429.50		9,453.53		30.01		9,912.54
	2/25	3/1	Ethiopia		990.25				23.63		1,013.88
George Salvatierra	2/22	2/25	Italy		429.00		9,453.53		786.61		10,669.14
	2/25	3/1	Ethiopia		990.25				90.79		1,081.04
H.C. Young	2/22	2/25	Italy		429.00		9,903.53		17.29		10,349.82
	2/25	3/1	Ethiopia		990.25				89.90		1,081.15

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATION STAFF), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 2006.—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Committee total					9,455.25		52,812.55		2,413.37		64,681.17

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JERRY LEWIS, Chairman, Apr. 5, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Germany, Ireland With CODEL Porter, December 26, 2005–January 2, 2006:											
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/28	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/28	12/29	Iraq								
	12/30	1/2	Pakistan		982.00						982.00
	12/31	1/1	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/2	1/3	Ireland		320.00						320.00
Josh Holly	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/30	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/28	12/29	Iraq								
	12/30	1/1	Pakistan		982.00						982.00
	12/31	1/1	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/2	1/3	Ireland		320.00						320.00
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, Germany, January 8–13, 2006:											
Hon. Rob Simmons	1/9	1/12	Kuwait		1,218.00						1,218.00
	1/10	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/13	Germany		137.00						137.00
Hon. Jeb Bradley	1/9	1/12	Kuwait		1,218.00						1,218.00
	1/10	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/13	Germany		137.00						137.00
Hon. Neil Abercrombie	1/9	1/12	Kuwait		1,218.00						1,218.00
	1/10	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/13	Germany		304.00						304.00
Hon. John Spratt	1/9	1/12	Kuwait		861.00						861.00
	1/10	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/13	Germany		57.00						57.00
Steven DeTeresa	1/9	1/12	Kuwait		1,218.00						1,218.00
	1/10	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/13	Germany		137.00						137.00
Mark Lewis	1/9	1/12	Kuwait		1,218.00						1,218.00
	1/10	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/13	Germany		137.00						137.00
Delegation expenses	1/9	1/12	Kuwait				496.50		3,860.61		4,357.11
Visit to Switzerland, Poland, Romania, Kosovo, Morocco With CODEL Duncan, January 16–26, 2006:											
Hon. Jeff Miller	1/17	1/19	Switzerland		455.70						455.70
	1/19	1/21	Poland		320.00						320.00
	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00						834.00
	1/22	1/22	Kosovo								
	1/24	1/26	Morocco		296.00						296.00
Hon. Solomon Ortiz	1/17	1/19	Switzerland		455.70						455.70
	1/19	1/21	Poland		320.00						320.00
	1/22	1/22	Kosovo								
	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00						834.00
	1/24	1/26	Morocco		296.00						296.00
Visit to the Republic of Korea, January 21–28, 2006:											
Hon. Lane Evans	1/22	1/28	Republic of Korea		2,148.00						2,148.00
Commercial airfare							4,914.00				4,914.49
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, Germany, January 26–30, 2006:											
Hon. Duncan Hunter	1/27	1/28	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	1/28	1/29	Iraq								
	1/29	1/30	Germany		137.00						137.00
Heath Bope	1/27	1/28	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	1/28	1/29	Iraq								
	1/29	1/30	Germany		137.00						137.00
Andrew Hunter	1/27	1/28	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	1/28	1/29	Iraq								
	1/29	1/30	Germany		137.00						137.00
Delegation Expenses	1/27	1/28	Kuwait				134.94		1,329.38		1,464.32
Visit to Germany With CODEL McCain, February 2–5, 2006:											
Hon. Joe Schwarz	2/3	2/5	Germany		127.00						127.00
Hon. Ellen Tauscher	2/3	2/5	Germany		348.00						348.00
Hon. Mark Udall	2/3	2/5	Germany		348.00						348.00
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, February 14–20, 2006:											
Alexis Lasselle	2/15	2/16	Kuwait		356.00						356.00
	2/16	2/17	Iraq								
	2/17	2/20	Kuwait		1,068.00						1,068.00
Commercial airfare							7,495.17				7,495.17
Paul Arcangeli	2/15	2/16	Kuwait		356.00						356.00
	2/16	2/17	Iraq								
	2/17	2/20	Kuwait		1,068.00						1,068.00
Commercial airfare							7,495.17				7,495.17
Jesse Tolleson	2/15	2/16	Kuwait		356.00						356.00
	2/16	2/17	Iraq								
	2/17	2/20	Kuwait		1,068.00						1,068.00
Commercial airfare							7,475.17				7,475.17
Delegation Expenses	2/14	2/20	Kuwait				11.96		38.01		49.97
Visit to Taiwan, February 18–23, 2006:											
Hon. Rob Simmons	2/20	2/22	Taiwan		690.00						690.00
Commercial airfare							5,063.86				5,063.86
Delegation Expenses	2/20	2/22	Taiwan						516.28		516.28
Visit to South Korea, Japan, China, March 21–27, 2006:											
Hon. Roscoe Bartlett	3/23	3/24	Japan		319.00						319.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	3/24	3/25	South Korea		295.00						295.00
	3/25	3/25	China								
Hon. Gene Taylor	3/23	3/24	Japan		319.00						319.00
	3/24	3/25	South Korea		295.00						295.00
	3/25	3/25	China								
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	3/23	3/24	Japan		319.00						319.00
	3/24	3/25	South Korea		295.00						295.00
	3/25	3/25	China								
Douglas Lane	3/23	3/24	Japan		319.00						319.00
	3/24	3/25	South Korea		295.00						295.00
	3/25	3/25	China								
Andrew Hunter	3/23	3/24	Japan		319.00						319.00
	3/24	3/25	South Korea		295.00						295.00
	3/25	3/25	China								
Visit to Bosnia, Italy, March 18–26, 2006:											
Hon. Loretta Sanchez	3/19	3/20	Bosnia		220.00						220.00
	3/21	3/25	Italy		1,160.00						1,160.00
Commercial airfare							8,072.92				8,072.92
Visit to Kuwait, Iraq, Jordan, With CODEL McCain, March 23–27, 2006:											
Hon. Joe Schwarz	3/23	3/25	Kuwait		146.00						146.00
	3/25	3/26	Iraq								
	3/26	3/27	Jordan		269.00						269.00
Committee total					31,066.40		41,160.18		5,744.28		77,970.86

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DUNCAN HUNTER, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Harold Ford	1/6	1/8	Jordan, Iraq, Kuwait		758.00		3,638.48				4,396.48
	1/9	1/11	Pakistan, Afghanistan		716.00		2,275.74				2,991.74
Hon. Chris Chocola	1/9	1/12	Kuwait, Iraq		1,218.00		(3)				1,218.00
	1/12	1/13	Germany		137.00		(3)				137.00
Committee total					2,829.00		5,914.22				8,743.22

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

JIM NUSSLE, Chairman, Apr. 27, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. John Shimkus	3/17	3/20	Belarus		968.58		6576.57		397.78		7942.93
Committee total					968.58		6576.57		397.78		7942.93

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

———Apr. 11, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Cliff Stearns	1/17	1/19	Switzerland		356.00						356.00
	1/19	1/21	Poland		320.00						320.00
	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00						834.00
	1/24	1/26	Morocco		296.00						296.00
Hon. John Shadegg	3/17	3/18	Middle East		273.00		9,407.41				9,680.41
	3/19	3/20	Middle East		156.00						156.00
	3/20	3/21	Middle East		309.00						309.00
	3/22	3/24	Middle East		852.00						852.00
Hon. Marsha Blackburn	1/1	1/3	Iraq		838.00		7,026.07				7,864.07
Hon. Tim Murphy	1/16	1/17	Ireland		692.00						692.00
	1/17	1/18	Northern Ireland		361.00						361.00
	1/18	1/19	England		542.00						542.00
Hon. Edward J. Markey	1/15	1/27	Switzerland		570.00		7,332.57		(190.00)		7,712.57
Hon. John Shimkus	3/17	3/20	Belarus		968.58		6,576.57		397.78		7,942.93
Committee total					7,367.58		30,342.62		207.78		37,917.98

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOE BARTON, Chairman, May 5, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Michael G. Fitzpatrick	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00	(3)					304.00
	12/28	12/30	Kuwait		788.00	(3)					788.00
	12/30	1/2	Pakistan		982.00	(3)					982.00
	1/2	1/3	Afghanistan		90.00	(3)					90.00
	1/3	1/4	Ireland		320.00	(3)					320.00
Hon. Jim Gerlach	1/20	1/21	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	1/22	1/23	Qatar		347.00	(3)					347.00
	1/24	1/25	United Arab Emirates		313.76		7,240.33				7,554.09
Hon. Barney Frank	1/25	1/30	Switzerland		1,681.00		6,368.64				8,049.64
Hon. Maxine Waters	3/20	3/20	Haiti				1,507.00				1,507.00
Committee total					5,231.76		15,115.97				20,347.73

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Stephen Lynch	1/20	1/21	Kuwait		406.00		6,895.43				7,301.43
	1/22	1/23	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	1/24	1/25	United Arab Emirates		313.76						313.76
Hon. Todd Platts	1/20	1/21	Kuwait		406.00		7,240.33				7,646.33
	1/22	1/23	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	1/24	1/25	United Arab Emirates		313.76						313.76
Hon. Christopher Shays	2/3	2/3	United Kingdom		440.00		3,328.00				3,768.00
	2/5	2/6	Israel		362.00						362.00
	2/6	2/7	Italy		363.00						363.00
Nick Palarino	2/3	2/3	United Kingdom		440.00		3,328.00				3,768.00
	2/5	2/6	Israel		362.00						362.00
	2/6	2/7	Italy		363.00						363.00
Jeff Baran	2/3	2/3	United Kingdom		440.00		3,328.00				3,768.00
	2/5	2/6	Israel		362.00						362.00
	2/6	2/7	Italy		363.00						363.00
James Kaiser	2/22	2/26	Columbia		650.00		1,067.00				1,717.00
Dennis Kilcoyne	2/22	2/26	Columbia		566.00		1,067.00				1,633.00
Hon. Darrell Issa	3/19	3/23	Brazil		506.00						506.00
	3/23	3/26	Argentina		318.00						318.00
Laurent Crenshaw	3/19	3/23	Brazil		506.00						506.00
	3/23	3/26	Argentina		318.00						318.00
Hon. Mark Souder	2/22	2/26	Colombia		936.00		2,761.00				3,697.00
Hon. William Lacy Clay	3/30	3/31	Jamaica		234.00						234.00
Marc Wheat	2/22	2/26	Colombia		936.00		1,067				2,003.00
Hon. Mark Souder	3/16	3/17	Jordan		186.00		7,400.49				7,586.49
	3/19	3/20	Qatar		347.00		1,067				347.00
	3/20	3/22	Pakistan		309.00						309.00
	3/22	3/24	Dubai		426.00						426.00
Committee total					11,866.52		37,482.25				49,348.77

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

TOM DAVIS, Chairman, Apr. 25, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Peter T. King	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,141.00		(3)				2,249.00
	1/11	1/12	Italy		517.00		(3)				
	1/12	1/14	Spain		591.00		(3)				
Hon. Mike Rogers	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,141.00		(3)				2,249.00
	1/11	1/12	Italy		517.00		(3)				
	1/12	1/14	Spain		591.00		(3)				
Hon. William Pascrel	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,141.00		(3)				2,249.00
	1/11	1/12	Italy		517.00		(3)				
	1/12	1/14	Spain		591.00		(3)				
Hon. Michael McCaul	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,141.00		(3)				2,249.00
	1/11	1/12	Italy		517.00		(3)				
	1/12	1/14	Spain		591.00		(3)				
Hon. Donna Christensen	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,141.00		(3)				2,249.00
	1/11	1/12	Italy		517.00		(3)				
	1/12	1/14	Spain		591.00		(3)				
Robert O'Connor	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,320.00		(4) 7,307.57				9,735.57
	1/11	1/12	Italy		517.00						
	1/12	1/14	Spain		591.00						
Thomas Finan	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,320.00		(4) 7,352.64				9,780.64
	1/11	1/12	Italy		517.00						
	1/12	1/14	Spain		591.00						
Margaret Peterlin	1/9	1/11	United Kingdom		1,320.00		(4) 6,996.14				9,350.14
	1/11	1/13	Italy		1,034.00						
Hon. Sheila Jackson-Lee	3/30	3/31	Jamaica		273.00		(3)				273.00
Committee total					18,728.00		21,656.35				40,384.35

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] Commercial air transportation.

PETER T. KING, Chairman, Apr. 18, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 31 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Gary Ackerman	1/4	1/11	Israel		2,490.00		7,450.85				9,940.85
David Adams	1/4	1/11	Israel		2,490.00		6,358.20				8,848.20
Douglas Anderson	1/5	1/6	Singapore		210.00						210.00
	1/6	1/12	Indonesia		1,271.00						1,271.00
Round trip airfare	1/5	1/12					7,610.00				7,610.00
	3/18	3/20	South Korea		650.00						650.00
	3/20	3/24	Mongolia		474.00						474.00
	3/24	3/25	China		241.00						241.00
Round trip airfare	3/18	3/25					6,538.90				6,538.90
Hon. Gresham Barrett	1/9	1/12	Kuwait		1,218.00						1,218.00
	1/12	1/13	Germany		304.00		(3)				304.00
Mike Beard	1/2	1/5	Morocco		1,280.00						1,280.00
	1/5	1/7	Libya		788.00						788.00
	1/7	1/8	Jordan		254.00						254.00
	1/8	1/12	Israel		1,448.00						1,448.00
	1/12	1/19	Hungary		1,876.00						1,876.00
Round trip airfare	1/1	1/20					9,519.06				9,519.06
Hon. Howard Berman	2/16	2/18	Greece		688.00						688.00
	2/18	2/23	Egypt		867.00						867.00
	2/23	2/28	Israel		1,834.00						1,834.00
Round trip airfare	2/16	2/28					6,284.17				6,284.17
Ted Brennan	1/22	1/24	Ecuador		327.00						327.00
	1/24	1/27	Bolivia		345.00						345.00
Round trip airfare	1/22	1/27					3,316.00				3,316.00
	2/5	2/8	Haiti		256.00		1,027.00				1,283.00
	3/20	3/22	El Salvador		382.00		1,349.00				1,731.00
	3/30	3/31	Jamaica		43.00		(3)				43.00
Edward Burrier	1/8	1/11	Austria		804.00						804.00
	1/11	1/14	France		1,209.00						1,209.00
Round trip airfare	1/8	1/14					7,243.23				7,243.23
Hon. Dan Burton	1/8	1/10	Guatemala		502.00				(4) 1,227.66		1,729.66
	1/10	1/12	Costa Rica		442.00				(4) 3,944.13		4,386.13
	1/12	1/13	Panama		236.00						236.00
Round trip airfare	1/8	1/13					1,842.54				1,842.54
Hon. Russ Carnahan	3/19	3/23	Brazil		392.00						392.00
	3/23	3/26	Argentina		337.00		(3)				337.00
Vladimir Cerga	1/9	1/14	Georgia		1,260.00						1,260.00
	1/14	1/20	Macedonia		1,315.00						1,315.00
Round trip airfare	1/9	1/20					7,956.66				7,956.66
Hon. Steve Chabot	1/16	1/19	Colombia		2,148.15		1,551.99				3,700.14
Hon. Ben Chandler	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40						834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.00		(3)				268.00
Hon. Joseph Crowley	2/18	2/21	India		1,332.00						1,332.00
	2/21	2/23	Bangladesh		482.00		1,386.00				1,868.00
Round trip airfare	2/18	2/23					7,789.28				7,789.28
Hon. Eliot Engel	1/7	1/13	Israel		2,172.00		3,401.84				5,573.84
	1/25	1/27	Kosovo		459.00		6,175.97		1,217.33		7,852.30
Barbara Fleck	1/8	1/10	Guatemala		502.00						502.00
	1/10	1/12	Costa Rica		442.00						442.00
	1/12	1/13	Panama		36.00						36.00
Round trip airfare	1/8	1/13					2,018.84				2,018.84
Bart Forsyth	1/16	1/19	Colombia		786.00		1,522.99				2,308.99
Kirsti Garlock	3/20	3/23	China		825.00		8,968.18				9,793.18
Dan Getz	1/22	1/24	Ecuador		327.00						327.00
	1/24	1/27	Bolivia		338.10						338.10
Round trip airfare	1/22	1/27					3,408.00				3,408.00
	2/19	2/23	Indonesia		522.00						522.00
	2/23	2/24	East Timor		115.00		(3)				115.00
Kristen Gilley	1/22	1/24	Ecuador		327.00						327.00
	1/24	1/27	Bolivia		345.00						345.00
Round trip airfare	1/22	1/27					3,408.00				3,408.00
	3/20	3/23	China		873.00		9,281.18				10,154.18
Dennis Halpin	2/18	2/21	Taiwan		885.00						885.00
	2/21	2/24	China		629.00						629.00
	2/24	2/26	Hong Kong		784.00						784.00
Round trip airfare	2/18	2/26					7,517.24				7,517.24
Hon. Katherine Harris	2/3	2/4	United Kingdom		440.00						440.00
	2/4	2/5	Iraq								
	2/5	2/6	Israel		362.00						362.00
	2/6	2/7	Italy		363.00		(3)				363.00
Hon. Darrell Issa	3/30	3/31	Jamaica		143.00		(3)				143.00
Nurjadi Jasin	2/20	2/21	Indonesia		283.62						283.62
	2/21	2/25	East Timor		484.64						484.64
Round trip airfare	2/20	2/25					730.00				730.00
Jonathan Katz	1/9	1/11	Romania		1,668.00		7,308.59				8,976.59
	2/22	2/23	Austria		318.00						318.00
	2/23	2/24	Belgium		382.00						382.00
Round trip airfare	2/22	2/24					5,710.15				5,710.15
	3/22	3/24	Netherlands		294.28		6,245.12				6,539.40
Kenneth Katzman	2/24	2/26	United Arab Emirates		426.00						426.00
	2/26	3/2	Afghanistan		360.00						360.00
Round trip airfare	2/24	3/2					7,037.00				7,037.00
David Killion	1/3	1/4	United Arab Emirates		382.37						382.37
	1/4	1/7	Afghanistan		120.00						120.00
	1/7	1/8	Qatar		283.59						283.59
	1/8	1/11	Belgium		664.00						664.00
Round trip airfare	1/3	1/11					8,625.31				8,625.31
Robert King	1/2	1/5	Morocco		1,280.00						1,280.00
	1/5	1/8	Libya		1,182.00						1,182.00
Round trip airfare	1/2	1/8					6,165.93				6,165.93
Hon. Tom Lantos	1/1	1/2	United Kingdom		440.00						440.00
	1/2	1/5	Morocco		444.00						444.00
	1/5	1/7	Libya		788.00						788.00
	1/7	1/8	Jordan		254.00						254.00
	1/8	1/12	Israel		362.00				4 3,030.32		3,392.32
	1/12	1/18	Hungary		854.00				4 1,000.00		1,854.00
Round trip airfare	1/1	1/22					9,519.060				9,519.06
Hon. Barbara Lee	1/2	1/8	Grenada		561.00		1,488.31		4 979.00		3,028.31
John Lis	1/23	1/27	Lebanon		468.00						468.00
	1/27	1/28	France		453.00						453.00
Round trip airfare	1/23	1/28					6,839.69				6,839.69
	2/19	2/23	Indonesia		1,100.00						1,100.00
	2/23	2/25	East Timor		230.00		(3)				230.00
	2/25	2/26	United Arab Emirates		426.00						426.00
	2/26	3/2	Afghanistan		360.00				4 244.00		604.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 31 AND MAR. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Round trip airfare	2/25	3/2					5,470.50				5,470.50
	3/20	3/25	Morocco		1,490.00		6,024.32				7,514.32
Don MacDonald	1/8	1/11	Austria		684.00						684.00
	1/11	1/14	France		1,169.00						1,169.00
Round trip airfare	1/8	1/14					7,263.23				7,263.23
Greg McCarthy	1/3	1/4	United Arab Emirates		382.37						382.37
	1/4	1/7	Afghanistan		120.00						120.00
	1/7	1/8	Qatar		283.59						283.59
	1/8	1/11	Belgium		664.00						664.00
Round trip airfare	1/3	1/11					8,625.31				8,625.31
James McCormick	3/19	3/23	China		873.00		9,281.18				10,154.18
Hon. Betty McCollum	1/2	1/4	Senegal		647.00						647.00
	1/4	1/6	Benin		130.00						130.00
	1/6	1/8	Sudan		41.00						41.00
	1/8	1/11	Uganda		1,092.00						1,092.00
	1/11	1/12	Ireland		729.00		(3)				729.00
Hon. Thaddeus McCotter	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/29	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/29	12/30	Iraq								
	12/30	12/31	Pakistan		804.00						804.00
	12/31	1/2	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/2	1/3	Pakistan		178.00		(3)				178.00
Mary McDermott Noonan	2/20	2/21	Ireland		332.00						332.00
	2/21	2/23	United Kingdom		582.00						582.00
Round trip airfare	2/20	2/23					5,377.30				5,377.30
John Mackey	1/9	1/13	Argentina		912.00		4,150.50				5,062.50
	1/16	1/21	Colombia		1,220.00						1,220.00
	1/21	1/24	Ecuador		618.00						618.00
Round trip airfare	1/16	1/24					1,848.15				1,848.15
	3/20	3/22	El Salvador		382.00		1,329.00				1,711.00
	3/26	3/28	Colombia		500.00		1,587.81				2,087.81
Alan Makovsky	1/1	1/2	United Kingdom		440.00						440.00
	1/2	1/5	Morocco		444.00						444.00
	1/5	1/9	Libya		1,576.00						1,576.00
	1/9	1/10	Germany		308.00						308.00
	1/9	1/13	Israel		1,448.00						1,448.00
Round trip airfare	1/1	1/13					8,055.00				8,055.00
Pearl-Alice Marsh	3/19	3/23	Belgium		1,117.00		3,165.00				4,282.00
Hon. Gregory Meeks	3/30	3/31	Jamaica		143.00		(3)				143.00
Richard Mereu	2/20	2/21	Ireland		397.00						397.00
	2/21	2/23	United Kingdom		595.50						595.50
Round trip airfare	2/20	2/23					5,445.35				5,445.35
Carol Migdalovitz	3/20	3/25	Morocco		1,490.00		6,024.32				7,514.32
Francis Miko	1/23	1/27	Lebanon		468.00						468.00
	1/27	1/28	France		453.00						453.00
Round trip airfare	1/23	1/28					6,913.69				6,913.69
	2/24	2/26	United Arab Emirates		426.00						426.00
	2/26	3/2	Afghanistan		360.00						360.00
Round trip airfare	2/24	3/2					7,917.44				7,917.44
	3/20	3/25	Morocco		1,490.00		6,024.32				7,514.32
Paul Oostburg Sanz	1/10	1/13	Argentina		520.00		8,947.50				9,467.50
	1/25	1/27	Bolivia		218.00		2,360.00				2,578.00
	2/5	2/8	Haiti		236.00		1,027.00				1,263.00
Hon. Donald Payne	2/19	2/20	Kenya		280.00		4,114.25				4,394.25
Alfred Prados	1/23	1/27	Lebanon		468.00						468.00
	1/27	1/28	France		453.00						453.00
Round trip airfare	1/23	1/28					6,839.39				6,839.39
Beverly Razon	1/22	1/26	Belgium		1,274.00		6,512.90				7,786.90
Sheri Rickert	1/4	1/8	Uganda				1,416.00		8,821.00		9,237.00
	2/20	2/22	Ethiopia		109.00						109.00
	2/22	2/25	Ghanha		435.00						435.00
Round trip airfare	2/20	2/25					8,592.00				8,592.00
Gregg Rickman	1/3	1/4	United Arab Emirates		382.37						382.37
	1/4	1/7	Afghanistan		120.00				[4]162.00		282.00
	1/7	1/8	Qatar		283.59				[4]162.00		282.00
	1/8	1/11	Belgium		664.00						664.00
Round trip airfare	1/3	1/11					8,625.31				8,625.31
William Robinson	3/19	3/25	Georgia		1,560.00		7,937.18				9,497.18
Robin Roizman	2/18	2/21	India		878.00						878.00
	2/21	2/23	Bangladesh		393.50						393.50
Round trip airfare	2/18	2/21					8,934.28				8,934.28
Hon, Illeana Ros-Lehtinen	1/20	1/21	Kuwait		406.00				[4]1,964.28		2,370.28
	1/21	1/23	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	1/23	1/25	UnitedArab Emirates		313.76		(3)				313.76
Hon. Adam Schiff	2/19	2/23	Indonesia		532.61		(3)				532.61
Thomas Sheehy	1/8	1/11	Austria		804.00						804.00
	1/11	1/14	France		1,209.00						1,209.00
Round trip airfare	1/8	1/14					7,243.23				7,243.23
Gregory Simpkins	1/4	1/8	Uganda		1,416.00		7,821.00				9,237.00
Hon. Christopher Smith	1/4	1/8	Uganda		1,416.00		7,821.00				9,237.00
Cliff Stammerman	1/3	1/4	UnitedArab Emiorates		382.37						382.37
	1/4	1/7	Afghanistan		120.00						120.00
Round trip airfare	1/3	1/8					8,319.22				8,319.22
Sam Stratman	1/20	1/21	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	1/21	1/23	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	1/23	1/25	United Arab Emirates		313.76		(3)				313.76
William Tucherello	2/20	2/21	Indonesia		157.93						157.93
	2/21	1/25	East Timor		273.43		(3)				273.43
Mark Walker	1/8	1/10	Guatemala		502.00						502.00
	1/10	1/12	Costa Rica		442.00						442.00
	1/12	1/13	Panama		236.00						236.00
Round trip airfare	1/8	1/13					2,072.84				2,072.84
	1/25	1/27	Bolivia		236.00		3,089.00				3,325.00
Hon. Diane Watson	3/30	3/31	Jamaica		143.00		(3)				143.00
Hon. Robert Wexler	1/9	1/11	Romania		1,668.00		7,308.59				8,976.59
	2/22	2/23	Austria		318.00						318.00
	2/23	2/24	Belgium		382.00						382.00
Round trip airfare	2/22	2/24					5,710.15				5,710.15
	3/22	3/23	Netherlands		147.14		6,245.28				6,392.42
Hillel Weinberg	1/22	1/26	Belgium		1,460.00						1,460.00
	1/26	1/28	Finland		530.00						530.00
	1/28	1/31	Mali		525.00						525.00
Round trip airfare	1/22	1/31					12,467.06				12,467.06
	2/25	2/28	Japan		1,074.00						1,074.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 31 AND MAR. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Peter Yeo	1/5	1/6	Singapore		210.00						210.00
	1/6	1/8	Indonesia		1,091.00						1,091.00
Round trip airfare	1/5	1/8					7,274.00				7,274.00
Matthew Zweig	1/20	1/21	Kuwait		406.00						406.00
	1/21	1/23	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	1/23	1/25	United Arab Emirates		313.76		(3)				313.76
Committee total					112,177.83		422,793.29		15,154.72		550,125.84

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] Delegation costs.

HENRY J. HYDE, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.	1/7	1/10	Poland		1,008.00		2,875.00				3,883.00
			Lithuania				385.16				385.16
	1/10	1/12	Lithuania		510.00		514.00				1,024.00
	1/12	1/13	Amsterdam		378.00		4,217.27				4,595.27
Philip Kiko	1/7	1/10	Poland		1,008.00		2,875.00		1,049.00		4,932.00
			Lithuania				385.16				385.16
	1/10	1/12	Lithuania		510.00		514.01		447.54		1,471.55
	1/12	1/13	Amsterdam		378.00		4,217.27				4,595.27
Committee total					3,792.00		15,982.87		1,496.54		21,271.41

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr., Chairman, Apr. 26, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
No 1st quarter travel											
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RICHARD POMBO, Chairman, Apr. 27, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MARCH 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Phil Gingrey	3/9	3/11	Kuwait		406.00		(3)				406.00
	3/11	3/12	UAE		519.00		(3)				519.00
	3/12	3/13	Germany		304.00		(3)				304.00
Committee total					1,229.00						1,229.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

DAVID DRIER, Chairman, May 1, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. David Wu	11/26	12/3	China						8,434.44		8,434.44
Committee total									8,434.44		8,434.44

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

———Mar. 20, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Roscoe Bartlett	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Ben Chandler	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Bud Cramer	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Jim Costa	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Lincoln Davis	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Phil Gingrey	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Darlene Hooley	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Bob Inglis	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Hon. Brad Miller	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Chuck Atkins	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Amy Carroll	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		1,668.80		(3)				1,668.80
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Tim Clancy	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Elizabeth Grossman	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		834.40		(3)				834.40
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
John Konkus	1/4	1/12	New Zealand		1,668.80		(3)				1,668.80
	1/12	1/15	Australia		268.80		(3)				268.80
Committee total					18,216.80						18,216.80

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

———, Apr. 5, 2006.

(ADDENDUM) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Johannes Loschn	3/28	4/2	Russia		563.00		5,288.40		1,225.59		7,076.99
Kaitlyn O'Hara	3/28	4/2	Russia		563.00		5,308.40		1,272.87		7,144.27
Committee total					1,126.00		10,576.80		2,498.46		14,221.26

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, Chairman, Apr. 26, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Nathan Berkeley	1/4	1/12	Japan				9,210.75	522.00	2,248.00		11,458.75
Bradley Knox	1/1	1/12	Japan				9,210.75	522.00	2,248.00		11,458.75
Hon. Donald Manzullo	1/1	1/12	Japan				9,210.75	522.00	2,248.00		11,458.75
Rich Beutel	2/19	2/22	China				6,798.19		873.00		7,671.19
Committee total							34,430.44		7,617.00		42,047.44

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DONALD A. MANZULLO, Chairman, Apr. 24, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Jerrold Nadler	1/16	1/16	Guantanamo Bay				(3)				
Hon. John Duncan	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Hon. Jim Oberstar	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Hon. E. B. Johnson	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Hon. Corrine Brown	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Hon. Henry Brown	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Hon. John Boozmam	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Fraser Verrusio	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
John Cullather	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Jim Coon	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Jim Tymon	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Stephanie Manning	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Geoff Bowman	1/16	1/19	Switzerland		708.00		(3)				708.00
Hon. John Duncan	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Hon. Jim Oberstar	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Hon. E. B. Johnson	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Hon. Corrine Brown	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Hon. Henry Brown	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Hon. John Boozmam	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Fraser Verrusio	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
John Cullather	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Jim Coon	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Jim Tymon	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Stephanie Manning	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Geoff Bowman	1/19	1/21	Poland		672.00		(3)				672.00
Committee total					16,560.00		(3)				16,560.00
Hon. John Duncan	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Hon. Jim Oberstar	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Hon. E.B. Johnson	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Hon. Corrine Brown	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Hon. Henry Brown	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Hon. John Boozmam	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Fraser Verrusio	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
John Cullather	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Jim Coon	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Jim Tymon	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Stephanie Manning	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Geoff Bowman	1/21	1/24	Romania		834.00		(3)				834.00
Hon. John Duncan	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Jim Oberstar	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. E.B. Johnson	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Corrine Brown	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Henry Brown	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. John Boozmam	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Fraser Verrusio	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
John Cullather	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Jim Coon	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Jim Tymon	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Stephanie Manning	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Geoff Bowman	1/24	1/26	Morocco		596.00		(3)				596.00
Hon. Kenny Marchant	2/17	2/21	France		1,812.00		(3)				1,812.00
	2/21	2/21	Belgium				(3)				
	2/21	2/22	Estonia		242.00		(3)				242.00
	2/22	2/24	Latvia		534.00		(3)				534.00
	2/24	2/26	Poland		544.00		(3)				544.00
Committee total					20,292.00						20,292.00
Lloyd Jones	3/19	3/21	Italy		1,173.00		7,768.32				8,941.32
Elizabeth Megginson	3/19	3/21	Italy		1,173.00		7,768.32				8,941.32
Fraser Verrusio	3/19	3/21	Italy		1,173.00		7,768.32				8,941.32
John Anderson	3/19	3/21	Italy		1,173.00		7,768.32				8,941.32
Ken Kopocis	3/19	3/21	Italy		1,173.00		7,768.32				8,941.32
Geoff Bowman	3/19	3/21	Italy		1,173.00		7,768.32				8,941.32
Ryan Seiger	3/19	3/21	Italy		1,173.00		7,768.32				8,941.32
Lloyd Jones	3/21	3/23	United Kingdom		880.00						880.00
Elizabeth Megginson	3/21	3/23	United Kingdom		880.00						880.00
Fraser Verrusio	3/21	3/26	United Kingdom		1,760.00						1,760.00
John Anderson	3/21	3/23	United Kingdom	880.00							880.00
Ken Kopocis	3/21	3/23	United Kingdom	880.00							880.00
Geoff Bowman	3/21	3/23	United Kingdom	880.00							880.00
Ryan Seiger	3/21	3/23	United Kingdom	880.00							880.00
Lloyd Jones	3/23	3/26	Netherlands	1,621.00							1,621.00
Elizabeth Megginson	3/23	3/26	Netherlands	1,044.00							1,044.00
John Anderson	3/23	3/26	Netherlands	1,621.00							1,621.00
Ken Kopocis	3/23	3/26	Netherlands	1,621.00							1,621.00
Geoff Bowman	3/23	3/26	Netherlands	1,621.00							1,621.00
Ryan Seiger	3/23	3/26	Netherlands	1,621.00							1,621.00
Committee total					24,400.00		54,338.24				78,738.24
Grand committee total					61,252.00		54,338.24				115,590.24

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
(3) Military air transportation.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Apr. 26, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

STEVE BUYER, Chairman, April 7, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Phil English	3/19	3/23	Brazil		840.00		(3)				840.00
Hon. Phil English	3/23	3/26	Argentina		684.00		(3)				683.00
Hon. Mark Foley	3/20	3/20	Haiti		840.00		701.00				701.00
Committee total					1,524.00		701.00				2,225.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

BILL THOMAS, Chairman, May 4, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2006.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Elizabeth Larson	10/02	10/05	Europe	1,380.00							
Commercial airfare							7,254.48				8,634.48
Michael Delaney	10/02	10/07	Europe	2,188.00							
Commercial airfare							8,354.20				10,542.20
Kelly Gaffney	10/02	10/07	Europe	2,188.00							
Commercial airfare							8,354.20				10,542.20
Michele Lang	10/02	10/07	Europe	2,188.00							
Commercial airfare							8,354.20				10,542.20
Michael Ennis	10/10	10/13	Europe	676.00							
	10/14	10/16	Europe	938.00							
Commercial airfare							5,332.91				6,946.91
Kim Knur	10/10	10/13	Europe	676.00							
	10/14	10/16		938.00							
Commercial airfare							5,332.91				6,946.91
Jacob Abel	10/10	10/13		676.00							
	10/14	10/16		938.00							
Commercial airfare							5,332.91				6,946.91
Hon. John Tierney	11/26	11/28	Europe	880.00							
	11/28	11/30	Europe	756.00							
Commercial airfare							7,823.90				9,459.90
Larry Hanauer	11/26	11/28	Europe	880.00							
	11/28	11/30	Europe	756.00							
Commercial airfare							7,823.90				9,459.90
Wyndee Parker	10/29	10/31	Middle East	633.00							
	10/31	11/01	Middle East	536.00							
Commercial airfare							9,019.15				10,188.15
	10/03	10/04		176.00							
	10/05	10/07		417.00							
Commercial airfare							5,555.70				6,148.70
Hon. Michael Rogers	11/27	11/29	Middle East	234.00							
	11/30	12/01	Middle East	280.00							
	12/02	12/03	Middle East	762.00							
Military airfare											1,276.00
Hon. Rick Renzi	11/27	11/29	Middle East	234.00							
	11/30	12/01	Middle East	280.00							
	12/02	12/03	Middle East	762.00							
Military airfare											1,276.00
Kathleen Reilly	11/27	11/29	Middle East	234.00							
	11/30	12/01	Middle East	280.00							
	12/02	12/03	Middle East	762.00							
Military airfare											1,276.00
Robert Myhill	11/27	11/29	Middle East	234.00							
	11/30	12/01	Middle East	280.00							
	12/02	12/03	Middle East	762.00							
Military airfare											1,276.00
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	10/09	10/10	Hati	284.00							
Military airfare											284.00
David Abruzzino	10/09	10/10	Hati	284.00							
Military airfare											284.00
Committee total											102,030.46

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

———, ———

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
John Stopher	1/17	1/19	Asia		464.00						
	1/19	1/22	Asia		636.00						
	1/22	1/25	Asia		842.00						
	1/26	1/27	Asia		125.00						
Commercial airfare							7,688.00				9,755.00
Michael Ennis	1/17	1/19	Asia		464.00						
	1/19	1/22	Asia		636.00						
	1/22	1/25	Asia		842.00						
	1/26	1/27	Asia		125.00						
Commercial airfare							7,688.00				9,755.00
Wyndee Parker	1/17	1/19	Asia		464.00						
	1/19	1/22	Asia		636.00						
	1/22	1/25	Asia		746.85						
	1/26	1/27	Asia		125.00						
Commercial airfare							7,565.00				9,632.00
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	1/10	1/11	Europe		358.00						

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		142.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							9,432.65				11,367.68
Hon. John McHugh	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							9,432.65				11,367.68
Hon. Rush Holt	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
Commercial airfare							7,998.00				9,433.03
Hon. Jane Harman	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
Commercial airfare							7,138.50				8,573.53
Michael Meermans	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		242.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							6,001.93				8,036.96
Jamal Ware	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		242.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00		6,001.93				8,036.96
Commercial airfare											
Michele Lang	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		242.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							6,021.93				8,036.96
Committee total											93,994.80
Kelly Gaffney	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		242.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00		7,545.93				9,580.96
Commercial airfare											
Jacob Abel	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		242.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							6,021.93				8,056.96
Katrina Gammon	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		242.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00		6,021.93				8,056.96
Commercial airfare											
David Buckley	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
	1/17	1/18	Europe		242.00						
	1/18	1/19	Europe		358.00						
Commercial airfare							7,138.50				9,173.53
Jeremy Bash	1/10	1/12	Europe		358.00						
	1/12	1/13	Africa		297.03						
	1/13	1/14	Africa		200.00						
	1/14	1/15	Africa		300.00						
	1/15	1/17	Africa		280.00						
Commercial airfare							8,095.50				9,530.53
Hon. William Thornberry	1/9	1/13	Europe		537.00						
Commercial airfare							7,763.15				8,300.15
Riley Perdue,	1/9	1/13	Europe		537.00						
Commercial airfare							7,763.15				8,300.15
Kerry Taylor	1/9	1/13	Europe		537.00						
Commercial airfare							7,763.15				8,300.15
Hon. Jane Harman	2/2	2/5	Europe		966.00		(3)				966.00
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	2/18	2/20	Asia		750.00						
	2/21	2/24	Australia		910.00						
Commercial airfare							10,644.36				12,304.36
Michael Ennis	2/18	2/20	Asia		750.00						
	2/21	2/24	Australia		910.00						
Commercial airfare							9,038.36				10,648.36
Jamal Ware	2/18	2/20	Asia		750.00						
	2/21	2/24	Australia		910.00						
Commercial airfare							12,508.36				14,168.36
Christopher Donesa	2/18	2/20	Asia		750.00						
	2/21	2/24	Australia		910.00						
Commercial airfare							9,038.36				10,698.35

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Riley Perdue	2/19	2/23	Europe		1,760.00						
Commercial airfare							7,233.43				8,993.43
Donald Stone	2/19	2/23	Europe		1,760.00						
Commercial airfare							7,233.43				8,993.43
James Lewis	2/07	2/09	Middle East		547.00						
Commercial airfare							6,090.39				6,637.39
Hon. Robert Crammer	3/15	3/22	Europe		2,220.00						
Commercial airfare							8,441.93				10,661.93
Michael Delaney	3/15	3/22	Europe		2,220.00						
Commercial airfare							8,386.93				10,606.93
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	3/17	3/18	Middle East		273.00						
	3/19	3/20	Middle East		156.00						
	3/20	3/21	Middle East		309.00						
	3/22	3/24	Middle East		852.00						
Commercial airfare							7,752.11				9,342.11
Hon. Todd Tiahrt	3/17	3/18	Middle East		273.00						
	3/19	3/20	Middle East		156.00						
	3/20	3/21	Middle East		309.00						
	3/22	3/24	Middle East		852.00						
Commercial airfare							7,764.84				9,354.84
Hon. Dutch Ruppersberger	3/17	3/18	Middle East		273.00						
	3/19	3/20	Middle East		156.00						
	3/20	3/21	Middle East		309.00						
	3/22	3/24	Middle East		852.00						
Commercial airfare							7,622.41				9,212.41
James Lewis	3/17	3/18	Middle East		273.00						
	3/19	3/20	Middle East		156.00						
	3/20	3/21	Middle East		309.00						
	3/22	3/24	Middle East		852.00						
Commercial airfare							7,602.41				9,192.41
David Buckley	3/17	3/18	Middle East		273.00						
	3/19	3/20	Middle East		156.00						
	3/20	3/21	Middle East		309.00						
	3/22	3/24	Middle East		852.00						
Commercial airfare							8,367.24				9,957.24
Wyndee Parker	3/22	3/23	Europe		403.00						
	3/23	3/25	Europe		408.00						
Commercial airfare							6,768.37				7,579.37
Committee total											393,561.11

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

PETER HOEKSTRA, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Chairman, Apr. 3, 2006.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8191. A letter from the Directors, Congressional Budget Office and Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a joint report on the technical assumptions to be used in preparing estimates of National Defense Function (050) fiscal year 2006 outlay rates and prior year outlays, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 226(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8192. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of the next higher grade in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8193. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of the next higher grade in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8194. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of the next higher grade in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8195. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisitions, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report presenting the specific amounts of staff-years of technical effort to be allocated for each Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC) during Fiscal Year 2007, pursuant to Public Law 109–148, section 8026(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8196. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's quarterly report as of March 31, 2006, entitled, ''Acceptance of contributions for defense programs, projects and activities; Defense Cooperation Account,'' pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2608; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8197. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisitions, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report required by Section 812 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, Pub. L. 108–136, entitled, ''Foreign Sources of Supply: Assessment of the United States Defense Industrial Base for Fiscal Year 2005''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8198. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's STARBASE Program 2005 Annual Report, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2193b(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8199. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisitions, Technology and Logisitics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of acquisitions made by the Department from entities that manufacture the articles, materials, or supplies outside the United States in Fiscal Year 2005, pursuant to Public Law 108–447, section 641; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8200. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department's intention to close the Defense commissary store at Bad Kissingen (Daley Village Army housing area) by July 14, 2006; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8201. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration,

Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule— Class Exemption for Services Provided in Connection With the Termination of Abandoned Individual Account Plans [ZRIN 1210–ZA05; Prohibited Transaction Exemption 2006–06; Application No. D–11201] received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8202. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, MB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendement of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Coupeville and Sequim, Washington) [MB Docket No. 04–280; RM–11037; RM–11117] received April 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8203. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8204. A letter from the Deputy Solicitor for National Operations, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of the Department of Labor Freedom of Information Act Regulations and Implementation of Electronic Freedom of Information Act Amendments of 1996; Final Rule (RIN: 1290–AA17) received May 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8205. A letter from the Secretary for Regulatory Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Individuals and Groups Considered to Have Performed Active Military, Naval, or Air Service (RIN: 2900–AM39) received May 18, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

8206. A letter from the Office of Regulatory Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Remarriage of a Surviving Spouse (RIN: 2900–AM24) received May 18, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

8207. A letter from the Office of Regulatory Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amended Delegation of Authority—Property Management Contractor (RIN: 2900–AM38) received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

8208. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Extension of the Expiration Date for the Digestive Listings (RIN: 0960–AG39) received May 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8209. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medicare Program; Requirements for Providers and Suppliers to Establish and Maintain Medicare Enrollment [CMS–6002–F] (RIN: 0938–AH73) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 885. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5638) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the unified credit against the estate tax to an exclusion equivalent of $5,000,000 and to repeal the sunset provision for the estate and generation-skipping taxes, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–517). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PUTNAM: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 886. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4890) to amend the Congressional and Impoundment Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of budget authority (Rept. 109–518). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 5655. A bill to eliminate the annual numerical limitation on the number of aliens who may be provided status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HALL, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 5656. A bill to provide for Federal energy research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 5657. A bill to promote preventive health care for Americans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GORDON:

H.R. 5658. A bill to facilitate the development of markets for alternative fuels and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel through research, development, and demonstration and data collection; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. GORDON:

H.R. 5659. A bill to provide for the demonstration and commercial application of innovative energy technologies derived from federally-sponsored research and development programs, by incorporating those technologies into Federal buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MELANCON, and Mr. JINDAL):

H.R. 5660. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and expand the benefits for businesses operating in empowerment zones, enterprise communities, or renewal communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 5661. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the unauthorized removal or use of personal information contained in a database owned, operated, or maintained by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5662. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide individuals a deduction for certain mass public transportation expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 5663. A bill to penalize States that prohibit oil and gas exploration within their borders by denying them the use of any oil or natural gas produced domestically elsewhere; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 5664. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 110 Cooper Street in Babylon, New York, as the ''Jacob Fletcher Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 5665. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and improvements of the Gooding Division of the Minidoka Project, Idaho; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 5666. A bill to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the A & B Irrigation District in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 5667. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of discretionary budget authority, promote fiscal responsibility, reinstate Pay-As-You-Go rules, require responsible use of reconciliation procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Standards of Official Conduct, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE (for herself and Mr. RUSH):

H. Con. Res. 431. Concurrent resolution calling on the President to proclaim 2007 as the ''National Year of the Bible''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. WATERS:

H. Res. 882. A resolution honoring Dr. Carolyn R. Wilder, Professor of Child Development at West Los Angeles College in Los Angeles, California, in recognition of her retirement after 32 years of service to the College; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H. Res. 883. A resolution urging every Representative Member, officer, and employee of the House of Representatives to read, ponder, and reflect upon the principles of the United States Constitution on Constitution Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. OSBORNE, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr.

LUCAS, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BERRY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Res. 884. A resolution honoring the town of Nicodemus, Kansas, for its contribution to American history; to the Committee on Resources.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. RANGEL introduced a bill (H.R. 5668) for the relief of Amadou Heinz Ly; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 550: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 653: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 910: Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 952: Mr. CARDIN.
H.R. 1182: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1298: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 1384: Mr. FORBES, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 1413: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1449: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 1589: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1603: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 1689: Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 2103: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2134: Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 2429: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 2512: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3413: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 3427: Mr. INSLEE and Ms. HART.
H.R. 3628: Mr. CARDIN.
H.R. 3762: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 4023: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. POMEROY, and Ms. HOOLEY.
H.R. 4188: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 4416: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 4465: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 4494: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 4597: Mr. BOREN and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 4710: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 4725: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KELLER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4761: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 4843: Mr. SALAZAR.
H.R. 4927: Mr. MCNULTY and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4960: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 4962: Mr. REYNOLDS and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 5013: Mr. POMBO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 5022: Mr. MEEHAN and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 5092: Mr. FORBES, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 5146: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 5150: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 5159: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 5225: Mr. NEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 5230: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
H.R. 5250: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 5262: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 5290: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 5322: Mr. FEENEY and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 5337: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 5344: Ms. HERSETH.
H.R. 5356: Mr. GUTKNECHT.
H.R. 5358: Mr. GUTKNECHT.
H.R. 5372: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 5424: Mr. LEACH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 5453: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 5455: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 5467: Mr. HEFLEY.
H.R. 5474: Mr. MCCRERY.
H.R. 5478: Mr. UPTON and Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 5507: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 5513: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. CASE.
H.R. 5520: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 5538: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
H.R. 5551: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 5560: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 5578: Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 5588: Mr. FILNER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 5604: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 5615: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 5624: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 5633: Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 5637: Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 5638: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Ms. HART, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LINDER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. SHAW.
H.R. 5640: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Ms. HART.
H.R. 5644: Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 5652: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.J. Res. 55: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H. Con. Res. 416: Mr. HAYES, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. HEFLEY.
H. Res. 790: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. STARK, and Mr. BOYD.
H. Res. 820: Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 846: Mr. SERRANO.
H. Res. 852: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H. Res. 854: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. SHAYS.
H. Res. 860: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PENCE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
H. Res. 881: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, MR. BOREN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BARROW, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HOYER, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WU, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CASE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. STARK, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. SPRATT.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4755: Mr. MCKEON.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 2006 No. 81

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Father of mercies, teach us to be patient and kind. Bid us to understand one another before we idealize or condemn. Keep us aware of the cries of humanity, and use us as forces for good.

Continue to sustain the Members of this legislative body. Use them to enable others to realize their best. Empower them to seize opportunities to bring cheer to the despairing, companionship to the lonely, understanding to the perplexed, and hope to the downtrodden.

Renew a right spirit in us all as we seek to do Your will. And, Lord, continue to protect our military men and women in harm's way. Show Your strength, Lord, so that we may celebrate Your power. We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in a couple of minutes we will resume work on the Defense authorization bill. This morning we have an order for 90 minutes of debate prior to the two votes related to the minimum wage. Following those votes, Senator LEVIN will offer an amendment related to Iraq on which there will be 5 hours of debate. Many Senators have expressed a desire to speak during that time, and we may be able to set up blocks of controlled time in order to line up speakers. Following debate on the Levin amendment, we will set that amendment aside and begin debate on Senator KERRY's Iraq language. Although there is no limit for debate on that amendment, we anticipate that we will lock in a debate structure for that amendment as well. This is our second week of consideration of the bill, and last night, to ensure that we will finish the bill in a reasonable time, we filed cloture on the Defense authorization bill. Senators will have until 1 o'clock today to file their first-degree amendments.

With respect to the Iraq language, it is my expectation that we will vote on the Iraq amendments prior to the cloture vote which would occur on Thursday. Senator WARNER and Senator LEVIN have cleared a large number of amendments and will continue to work to clear additional amendments as we go forward. In addition, there will likely be germane amendments debated and voted once cloture is invoked.

Having said that, I look forward to constructive debate throughout the day and evening on the two Iraq amendments before us.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate is now in the middle of an important debate on Iraq, but it wasn't so long ago that we found ourselves in an important debate on another issue, immigration reform. It took weeks of negotiations for the Senate to develop the basic framework for legislation that both Democrats and Republicans could support. Then it took several more weeks to work through dozens of amendments and pass a bill, a comprehensive immigration reform bill.

The day we finally passed immigration legislation, I came to the floor to say it was a good day for the Senate but a day not for celebrating. News reports from all over the country this morning show why I was right. For example, from the Washington Post today:

House Republicans have largely given up on passing a broad rewrite of the nation's immigration laws before the November elections. House GOP leaders said today they would hold hearings even before naming conferees.

The truth is out. For all their tough talk about securing our borders, House Republicans have no intention of actually accomplishing the goal. They want to defeat comprehensive immigration reform of the kind we passed in the Senate, a bipartisan bill, and House leaders are willing to sacrifice the security of the American people to accomplish what I believe are their selfish goals.

Let's be perfectly clear. This idea of field hearings is just a front, an attempt to delay, impede, and obstruct a bipartisan effort to strengthen our borders and fix our immigration system. The House doesn't need hearings to write a bill because they have already passed their bill. They don't need hearings to name conferees. The only reason for hearings is to pander to the rightwing base of their party and avoid the hard work of negotiating a final bill with the Senate for the American people.

It has been clear for weeks now that House Republicans have no interest in passing an immigration bill this year.

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

Printed on recycled paper.

But even as House leaders speak more and more openly about their opposition to comprehensive reform, we have heard only silence from the White House. The President went on national television and pledged his support for comprehensive reform. Now we will see if his actions match his words. I know the President is overseas, but I am confident there is reliable telephone service in Vienna. I respectfully suggest that President Bush pick up the phone and tell the Speaker and the majority leader of the House to stop stalling. He needs to persuade them that our national security depends on action, a conference, and final legislation.

Meanwhile, here in the Senate, I am waiting for assurances from the majority leader that the conference committee on immigration reform will address only immigration reform, not tax breaks for corporations or billionaires. I am confident the majority leader can provide those assurances. He has told me he wants to; he just hasn't done so.

Democrats are ready to roll up their sleeves and get this bill done. We are determined to move forward. I have a list of Democratic conferees in my pocket. I also happen to know that there are a fair number of Republicans who want to move forward. I spoke yesterday to two of my Republican colleagues who said they are willing to sign a letter saying that if anything comes back from conference with anything other than the tax measures that are in this bill, they will not support the conference report.

Unlike same-sex marriage and flag burning, immigration reform is an issue that affects real people every day. It is a national security issue. It is an economic issue, an issue that my constituents want us to deal with. It is an issue all Americans want us to deal with. Certainly no one wants to do it the way the House did it, by making felons out of immigrants, by making criminals out of humanitarian workers who operate soup kitchens, or the clergy who offer these immigrants religious counseling or, from a Catholic perspective, have them be given the holy sacraments. It is untoward what their bill does.

The way the Senate did it, by beefing up security on the borders and forcing employer sanctions and giving out undocumented aliens who are here a way to get right with the law and to have strong employer sanctions, is what the American people want and deserve.

The Senate has worked its will. The House has worked its will. It is time to let the conference committee go forward and come up with a product. It is my hope President Bush won't let a few extreme Republicans hold our border security hostage. It is my hope the House leaders will abandon their delaying tactics once and for all.

Some have said that the immigration bill is on life support. Well, we Democrats don't believe that. We want to breathe life into this process. This legislation is imperative. It is important. I hope my Republican colleagues won't put this on life support. If so, they will help us revive this most important issue.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I join my leader urging the House to move forward promptly. Would the leader not agree with me that at the current time our borders are effectively broken and that only means a real potential danger to our national security, and that our legislation that passed in the Senate would address that aspect of the immigration issue? Would the Senator agree with me on that?

Mr. REID. I respond to my friend, there is no finer example of how legislation should move forward than what we did in the Senate. The President got involved. We applauded him. We had Democrats and Republicans working together. What we did was extraordinary. I heard an interview on National Public Radio this morning where the acting head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service was saying that he doesn't want a fence on the entire border with Mexico. Well, the Senate worked its will. We agreed. We have a fence in certain places, but we have security. Security was our No. 1 issue. We took care of security. We took care of a guest worker program that is badly needed, a pathway to legalization. We took care of enforcing employer sanctions. We have a piece of legislation that every American should be proud of. It should not be demagogued, and that is what is happening in the House.

We need to work together. It is so important that we do something. I hold up the Senate legislation as a model for how we should move legislation. We should have a conference with the House and have a final product. I am calling on the President today to continue his partnership with us on this legislation, not concede that we can't get this done.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the Senator will yield for another brief question, the Senator would agree with me that effectively our borders are broken. The employer enforcement program that exists today is in tatters, as we have seen from the GAO report. There is continuously this Third World underground economy that is operating effectively out of control. All those issues were addressed effectively and in a bipartisan way in the Senate.

Would the Senator not agree with me that if the House continues to avoid a conference and the hopeful aspect of a reasonable compromise, we fail the American people in dealing with these extremely important public policy issues in a bipartisan way?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as an example on employer sanctions—they are in such desperate shape—last year there were three enforcement measures taken. In our bill, we provide for 7,000 new hires that will deal only with employer sanctions. That is one example. The other example is that with border security, which is in desperate shape as we speak, I have been there. I have seen what happens. There are 24 lanes of traffic coming in at the San Ysidro border security point, 24 lanes of traffic every day, 24 hours a day. They don't have enough help there. We have given them help so they can do their job. That is another example.

I feel so desperate, desperate for the American people. I feel desperate for my State. We have problems. This bill would address our problems in Nevada.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator realizes, we have $25 billion for border security and other immigration enforcement. Evidently, the House doesn't believe that is something that ought to get passed if we are not going to have a resolution of that issue, $25 billion in terms of enforcement spending that is authorized. If we don't get that passed, we don't have that $25 billion; am I correct?

Mr. REID. The Senator is absolutely right. I want to say to my friend, people are calling for bipartisanship in the Congress.

Here we had it in the Senate. We have the Senator from Massachusetts who has a certain political philosophy and the Senator from Arizona with a certain political philosophy; they have locked arms with Democrats and Republicans of all political philosophies, and we came up with a tremendous piece of legislation.

If there is something wrong with our legislation, let's go to conference on it. We would be happy to visit with them. Let's not say we are not going to work with you. We want to have a conference and work out legislation that will protect our borders and give the American people what they need. We have to do this.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have a final question. Would the Senator agree with me that the time for talking has ended and the time for action ought to be now?

Mr. REID. Yes. I have in my pocket the names of our conferees. We are ready to roll; we are ready to go to work.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Will the Senator yield for a question?

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to respond to a question from my friend from Florida.

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Would the Senator agree, given the fact that the Senate position is often described as amnesty, that indeed amnesty is the current situation of the law—a law that passed in the 1980s that is not enforced by the Government, that is not obeyed by the people nor the employers of this country and which, in effect, grants amnesty to 12 million people who are illegally in this country and that the whole point of the Senate bill

is to remove this amnesty under the present condition and return those who are going to be here working in a legal status? Would the Senator think that is a fair characterization?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is very clear we worked very hard to make sure there was no amnesty and that there was a path to legalization. The people had to have a job, pay their taxes and stay out of trouble, learn English and pay penalties and fines and then move to the back of the line. What we did legislatively was nothing short of miraculous to get it passed in this body. It would be a disaster for this country not to move forward on this with the tremendous amount of work we have done. As I have said, on a bipartisan basis we did that. Here is a Senate action that was not in a partisan vein but in a bipartisan vein.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume the consideration of S. 2766, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2766) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain amendment No. 4241, to name the act after John Warner, a Senator from Virginia.

Kennedy amendment No. 4322, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

Enzi amendment No. 4376, to promote job creation and small business preservation in the adjustment of the Federal minimum wage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 1½ hours equally divided for debate between the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI, and the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY or their designees.

Who yields time? The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in a short while, we will have an opportunity in the Senate to vote on whether we are going to provide an increase in the minimum wage that will affect approximately 15 million Americans. We have not, as has been pointed out in our discussions yesterday and the day before, increased the minimum wage in the last 9 years. Even the $5.15 an hour, the current minimum wage, has lost, since 9 years ago, about 20 percent of its purchasing power.

The men and women who earn the minimum wage are men and women of dignity. They take pride in doing the jobs they do, although they do very menial work at the bottom rung of the economic ladder. They work as teachers assistants in our schools. They work in the nursing homes looking after the men and women who have made this country the great country it is. They provide the essential services in many of the buildings of our Nation, where American commerce is taking place. They work and they play by the rules and still they fall further and further behind.

I think there is a broad agreement in this body—there should be—that if you are going to work in the United States and you are going to work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, you should not have to live in poverty. But these individuals do. We have seen what has happened to the minimum wage over recent years. The minimum wage jobs are not jobs that get you out of poverty. Minimum wage jobs are jobs that keep you in poverty. That is a rather dramatic difference from what we have had historically when we had Democratic and Republican administrations all voting for an increase in the minimum wage and an expansion of minimum wage coverage.

So that is the issue that is going to be before us, whether we are going to go over a 2-year period and raise the minimum wage to $7.25 an hour. There are those who are strongly opposed to it. We heard some of those voices yesterday. They say let's let the market decide on these issues. Let's let the market make the judgment and decide whether $5.15 is fair or whether we should see even a reduction. We have a number of States that have no minimum wage whatsoever, none. It is amazing. Six States have no minimum wage. One State has minimum wage of $2.65 an hour.

I think Americans have made the judgment that a minimum wage ought to be a minimum wage and people who work ought to be able to at least get the essentials in life. Of course, that is impossible today with the explosion in costs. We have seen the explosion of costs taking place, whether it is gasoline, education funds, health care or whether it is food, but we have not seen an increase in the minimum wage. We have seen an increase in salaries of the Members of the Senate. That has gone through. We have seen that over the last 9 years.

We have increased our salaries with the cost of living by some $30,000, but we refuse to provide an increase in the minimum wage for primarily women because 59 percent of these individuals who would benefit are women. They work hard. Many of those women have children. So it is a women's issue and a children's issue. It is also a family issue. We hear a great deal in the public discourse about family values, about our value system in the United States. Is X, Y, and Z public policy issue consistent with our values? Certainly, if you are talking about having someone who is going to work 40 hours a week, a women who works hard and is trying to raise a child, whether they are going to be able to have any family time together effectively or whether that woman is going to have to work two or three jobs and have little or no time with that child is a family issue and is a values issue.

Americans understand that. So this is a values issue. The leaders of our great religions understand it.

That is why the members of the churches in our country have been in strong support—and I will come back to that in a minute—of an increase in the minimum wage. It is also a civil rights issue because so many of those men and women entering the job market at this level are men and women of color. It is a children's issue, a women's issue and, mostly I as I have said many times and continue to say, it is a fairness issue. Americans understand fairness. Work hard and play by the rules in the richest country in the world and you should not have to live in poverty. Yet we find that at the end of the year, these families are $6,000 below the poverty line and they are falling further behind.

This is it. We'are not going to get another chance. Arguments will be made that, well, you should not offer it on this particular legislation. This is the Defense authorization bill. We say: Look, Mr. Republican leader, give us a chance to have a direct up-or-down vote on the increase in the minimum wage. You have your alternative on it. Give us a freestanding bill and I have indicated that we would withdraw this amendment, but we have been unable to get that.

All of us understand legislatively that we are moving more and more rapidly into the appropriations, and there is going to be a point of order made against legislating on appropriations. This legislation is appropriate for a very basic and fundamental reason. That is why our men and women who wear the American uniform are fighting in Iraq and fighting in Afghanistan—to defend American values and ideals. One of the American values is fairness here at home. It is treating people fairly for a day's work. That is an American value. That is one of the values these Americans are fighting for. That is why it is appropriate here. I don't know offhand, though, if we had more time—and I will find out next time we debate this issue because even if we get $7.25 an hour, we are still failing to meet the needs of working poor. I don't know how many servicemen are in the military serving overseas whose parents are earning the minimum wage, but there are scores of them.

So this is about the values we hold in this country and the values worth protecting by the military of this country. That is what it is talking about. We understand there are important debates going on through noontime, and as far as I am concerned, they can go on through the evening. The idea that we are taking a few moments this morning to talk about an issue that affects some 15 million of our fellow citizens—this Senate could find plenty of time to debate the estate taxes, plenty

of time to debate flag burning. I don't know when the last flag was burned in my State of Massachusetts, but we have plenty of time to deal with that. We have had plenty of time on the Federal marriage amendment. But we don't want to deal with an increase in the minimum wage that affects 15 million people.

There you are. There are the priorities. It could not be clearer. So we know where we stand. We are always asked how we stand on different issues: What do you believe in?

We will have a very good opportunity this morning to indicate what we believe in. That is basically the framework of this issue.

Mr. President, how much time have I used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ISAKSON). Thirty-four minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself 4 more minutes.

Mr. President, this letter is from the heads of 33 major religious groups calling on Congress to do its moral duty to raise the minimum wage. This is the Let Justice Roll, which is an organization of faith and community leaders:

As leaders of our respective faith communities, we call on Congress to raise the Federal minimum wage in the 109th session. For too long, the ranks of the working poor have grown in this country. For too long, low-wage workers have been unable to support themselves and their families, even though they work several jobs, trying to make ends meet. Poverty has become a disease, striking at the very heart of the United States, attacking the most vulnerable, even as the wealthy few continue to accumulate far more than their reasonable share. It is unacceptable that such a state of affairs be allowed to continue, as year after year, Congress fails to pass an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

Prophetic voices through the ages have called upon their nations to show justice to the poorest and most vulnerable in society. The Prophet Amos exhorts the people of Israel, ''Hate evil and love good, and establish justice. Let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream.'' Then, and now, the assembled people of God are called upon to establish justice for low-wage workers, whose cries are so often heard across our land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the signers be printed in the RECORD.

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

LIVING WAGE CAMPAIGN,
November 7, 2005.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: As leaders of our respective faith communities, we call on Congress to raise the Federal minimum wage in the 109th session. For too long, the ranks of the working poor have grown in this country. For too long, low-wage workers have been unable to support themselves and their families, even though they work several jobs, trying to make ends meet. Poverty has become a disease, striking at the very heart of the United States, attacking the most vulnerable, even as the wealthy few continue to accumulate far more than their reasonable share. It is unacceptable that such a state of affairs be allowed to continue, as year after year, Congress fails to pass an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

Prophetic voices throughout the ages have called upon their nations to show justice to the poorest and most vulnerable in society. The Prophet Amos exhorts the people of Israel, ''Hate evil and love good, and establish justice. Let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream.'' Then, and now, the assembled people of God are called upon to establish justice for low-wage workers, whose cries are so often heard across our land.

The situation among America's minimum wage workers is particularly dire. A minimum wage employee—making $5.15 an hour, working 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, earns $10,700 a year—$5,000 below the Federal poverty line for a family of three. The real value of the minimum wage today is nearly $4.00 less than it was in 1968. Indeed, in order for the minimum wage to have the same purchasing power as it did in 1968, the Federal minimum would have to be raised to more than $9.00. This situation is unconscionable, as the wealth of our Nation continues to be built on the backs of the working poor.

In his Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community?, our modern-day prophet, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., says, ''There is nothing new about poverty. What is new, however, is that we now have the resources to get rid of it.'' It is time to heed the call of the prophets, both ancient and modern. It is time to recognize that a minimum wage should be a fair, just, and living wage.

Signed,

Kim Bobo, Executive Director of Interfaith Worker Justice; The Reverend Dr. Robert W. Edgar, General Secretary of the National Council of Churches of Christ; The Reverend C. Welton Gaddy, President of The Interfaith Alliance and the Interfaith Alliance Foundation; The Most Reverend Frank T. Griswold, Presiding Bishop and Primate of the Episcopal Church; The Reverend Dr. Stan Hastey, Executive Director of the Alliance of Baptists; James E. Hug, S.J., President of Center of Concern; The Reverend Dr. Clifton Kirkpatrick, Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.); The Reverend Timothy McDonald III and the Reverend Dr. Robert P. Shine, Sr., Chair and Vice-Chair of African American Ministers in Action.

Mary Ellen McNish, General Secretary of the American Friends Service Committee; Bishop William B. Oden, Head of Communion and Ecumenical Officer of the United Methodist Church; Bishop Roy Riley, Chair of the Evangelical Lutheran Church Conference of Bishops; Rabbi David Saperstein, Director and Counsel of the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism; Alexander Sharp, Executive Director of Protestants for the Common Good; The Reverend William G. Sinkford, President of the Unitarian Universalist Association; The Reverend John H. Thomas, General Minister and President of the United Church of Christ; The Reverend Romal J. Tune, CEO of Clergy Strategic Alliances, LLC.

The Reverend Dr. Sharon Watkins, General Minister and President of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ); Rabbi Eric Yoffie, President of the Union for Reform Judaism; Scott D. Anderson, Executive Director of the Wisconsin Council of Churches; The Reverend John Boonstra, Executive Minister of the Washington State Association of Churches; The Reverend Albert G. Cohen, Executive Director of the Southern California Ecumenical Council; The Reverend Stephen Copley, President of the Arkansas Interfaith Conference; The Reverend Dr. Barbara Dua, Executive Director of the New Mexico Conference of Churches' The Reverend Nancy Jo Kemper, Executive Director of the Kentucky Council of Churches.

David Lamarre-Vincent, Executive Director of the New Hampshire Council of Churches; David A. Leslie, Executive Director of Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon; Marilyn P. Mecham, Exeutive of Interchurch Ministries of Nebraska; The Reverend J. George Reed, Executive Director of the North Carolina Council of Churches; The Reverend Dr. Stephen J. Sidorak, Jr., Executive Director of the Christian Conference of Connecticut; The Reverend C. Douglas Smith, Executive Director of the Virginia Interfaith Center for Public Policy; The Reverend Dennis Sparks, Executive Director of the West Virginia Council of Churches; The Reverend Sandra L. Strauss Director of Public Advocacy of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches; The Reverend Rebecca Tollefson, Executive Director of the Ohio Council of Churches.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, when we asked people to sign on as citizen cosponsors of the Fair Minimum Wage Act, 1,000 religious leaders answered the call. They took a stand to say that minimum wage is a moral issue that must be addressed. They have come together from all denominations, all walks of life to send this important message.

I will take a couple more moments.

First, I remind my colleagues in the Senate that support for an increase in the minimum wage is going like a wildfire across the country. This chart indicates in red those States which have increased the minimum wage above the Federal Government minimum wage. Look at this: Arkansas and Illinois.

The States in yellow are those States where the minimum wage will likely be on the ballot this fall.

Illinois, Florida, North Carolina—red States—passed an increase in the minimum wage in both houses, but they have not been reconciled. North Carolina, Arkansas, the home of Wal-Mart, increased the minimum wage.

This is happening in the countryside. I remind the Senate again, with the failure to increase the minimum wage, what the impact has been on families and on the poor.

From 2000 to 2004, we failed to increase the minimum wage and 1.4 million more children have fallen into poverty. If we look at what has been happening to families, 5.4 million more Americans are in poverty over the last 4 years. This does not bring it up to 2006. This would continue to grow. It is 5.4 million now. The best estimate is we have 1.4 million more children who are now in poverty.

In terms of the industrialized nations of the world, this is what has happened: We have the highest child poverty rate in the industrialized world, and we haven't increased our minimum wage.

I remind my colleagues what has been happening in other countries.

Tony Blair said 7 years ago that he was going to end poverty in Britain by 2020. There were 4 million children living in poverty, and he said, as a matter of national direction and vision, that he was going to eliminate poverty for children by 2020. This is what they have done. They will have a minimum wage of $9.80—$9.80—an hour this October. They have moved 1.8 million children out of poverty over the last 4 years. The United States has refused to increase the minimum wage, and we have put 1.4 million children into poverty. That is completely unacceptable.

This is the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 28 minutes 48 seconds remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask that I be notified when I have consumed 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will so notify the Senator.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I didn't expect to hear the Democratic leader talk about the immigration bill this morning and his and Senator KENNEDY's desire to rush it through the House of Representatives, calling for action now. It is a very bad bill, and it impacts directly the issues we are talking about today—wages for working Americans. I am going to talk about that issue and ask our colleagues to give serious thought to the matters I will raise.

With regard to our colleagues who claim they are concerned about poverty among American workers, I ask those Members—Senator REID and Senator KENNEDY—who proposed the immigration bill and tried to rush it through this Senate without any amendments to consider some of the concerns of their own allies, economists and professors, who believe that if passed, it would damage the wages of American workers.

I agree that we have a troubling condition in our country. People have referred to it often as the wage gap, that higher income people seem to be doing well, but there has been a lag in performance among lower income workers. That has caused quite a bit of concern. I am not sure exactly what the economic numbers show on that, but repeatedly, we have been told often from our Democratic colleagues—but not so much lately—that there is a growing gap in income. Why is this occurring? I wish to share some thoughts about it because I believe it is important.

Let me mention this: I don't want the American worker to have a $7.25-an-hour job; I want them to have a $15-an-hour job, a $30-an-hour job. That is what we want in an economy that is growing and prosperous. We want a full-employment economy where people can choose jobs that fulfill their highest aspirations and pay them a good wage, with good retirement and good health care, and we are creating a growing economy that nurtures that. But for some reason, the wages in some job markets have not kept up as well as they should.

I will read from a number of experts on this matter and ask my colleagues to think about it, not what I say but what the experts say. I am looking at a Washington Post article from Jonathan Weisman, March 31, dealing with this precise issue of minimum wage and immigration. It is titled ''Immigration Divides Allies, Guest Worker Plan Sets Democratic Supports Against Organized Labor.'' It starts off saying this:

> A growing body of economic research contends that the recent surge of foreign workers has depressed wages for low-skilled workers, especially for high school dropouts, and has even begun displacing native-born workers.

Then the article quotes Professor George Borjas, an economist at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. He has written a definitive book on immigration, ''Heaven's Door.'' He says:

> What immigration really does is redistribute wealth away from workers toward employers.

I did mention my good friend Senator KENNEDY. Senator KENNEDY has been a champion for civil rights, and a champion for helping us fight poverty, and he cares about this issue very deeply. He sincerely does. But I suggest he is not always perfectly correct on how to fix it. We can have a legitimate debate about how to improve the wages of working Americans, and that is what we need to be talking about.

The article says:

> Kennedy, the Senate's liberal lion and an unflagging ally of organized labor, says the [immigration] legislation he co-wrote would help all low-wage workers by applying minimum-wage laws and other . . . protections.

The AFL–CIO disagrees. According to John Sweeney, the AFL–CIO President:

> Guest-worker programs cast [American] workers into a perennial second-class status and unfairly put their fates into their employers' hands, creating a situation ripe for exploitation. . . .

He goes on:

> ''They encourage employers to turn good jobs into temporary jobs at reduced wages and diminished working conditions and contribute to the growing class of workers laboring in poverty.''

That was Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Weisman, the staff writer for the Washington Post, then quotes Professor Borjas:

> But some of those macroeconomic gains have come at the expense of low-wage workers, especially the 10 percent of the labor force that dropped out of high school. In recent years, competition from low-skilled immigrant workers has reduced the wages of high school dropouts by as much as 8 percent, Borjas said.

How about another professor, Andrew Sum, director of Northeastern University's Center for Labor Market Studies. The article says quotes him:

> Looking at annual earnings, the percentage losses are in the double digits, said Andrew Sum, director of Northeastern University's Center for Labor Market Studies, because jobs that once provided year-round employment are increasingly becoming temporary.
>
> A Northeastern University study found that nearly 86 percent——

Listen to this, I say to my colleagues, this is important for us.

> A Northeastern study found that nearly 86 percent of all newly employed workers hired from 2000 to 2005 were immigrants. For men, the statistics were more stark. In that time, the labor market for men rose by 2.66 million while 2.77 million foreign-born men found work.

Listen to that: The Northeastern study found that foreign-born workers filled all of the new jobs created for men between 2000 and 2005, plus some other jobs.

> In other words, Sum said, immigrants have begun replacing native-born male workers.

In the immigration bill floor debate, if we not forced the Democratic side to allow us to have some amendments and reduce some of the incredible increases in immigration under the bill as presented, it would have been shocking what the immigration bill would have done to the jobs and wages of American workers. Even after successful amendments that cut the numbers of low-skilled workers allowed to come in the future, the Senate bill will still, over 20 years, virtually triple the number of people coming into our country legally, not counting those who will continue to come illegally. That will undoubtedly impact our economy. That is why the House of Representatives needs to examine this bill very carefully before we go to conference.

How about this one? Professor Sum is quoted again in the Post article: ''Young guys are being displaced by immigrants,'' he said. ''Some of my good liberal friends take issue, but if you're a young worker under 25, poorly educated, probably African American, the higher the share of new immigrants in your community, the worse your employment prospects are becoming.''

How about Carol Swain, a law professor and political scientist at Vanderbilt University? She is also quoted in the Post article:

> ''What they're doing is increasing the pool of people eligible to compete for the very limited resources that are available for the people at the bottom. . . .The obligation of the nation should be for the people who have been here for decades.''

How about the famous economics professor Robert Samuelson? He wrote an article in May in the Washington Post titled ''Still Dodging Immigration's Truths.'' He quotes approvingly

from the testimony before our Judiciary Committee of Barry Chiswick, University of Illinois, an immigration scholar, most respected, who said the presence of immigrants in the labor market:

> Increases competition for low-skilled jobs, reducing the earnings of low-skilled native-born workers. Because of their low earnings, low-skilled immigrants also tend to pay less in taxes than they receive in public benefits. . . . Hardly anyone is discussing these issues candidly. We can be a lawful society and a welcoming society simultaneously [as President Bush has said] but we cannot be a welcoming society for limitless numbers . . . without seriously compromising our own future.

Part of the future he is talking about, is the future of the American worker. Samuelson goes on to say, and I quote the line from Professor Samuelson's article: ''Competition among them [low-skilled workers] depresses wages.'' He is talking about the additional flow of illegal immigrants into our country, or legal immigrants, for that matter. Increasing competition for the American worker by increasing the number of immigrant workers available in the labor market will depress the wages for the American worker.

In another article, Professor Samuelson, says this. He notes that illegal immigrants already here represent only about 4.9 percent of the labor force, and in no major occupation are immigrants a majority. They are 36 percent of insulation workers, 28 percent of drywall installers, and 20 percent of cooks who are drawn here by wage differences, not labor shortages. He writes about how most new illegal immigrants get work by accepting wages below the prevailing rates. What would happen, he asks, if new, illegal immigration stopped and wasn't replaced by guest workers? Well, some employers would raise wages to attract U.S. workers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair. He goes on to say: Facing greater labor costs, some would find ways to minimize costs. But he goes on to ask this question, and let me quote Professor Samuelson:

> What is wrong with higher wages for the poorest workers? From 1994 to 2004, the wages of high school dropouts rose only 2.3 percent after inflation, compared with 11.9 percent for college graduates. The number of native high school dropouts with jobs declined by 1.3 million from 2000 to 2005. Some lost jobs to immigrants. Unemployment remains high for some groups; 9.3 percent for African Americans.

I know that is true in my State. Although we have a great unemployment rate in Alabama—under 4 percent—we still have a far too high rate among the African-American community. And 12.7 percent for white teenagers, he notes. He says this: Poor immigrant workers hurt the wages of unskilled Americans; the only question is how much. One estimate, he said, was 10 percent.

We discussed these issues in the Judiciary Committee. We had one hearing on it. We had a number of professors, including Professor Freeman, the Ascherman Professor of Economics at Harvard. He said these things about the jobs and wages of American workers:

> One of the concerns when immigrants come in is they may take jobs from some Americans and drive down the wages of some Americans and obviously, if there are a large number of immigrants coming in, if they are coming in at a bad economic time, that is very likely to happen.

Professor Chiswick, University of Illinois at Chicago said the following:

> The large increase in low-skilled immigration has had the effect of decreasing the wages and employment opportunities of low-skilled workers who are currently resident in the United States.

He said this:

> Over the past two decades, the real earnings of high-skilled workers has risen substantially. The real earnings of low-skilled workers have either stagnated or decreased.

These economists are telling us what other people will not. We are being told by the business community that there is this incredible shortage out there—they can't find workers so they have to have foreign workers—but now we know the earnings of low-skilled workers have stagnated and decreased. Why? If a business wants to find more workers, they will usually increase wages, not decrease them.

He goes on to say—my time is about up, but I have quite a number of others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, may I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's additional comments be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will take 2 minutes to respond to my friend from Alabama, and then I see the Senator from Connecticut on the floor.

The Senator from Alabama has made the best case for comprehensive immigration reform because if you are not going to have the comprehensive reform, you are going to have the continuation of the pressure of driving wages down, as we find our employers hiring the undocumented workers. It has been his administration—according to the General Accounting Office, the Republican administration—that has refused to enforce employer sanctions against the employers who are currently doing it. There have been three cases in the last 4 years, $220,000 in fines. If he is so worried about this, I would say, Why aren't we after the Labor Department to try to do something about it?

Second point: For those who are going to come into the United States—and they ought to be able to come into the United States as workers, if there is a job an American does not take—there is going to be the labor protections, which do not exist today. There is going to be prevailing wage protections, there are Davis-Bacon protections, if they work in contract, if they work in construction, and service contract employees. None of that has been mentioned by the Senator from Alabama. That is an entirely different current situation. And we are going to have 7,000 inspectors to make sure that it is enforced, which does not exist now and is a principal reason why we have the kinds of results the Senator from Alabama refers to.

Mr. President, he has made the best case possible for passing a comprehensive program so that those conditions would not exist.

How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 26 minutes 45 seconds.

Mr. DODD. If I could have 10 or 12 minutes, if that is appropriate.

Mr. KENNEDY. Why don't we start with 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Alabama want 30 seconds? I will be glad to take this at another time when we have the time. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I would note we wrestled before Y2K as to how many high-skilled foreign workers the U.S. needed to let in for that period—you and I both discussed that in the Judiciary Committee and whether it would adversely impact the wages of high-skilled American workers. I would say that the current rate of immigration, legal and illegal—and I believe there is a growing consensus that supports this view—has depressed the wages of low-skilled American workers. I would ask the Senator if he would dispute the fact that the immigration bill he introduced would have greatly increased the number of immigrants into the country and wouldn't that have further adversely impacted the wages of low-skilled American workers?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, 15 seconds in response. The legislation we have introduced would require that there be a job that an American worker has not been interested in and refused to accept. Those are the jobs individuals would be eligible for under the guest worker program. I look forward to continuing this debate with my friend from Alabama.

I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, let me begin by thanking, again, my colleague from Massachusetts and others who have fought so long and hard over the last decade to have an increase in the minimum wage in our country, from the $5.15 that was adopted about a decade ago, to the suggestion today that

we raise it by $2.10. To many, $2.10 is nothing more than a cup of coffee at a high-priced coffee shop today or a few sodas or a sandwich along the way, but it makes a difference, Mr. President.

An increase in the minimum wage of $2.10, after nearly a decade, will add some $4,400 to the incomes of people who are depending upon the minimum wage to provide for themselves and their families. Remember whom we are talking about. The overwhelming majority of minimum wage workers are not teenagers, but are adults—working people trying to raise families, 60 percent of whom are women, many of whom are raising children on their own. So this $2.10 increase after nearly a decade, an additional $4,400 per year, means a great deal.

We are told by those who do the math on all of this that the increase could buy as much as 15 months of groceries for that families, 8 months of rent, 20 months of childcare—an issue that I worked with our colleague on many years ago—the importance of having a decent childcare program. As you are saying to these people, you have to stay at work and you have young children, where do the children go? The average cost of childcare rises all the time for people in this country. How do you expect someone making a minimum wage of $5.15 per hour who has two or three young children to keep them in a safe place with that kind of an income level? That $4,400 would be a tremendous help at that income level. That is the kind of difference we are talking about.

A group called America's Second Harvest has recently reported that they provide emergency hunger relief services to more than 25.3 million low-income people in the United States each year. That is an 18-percent increase since 1997. No other organization in our country does as much on a national level as Second Harvest does.

The numbers are quite clear. Over the last 4 or 5 years, we have watched an increase in children living in poverty in the United States climb by 1.4 million. What we are talking about is some 13 million children today who are living in poverty. Of the 37 million in our country, 13 million children who, through no fault of their own, through the accident of birth, are born into difficult circumstances. Those poverty numbers are going up. They are not going down.

What do we do about these children? How do we guarantee this child will get a good education? How do you learn anything in a school today if you are going to that school hungry? Talk to any grade school teacher in America in any community you wish and ask them the simple question: What is the difference between a child who has a decent meal in the morning and one who doesn't, in terms of their ability to learn, and they will tell you categorically that a child who is hungry doesn't learn.

We talk all the time about making sure America is going to be strong and vital and economically competitive in the global marketplace of the 21st century. If we continue increasing child poverty at the rate it is increasing now, this country will have a very difficult time, in my view, of meeting the competitive challenges it will face in this century.

So this proposal does make a difference—a huge difference—in the lives of people who struggle every day, good Americans out there who are trying to keep their families together. How does anyone expect a family today, particularly a family with two or three children, to live on a full-time salary of $10,700 a year? That is what you get with $5.15—$10,700 per year. I don't know of anyone who believes that you can meet your obligations of housing and food, of medical care you may need. You have to make terrible choices at that level.

I am not suggesting that $7.25 is going to solve all of those problems. But the cost of living has gone up. Everyone knows that. What has happened to gasoline prices and energy prices over the last number of months?

We have increased our salaries as Members of Congress by over $31,000 since 1997. Again, I have supported a number of those increases. How do we look in the mirror and say: A $31,000 increase for a Senator, a Congressman. Yet we can't provide a $2.10 per hour increase for someone making the minimum wage? How do we answer that question? We know the cost of living has gone up. We see it every single day. Minimum wage workers see it in a more painful way.

So I hope my colleagues, in the next 45 minutes when we have a chance to vote on this issue, vote for the Kennedy amendment. Raise the minimum wage that $2.10 and give these people a chance. Let's bring these poverty numbers down. All of us, regardless of party, ideology or anything else, ought to be committed to see to it in the United States of America that child poverty doesn't go up, it goes down. These are innocents. They didn't do anything except be born into a circumstance not of their choosing. We owe them and we owe the future of this country a lot better than they are getting. After one long decade of increasing prices, $2.10 is very little to ask. Democrats and Republicans ought to be able to come together around that request.

I hope that we can make that kind of difference. My colleague from Massachusetts and others want to be heard on this issue. I have great respect for my colleague from Wyoming who chairs our committee and does a terrific job, and we work together on many issues. But my hope is we accept the Kennedy amendment.

I didn't go into the problems of the alternative proposal, but it would mean that millions of children will get a lot less than they will if you adopt the Kennedy proposal of $2.10. This is a time when we ought to be doing what we can to strengthen those in our country who need some help now. That is all we are asking.

I have some 350,000 people in my State who show up at food shelters to get some assistance. That is in the most affluent State of the country on a per-capita basis, and even the State of Connecticut faces difficulties on this issue.

I know my colleagues from less affluent States see the problem in a far more dramatic way. It is not lost on me that States that have the lowest minimum wage at the State level have the highest levels of child poverty. With all the money we spend here, this is little to ask.

Small business is interested. A poll conducted among small businesses found that 86 percent of small businesses responded that an increase like this in the minimum wage is acceptable to them. In fact, studies in other countries have pointed out that their economies have not been adversely affected by this.

If small businesses said an increase is warranted, we as Members of the Congress ought not be holding back. If people who pay this wage believe it is the right thing to do, Members of Congress ought to join with them.

I urge my colleagues to support the Kennedy amendment—$2.10 to make life a little easier for people out there struggling every day to make ends meet. This is the United States of America. These children deserve better. Their families deserve at least an opportunity to get out from under the tremendous burdens they are facing every day. I urge adoption of the amendment when the vote occurs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator for his proposal which I think is a very thoughtful and effective way of addressing many issues, which especially single women in the workplace, especially single moms in the workplace have today. These are issues which are not addressed by the Kennedy amendment.

Whether it is $1.10 or $2.05, that is an important debate because it will have an important effect on how many jobs are created, and the impact on job creation and jobs is what we are talking about here. If you start losing jobs because you raise the minimum wage too quickly, so fast that small employers can't afford it, that is going to have an effect on people's opportunity to work.

I think the Senator from Wyoming has put forth a much more balanced approach as to what number the minimum wage should be raised by, but that is not what is going to make the workplace a more tolerable event and a

more acceptable event for the single mother who has kids at home. What would help a lot in this area is additional language in the Enzi proposal which is called ''family time.'' It is resisted aggressively by the other side of the aisle, and I don't understand it.

We just heard an impassioned plea from the Senator from Connecticut about working moms, single mothers—especially single mothers in low-paying jobs who have a very difficult time maintaining the quality of their household and taking care of their kids. Yet they resist a proposal which all Federal employees have had the right to since 1978, which is called ''family time.'' They stiff-arm the working mother in this country.

This may have been acceptable because the unions demanded that they do this back in the 1950s and 1960s, when there were not that many single mothers working in the workplace. But today there is a huge participation in the workplace from single mothers. Back in 1940, only 28 percent of the workplace were women. Today, 60 percent of the workplace are women. You have almost 7.3 million single mothers in the workplace, raising a family and trying to take care of their kids' needs at home. The Enzi proposal says to those mothers, if you want to, you can work out an agreement with an employer—the employer can't demand that you do it, it is entirely up to you to sign on to that agreement; it is at your discretion; you can't be compelled to participate in this—where 1 week you can work up to 10 extra hours and the next week you work 10 less hours.

Why is that important, especially to a single mother? Because they may have a child who is going to have to have some sort of operation, they may have a child who has some sporting event that goes on for a period of days, or has a rehearsal, or just a period in their life where that child needs their mother at home for a greater period of time. This doesn't just apply to single mothers, it applies to working families, husbands and wives, but it is a really important right a single mother should have in the workplace. It is so important, in fact, that we gave it to Federal employees back in 1978. Yet year in and year out the concept of family time has been resisted by the other side of the aisle.

They come forward with these statements of compassion, which are very compelling and which are well delivered—especially by the Senator from Connecticut for whom I have great regard—but if they truly believed in that they would have incorporated in their bill the flextime proposal which Senator ENZI has put in his proposal. That is where real compassion is. That is going to affect a lot of people. Literally millions of working parents will be positively impacted if the Enzi bill passes.

Sure, the minimum wage is important. But there are a lot more people who are going to be affected by the family time language in this bill and improve their quality of life and their ability to raise their children well than by the increase in the minimum wage. The family time will apply to everybody who works in the workplace, especially—well, everybody who works on a fixed, 40-hour week.

If you want to look at the essence of what will really help an American family, and especially an American family with a single breadwinner in it—not a single breadwinner but a single person working, single mother specifically—if you want to look at what will really help that family, you have to look at the Enzi bill and the family time language.

Let me again explain what it does. It says, over a 2-week period, at the discretion of the working mother or the working father—or if they are both working, if they are together and they are both working—they can reach an agreement with their employer which says, 1 week I can work an extra 10 hours and, in exchange, the next week—or up to an extra 10 hours—I can work less 10 hours.

The impact of that is just huge on a family. It is not necessary they do it. They can continue their 40-hour week if they wish. But there are a lot of events that occur in the raising of children where you do need those extra hours to be at home, where you do need those extra hours to take your child on something that is really important to them—a trip or an event that maybe involves a number of days, a 3-day basketball tournament or a 3-day recital event, or maybe just a situation where you need that extra day to be at home and make sure your children have you there.

This opportunity, this benefit which we make available to all Federal employees, should clearly be available to people who are not in the Federal Government. Senator ENZI has, in a very reasonable way, put this language in his bill. I actually think this is much more important than the issue of this fight between the $1.10 and the $2 or $2.05 or whatever, because it is going to impact so many more people. Just on this issue alone you should vote for the Enzi bill because if you really want to improve the quality of the workplace, especially for the single mother, this bill will do it through the family time language he has put in here.

I congratulate the Senator from Wyoming for bringing this package forward. I think this package, just because this language is in there, is dramatically better, dramatically more compassionate. We hear a lot of language about compassion. It is dramatically more attentive to the needs of children in this country and proper parenting of children in this country than the package that has been brought forward from the other side. Why don't we include this on the other side? We know why they don't: Because labor unions are against it. It is a knee-jerk reaction on the part of organized big labor to this language. But we should not allow that sort of knee-jerk reaction to control our ability to give working mothers and families the opportunity to have this sort of benefit, which will clearly improve the ability of those people to take care of their children and to raise their children and to be good parents and do what they want to do, in order to make sure they are available when their kids need them.

I congratulate the Senator from Wyoming. I think he has put together an excellent package. I hope everyone will support it.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). The Senator has 16 minutes and 14 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself 4 minutes.

I listened very carefully to the Senator from New Hampshire talk about flextime. Flextime is something that those of us on this side of the aisle support. But that is not what is in the bill. That is not what is in the bill. The Federal Government has what they call core time—core agency hours. That means that they have to work from 11 to 2 or 11 to 3, and then the other hours they can make the judgment whether they want to use that, in terms of flextime. That is the kind of proposal that makes some sense. That is what we would support. But that is not in this legislation.

The person who decides whether Mrs. Smith is going to get the time off to go to see her child's play or to see the ballgame is going to be the employer—period. Make no mistake about it. That is the way it is written here on page 4 of their legislation. If we are talking about providing a degree of flextime—we have been through this; we understand what it is—flextime is not the time that is allocated just by the employer when the employer makes the sole judgment and decision, as they do under the Enzi proposal—No. 1.

No. 2, the Senator from New Hampshire says, let's let that person work 50 hours a week this week and maybe 30 hours a week the next week. Here it is on page 4, which says:

> in which more than 40 hours of the work requirement may occur in a week of the period, except that no more than 10 hours may be shifted between the 2 weeks involved.

That means you can work 50 hours 1 week and 30 hours at the present time. What is the current law? The current law is, if you work 50 hours 1 week and then 30 hours the second week, you get the overtime for the 10 hours here. Do you think that is in the Enzi proposal? No. It is not there. They have eliminated it. You work the extra hours and you don't get the extra pay. Some deal—some deal for someone. That is called flextime. If you can sell that, you can sell the Brooklyn Bridge.

This is what you are doing. Instead of giving the person the overtime, as has

gone on under the Federal Labor Standards Act, that has been eliminated.

There is something else that the women of the country who are concerned about equal pay for equal work ought to understand. In the legislation under the Enzi amendment, because of the fact that you raise the exemption for companies that will be covered from $500,000 to $1 million, and because you eliminate the Federal Labor Standards Act protection for those who are involved in interstate commerce—that is all spelled out on page 13—that means 10 million workers will not have the protections of the minimum wage or the Federal Labor Standards Act, which means that the equal pay for equal work protections that are there for 4 to 5 million women will not be there.

Does America understand the difficulty we have had in this Chamber trying to get equal pay for equal work, let alone equal pay for comparable work? We have been able to get it under the Fair Labor Standards Act, and that is being eliminated for 4 to 5 million women.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will my colleague yield on that point?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. DODD. The Senator has spent a lot of time on this issue over the years. We have modified the Fair Labor Standards Act several times over the last 40 years. In each of those cases, as I recall, we modified the law to expand the number of people who would be covered by the minimum wage and the overtime pay and equal pay for equal work. This would be the first time, as I understand it, that we would be taking the opposite direction; the very first time that we are going to shrink the number of people who would have the right to overtime pay, thus, excluding some 10 million people who would otherwise be covered by the minimum wage.

Am I correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

For those who are even thinking about voting for the Enzi proposal, you are eliminating the protections, and you are getting the serious cutbacks. That is why the $1.10 increase would impact 1.8 million. Ours would be 6.6 million directly and 8 million on top of that.

The Senator makes a very good point.

This is not a base increase for the minimum wage.

This would be gutting the minimum wage protections for millions of Americans.

That is a fine ''how do you do.''

Mr. DODD. Every time we have modified the Fair Labor Standards Act, we were expanding the opportunity for workers. I believe this would be the first time in the history of our country that we actually go in the opposite direction. Those in poverty would be excluded from getting the overtime pay and protections for equal pay for equal work.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator stated it correctly. We are having a discussion and debate about the fact that we haven't increased the minimum wage in 9 years.

As the Senator pointed out and as I have pointed out, we have had this explosion of poverty with children, an explosion of poverty with minimum wage workers, and an explosion of hunger. What we do have as an alternative is an increase in reduction of protection, unlike the historical debate for an increase in the minimum wage.

Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 9 minutes 15 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and my colleague, the able Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, this is an extremely important issue before us. The last time the minimum wage was raised was in September of 1997. If we fail to increase the minimum wage before the end of the year, we will have gone the longest time without adjusting it since it was first enacted in 1938. That is a dismal performance on the part of the Congress.

Since 1997, inflation has drastically reduced the purchasing power of the minimum wage. It is now the lowest it has been in more than 40 years. To match the last increase, in terms of purchasing power, the minimum wage would have to be increased 25 percent above what it is now. And as we fail to act, the purchasing power of the current minimum wage continues to be eroded by the steady march of inflation—contributing to two serious problems in our society, rising poverty and increased inequality.

Thirty years ago, a worker paid the minimum wage who worked 40 hours a week for 52 weeks made enough to keep a family of three out of poverty. Now that worker is 35 percent below the poverty level.

People at the bottom of the wage scale have been falling further and further behind the rest of the workforce. In the 1950s and 1960s, the minimum wage averaged about 50 percent of the average wage. Today, at $5.15 an hour, the current minimum wage is only 31 percent of the average hourly wage. If we fail to act, minimum wage earners will continue to fall further behind.

Nearly 15 million Americans would benefit from raising the minimum wage to $7.25 an hour. 6.6 million would benefit directly because they make less than $7.25 an hour. Based on past experience with minimum wage hikes, another 8 million who make a little more than $7.25 an hour should enjoy a wage increase as well.

There are those who say only teenagers benefit from an increase in the minimum wage. However, eighty percent of the workers who would benefit from raising the minimum wage—12 million of those 15 million workers—are adults.

As Congress fails to act, States are raising the minimum wage themselves. My own State did that last January. And various studies indicate that job growth has been faster in the States that have raised the minimum wage than in those that have not raised the minimum wage. Economic studies by leading economists found that increases such as the proposed minimum wage hike would not reduce employment, which is an argument that is made against this amendment.

A hike in the minimum wage, in fact, has been found to reduce turnover of employees which has several advantages. You get a more experienced and productive workforce, lower costs for recruiting new workers, and lower costs for training new workers.

In fact, a letter in support of raising the minimum wage was signed by over 500 economists, including four Nobel laureate winners.

Last week, the House Appropriations Committee accepted an amendment offered in the committee by my able colleague, Congressman HOYER, to raise the minimum wage to $7.25. It was accepted by the committee on a bipartisan basis. The bill had been scheduled to come to the House floor this week, but it has been pulled from consideration. News reports suggest—I hope wrongly—that the House leadership wants to avoid a debate on the minimum wage until after the November elections.

Mr. President, we should pass the Kennedy amendment to raise the minimum wage. It will lower poverty, reduce inequality, and provide vital income gains to 15 million workers and their families.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the debate one more time. I want to make a couple of points as clearly as I can.

First of all, the debate we have heard this morning is a classic debate about two very different philosophies—one that believes in the marketplace, the competitive system we have in the United States of America of competition and entrepreneurship, and the second is the argument that says Government knows better in the top-down mandates work.

In 1970, Republicans tried wage and price controls to control inflation. They worked miserably. Democrats have tried, time and again, for wage controls, and they failed to have the intended consequences. They have because you are interjecting yourself into

the marketplace but only in one segment.

Second, the Senator from Massachusetts yesterday held up Europe as an example of how higher minimum wages work.

I have just returned from two of those European countries—Germany and France.

I would like to make the clear point as to why the Senator from Wyoming is right and, with all due respect, the Senator from Massachusetts is wrong.

High minimum wage laws in the countries of France and Germany have caused the following:

France's unemployment is 10 percent more, or two times that of the United States of America. Unemployment for youth in France is over 20 percent.

We have seen on the nightly news—and I saw firsthand when I was there—the tremendous economic problems the Government of France is having in driving its own economy. And it has declared itself its own worst enemy but could not get concessions to pull back some of these mandates. Therefore, the French economy is growing at 1.6 percent a year this year, a rate less than half that of the United States, with a minimum wage rate that is compounded over that of the United States.

Our great trading partner and great friend, Germany, has an unemployment rate of 11 percent.

Those are the two countries that were cited yesterday as the example as to why the higher minimum wage works.

In fact, they are an example of it not working.

Second, with regard to State minimum wages going up, that is precisely where our Constitution, our country, and our Founding Fathers believed these decisions should be made; that is, at the State level.

In fact, the Senator from Connecticut talked about raising the Federal minimum wage to a level less than the minimum wage in the State of Connecticut today and much less than what it goes to next year. It is right for the States to control those minimum wages.

Lastly, I have heard three times about the survey of small businesses where 86 percent say this is not an issue that is being quoted as a reason why we shouldn't even be debating this.

I ran a small business. I understand small business. The reason it wasn't an issue for 86 percent of them is mostly because people pay more than the Federal minimum wage anyway.

That is the name of the game in this country—for the marketplace to dictate.

But go find out who those 14 percent are. I will tell you. They are the people affected by the unintended consequence of a raise in the minimum wage. The 68 percent are either independent contractors or higher skilled workers, where the Federal minimum wage rate is not in effect in the first place. But those 14 percent are in the tourism industry, in the construction industry, in the maintenance industry, in the short-order cook industry or in the fast food industry. They are the ones who are getting their foot on the ladder.

Go interview those 14 percent, and you will find that the economic study I quoted yesterday is, in fact, correct. Every increase in the minimum wage will cost some of them their jobs.

In our free enterprise system, there are three components to the price of a product. One is the cost of goods, the second one is the cost to sell the goods, and third is the profit. If you raise the cost of goods sold, which you do by raising the wage rate, you either have to lower the marketing, lower your profits or increase your productivity.

What will every business do? First, they will increase their productivity. They will try to ask more of their workers so the mandated increase in their wages is neutralized by employing less people.

I commend the Senator from Wyoming on his legislation. It is a 21st century approach to the American workforce and the free enterprise system. And I respectfully oppose the proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

I have listened patiently through 4 hours yesterday and quite a bit of time this morning. There are some things that need to be said.

I appreciate the comments from our side of the aisle and from everybody who has gone before me. I particularly appreciate the comments of the Senator from Georgia because some of those things have been grating on us a little bit as we have listened to what has been said. We have seen the charts which show that small businesses in this country are in favor of that kind of a tax increase.

I spoke to the Federation of Independent Businesses yesterday morning. They do the most complete job of surveying their members than any association that I know of. They do not back anything unless there is a strong consensus by their members.

They are opposed, by their vote, to the minimum wage increase that Senator KENNEDY is suggesting.

I do not know where they find that 86 percent. But I have seen surveys before that are able to manufacture the kinds of numbers that people want to have.

From the manufacturing members, I suggest that it sounds reasonable to people.

I saw a chart over here last night that showed the average CEO in America is making $11.8 million compared to what a minimum wage person is making.

That is an average CEO. What do you suppose the good ones are making? Eleven million eight hundred thousand dollars a year for the average CEO in this country? I think that must be the average CEO in the top 100 companies in the world. But that is apples and oranges when you are talking about the minimum wage.

We have heard some pretty big numbers about how many people are in poverty and under the minimum wage.

The purpose is to take the 1.9 million people who are at the minimum wage and get them higher wages. We all agree on that. What we don't agree on is how to do that.

The Senator from Massachusetts earlier today said minimum wage jobs don't get you out of poverty; that they keep you in poverty.

That was his quote this morning. I absolutely agree with that. What we need to do is get higher skills in this country. We need to reduce the number of dropouts in this country. It is dropouts who are working at the minimum wage. It is people who have made some choices that put them in a position where they have to take the lower paying jobs. We need to change that.

When I first came to Washington, welfare reform was going into effect. The newspapers were full of stories that on the day that went into effect, people were going to drop through the cracks. It was going to be this tragedy for American people. After it happened, there were not many stories on that. That is because the tragedies did not happen. People improved their lot in life with jobs.

I happened to be in an ice cream shop where they shared the tables fairly closely. This was fine, but it made it impossible for me not to hear the conversation at the table abutted up to my table. It was a woman and her husband talking to a sister who had a child with her. She was talking about the change that welfare reform had made in her life because she had gotten some additional training, she had gotten a good job, and she was so pleased with her job she was going to shift some hours so she could be at work when her sister was in training. She would take care of that child who was sitting there so her sister could have the same kind of benefit she had.

That is the way we change America. We get people better jobs. We take care of things so people can get better training.

Better training reminds me of the Workforce Investment Act. I have been trying to get the Workforce Investment Act through this process for 3 years now. That is a bill that would train 900,000 people a year to higher paying jobs. That is what we want, higher paying jobs. Do you think we have been able to get it through the process? No. For 2 years we were not able to get a conference committee. Now we are being blocked from having it brought to the Senate for debate. That would solve a lot of the problems.

We talk about the difference in wages between men and women. We had a great hearing in our Committee on

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. I liked one of the people whom Senator KENNEDY selected to give testimony, a lady from New York City. She was talking about the value of taking nontraditional jobs. She happened to be a stone mason, a person who works with bricks, rock, and marble. She makes things beautiful. She started with basic construction, and she worked her way up to where she was hanging marble on skyscrapers. She shared with us the progression in pay she had gotten. She is making more than I am. She made that progression rather rapidly, but she had to take a job that was nontraditional for women. She wears a hard hat and safety toes and goes up skyscrapers. You do not necessarily have to do that to make more money.

I always point out in Wyoming we have a shortage of people to work. That shortage is providing power for this country. Over a third of the coal that is mined in this country is mined in Campbell County, WY, which is where Gillette is. That is where I am from. Their problem now is getting people to drive haul trucks. They are big trucks. Two of them would not fit in this Chamber. They would be as high as the ceiling. They are big equipment. They have power steering, power brakes, enclosed cabs with air conditioning. They drive almost like a car. If a person can drive and pass a drug test, they can start at $60,000 a year and get the training to work on that truck. That is way above minimum wage, folks. That is $60,000 a year. If they want to put in some overtime—they would not be allowed flextime at the present time—they can make more than that.

We need to have people look at some of the nontraditional jobs and look at some of the other areas of the country. If they are in an area with a lot of people and not many jobs, they will have lower paying jobs. We need to get more job training. We need to have the people be where the good-paying jobs are. They would find pretty good quality of life, too.

I need to correct a couple of other things. First of all, we make some of these charts sound as if everyone working at minimum wage is a single mom with lots of kids. That does not fit with the statistics. There are 1.9 million people at the minimum wage. Fully 85 percent of the minimum wage earners live with their parents—I would think most of the parents hope that means they are teenagers—or they have a working spouse or are living alone without children. So 41 percent live with a parent or relative, 23 percent are single or are the sole breadwinner in a household with no children, and 21 percent live with another wage earner. A lot of those are teenagers. Yes, they are in poverty if that is all they are making.

I have had some minimum wage jobs. I don't know how many in this Chamber have had minimum wage jobs. I worked in the summers and while I was going to college, even when I was considerably younger than that. One of the things I discovered was if I was interested in what I was doing and I learned as much as I could about it, I was not at the minimum wage very long. I got a promotion. I got more pay. But of course the reason I got more pay is because I was able to do more things. I was more skilled. Minimum wage equals minimum skills.

McDonald's takes a real rap for starting people at minimum wage, and I have a friend named Jack Preiss who owns several McDonald's. He pointed out to me he has three of his employees who started at minimum wage who now own 20 McDonald's.

That is the way we want America to work. We do not want minimum wage jobs that don't get you out of poverty. They keep you in poverty. Yes, we want higher skills, better jobs, and the opportunity for people to have higher wages. If people are locked into the fact they are going to have a minimum wage job their whole life, they are going to have a minimum wage job their whole life. But there are options. There are opportunities out there. And there could be more if we could do the Workforce Investment Act.

Flextime is one of six provisions in this bill that make a difference to small business.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of Senator KENNEDY's amendment to increase the minimum wage. Not only is it the right thing to do for working families, but my State has shown that a living wage is compatible with a growing economy.

The facts speak for themselves, and they speak loudly. Let's just take three numbers: 9, 37, and 50.

Nine is the number of years since the minimum wage was last increased. This is the longest time the Nation has gone without raising the minimum wage since it was implemented in 1938. The real value of the current minimum wage is already $4 below what it was in 1968.

Thirty-seven is the millions of Americans—37 million—who are currently living in poverty, including 13 million children.

Fifty is the percent by which poverty has increased in the past generation—freezing out an ever larger portion of our working citizens from the advantages of a higher standard of living that most of us enjoy.

I believe these numbers are a very strong signal that we are long past the time for the Nation, as a whole, to raise the level of the Federal minimum wage. I am proud that my home State of Washington has the highest minimum wage in the country, and it is indexed yearly to ensure that our workers are properly compensated for their hard work.

We in Washington State offer direct proof that a living minimum wage is compatible with a growing economy. May marked our 34th consecutive month of job growth. Our unemployment rate, even with the highest minimum wage in the country, is essentially at the national average. Our poverty rate stands at 11 percent, which is significantly below the national average of 12.5 percent. Our median household income stands at $48,000, much higher than the national average of $43,000. Good labor policies make for good labor productivity and a healthy state economy.

Ever since the Fair Minimum Wage Act was passed in 1938, opponents have kept raising the same baseless arguments. Even 68 years ago, opponents tried to paint a bleak picture of disastrous effects, like ''factories closed,'' ''industries forced into bankruptcy,'' and ''people who will be thrown out of employment.'' It wasn't true then. It is not true today. The fact is that this wage provides more economic opportunities for people to support their families and contribute to their communities.

Opponents often cite a negative impact on jobs as their prime argument to oppose an increase in the minimum wage. This tired argument is simply not true. In fact, the 4 years following our last minimum wage increase marked the strongest economic growth in three decades, creating almost 12 million new jobs. In contrast, during the past 4 years we have only seen the creation of about 4.7 million new jobs.

As elected representatives, it is our job not only to represent the people in our States, but also to stand up for the millions of Americans whose voices cannot be heard. Just since 2000, the number of Americans living in poverty has increased by a stunning 5.4 million people. A minimum wage employee, working 52 weeks a year for 40 hours a week, makes almost $6,000 below the Federal poverty guidelines for a family of three. At this rate, it will be a long time before we see significant progress against the scourge of poverty for America's families.

By raising the minimum wage to $7.25, we can put an extra $4,400 a year into the pockets of these workers, enabling them to better support their families. This meager amount can make a world of difference to the poor among us. It could mean 19 months of utilities, 15 months of groceries, 8 months of rent or tuition for a community college degree. These are the basics, not the luxuries, of life today.

It is important to continually remind ourselves who is going to benefit from an increase. Here are some numbers to help set the record straight. This amendment will benefit nearly 15 million Americans, 80 percent of whom are adults, not teenagers trying to earn some extra spending money. In fact, more than one-third of these adults are the sole source of income for their families. And let's not forget the 7 million children of those minimum wage workers who will benefit from this increase.

This Congress has substantially cut the tax rates for the wealthiest people

in this country, saving them millions of dollars over the last 5 years. But so far, this Congress has been unwilling to spend a few cents more to help the poorest of our working citizens.

I have carefully considered all aspects of this amendment and have come to the conclusion that we have no acceptable alternative. I see the growth of the job market and the strong economy in my State. I see how we have worked in Washington State to ensure that low-wage workers share in this success. I know that this is what our Nation needs. We should follow the lead of my State and the other 20 that have already increased their minimum wages and allow all Americans to share in these benefits.

Overall, this slight increase in the minimum wage would allow a significant portion of our Nation, people who are working hard and playing by the rules, to have an increased opportunity to share in the American dream. They will be able to better support their families and will not have to make unacceptable decisions like whether to buy groceries or pay the rent.

If any of my colleagues oppose this amendment, I would like them to consider living on $10,700 a year—and not just living on it, but rather, trying to raise a family of 4 on that low income. That would mean having about $7 a day per person, not adding in all the bills. Now just think about how much you spent on your last meal. If we think of the debate that we are having in these terms, it is clear that raising the minimum wage is the right thing to do.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment to increase the minimum wage. Let's show them that we have got our priorities straight, and let's finally give low-income workers the raise that they are long overdue. It is the right thing to do for workers and the right thing to do for our economy.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, this is a very important week in the Senate. For much of the week our focus has been on the war in Iraq—a necessary debate that is long overdue. But, today our focus is on a different kind of war: the war on poverty.

Since President Bush took office, the number of Americans living in poverty has increased by 5.4 million, and today 37 million Americans live in poverty, 13 million of whom are children. What is even more disturbing is that over 70 percent of children in poverty live in a home where at least one parent works. So we have a situation in which today in America, millions of children are living in poverty despite the fact that they are in homes with a working adult. In fact the reality is that among full-time, year-round workers, poverty has increased by 50 percent since the late 1970s.

This may be surprising, but if you take a minute to look at what is going on, it is not hard to understand. Consider a single mother of two working a minimum wage job 40 hours a week for 52 weeks a year. Without taking any time off for illness or vacation—she earns just $10,700 a year—nearly $6,000 below the Federal poverty line for a family of three.

This is an outrage. And it is not how things should be in America. No American working a full time job should live below the poverty line. If you work hard and play by the rules, you should be able to make a good life for yourself and be able to get ahead. That is the American dream.

Unfortunately, instead of helping people achieve the American dream, our leadership in Washington has repeatedly turned its back on them. Congress has failed to give minimum wage earners a raise in almost a decade. In fact, the real value of the minimum wage—taking into account the impact of inflation—has dropped. Since 1997 when we last raised the minimum wage, the real value of the minimum wage has fallen by 20 percent—effectively reversing all the gains made by the last increase. Never before in the history of the minimum wage have we let so much time lapse before adjusting the minimum wage.

Members of Congress understand the concept of real value. After all, even though Congress has failed to increase the minimum wage since 1997, it has given itself eight annual pay raises. This is indefensible. No Member of the House or Senate should have the gumption to argue in support of a pay raise for themselves and against a pay raise for hardworking Americans.

The Congress should follow the lead of the 12 States that have raised their minimum wages since January 2004. In fact, 17 States and the District of Columbia—representing 45 percent of the U.S. population—have set minimums above the Federal rate of $5.15. The State of Washington has the highest minimum wage in the country at $7.63 as of January 1, 2006. Oregon's is $7.50. My own State of Massachusetts is considering a minimum wage of $8.25. And the city of Santa Fe, NM has a minimum wage of $9.50.

Of course, not all States have taken the minimum wage so seriously. Thirty-three States have a minimum wage at or even below the Federal level. That is why we need a Federal minimum wage. The value of an hour of the same work should not vary State to State. We have a national poverty crisis, and we need a national solution.

It is time for Congress to get its priorities straight.

America's minimum wage isn't rising, but other basic costs for families are. Since President Bush took office, the cost of family health insurance has risen more than 70 percent, or an average of $4,500 per family. Six million more Americans are uninsured because they cannot afford coverage.

Since President Bush took office, gas prices have more than doubled. In many places the price of gas exceeds $3.00 per gallon—something many working Americans have to buy just to get to work. In my home State of Massachusetts working families have faced gas price increases of $1.41 a gallon—a 94 percent increase. Yet rather than rewarding work, the Republican leadership would rather reward oil and gas companies with sweetheart deals.

Since President Bush took office, the cost of a 4-year college education has increased by nearly $8,000, or 57 percent, at public universities and nearly $21,000, 32 percent, at private universities. Yet instead of working to ensure that American families can afford to send their kids to college, our Republican leadership is more interested in working to cut $12 billion from college student aid, increasing the costs of loans; and freezing Pell grants for higher education.

These are the wrong priorities. Raising the minimum wage is not just an economic issue; it is a moral issue. It is a question of values. And this is a values debate I think we need to have. The question is whether we value those who work hard and play by the rules and whether we will fight to ensure they receive a livable wage.

Don't be fooled by the side-by-side amendment that my colleague from Wyoming has introduced. It does not value those who work hard and play by the rules. Yes, it increases the minimum wage by $1.10, but it is loaded with poison pills that actually decrease the number of people who are eligible for the minimum wage. It cuts overtime pay, and would deny more than 10 million workers the minimum wage, overtime pay, and equal pay rights they currently receive. Rather than giving hard-working Americans a step up, it would force many more further into poverty. That is hardly the American way.

Before I end, I would like to take a moment to dispel a common myth about the minimum wage. Some argue that increasing the minimum wage will hurt small businesses. That is simply not the case. A new study from the Center for American Progress and Policy Matters in Ohio found that the ''11 States with a minimum wage above the Federal minimum wage . . . had higher rates of small business growth between 1997 and 2003.'' That is right—more growth. Small business employment in those States grew by 9.4 percent while small business employment in States with the Federal minimum wage grew by only 6.6 percent. What this report reveals is that having a higher minimum wage does not impair the growth of small businesses.

This is not new news. In 1999, a Levy Institute survey of small businesses revealed that more than three-quarters of the firms surveyed said their employment practices would not be affected by an increase in the minimum wage. In fact, jobless rates fell after the last minimum-wage increase.

Mr. President, it is time for us to give the working people of America the respect they deserve. It is time for Congress to give working Americans a pay

raise. It is time for us to get our priorities straight. I am proud to cosponsor my colleague, Senator KENNEDY's, amendment to increase the minimum wage. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in its favor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today in support of giving 56,000 Nevandans a raise by increasing the Federal minimum wage to $7.25 an hour.

My colleagues have done an excellent job of making the case for this raise. My side has pointed out it has been nearly 10 years since the minimum wage was last increased. We have communicated that the current wage is woefully inadequate, that someone who works full-time and makes the minimum wage lives below the poverty line. We have also talked about how minimum wage workers don't make enough to provide their families adequate housing, food, and essentials like clothing. We have talked about all the facts. So what I wish to do now is appeal to the Senate's sense of fairness.

All of us in the Senate, don't we believe that someone working full time should be able to live a life out of poverty? I believe the answer is yes, and I believe that is reason enough for us all to vote yes to increasing this wage. Three times in the last Congress the Republican leadership brought down a minimum wage bill rather than have an up-or-down vote. We can't wait any longer. There are only a few weeks left in this Congress, and those 56,000 Nevadans deserve a raise.

I know the majority has a proposal to raise the minimum wage by about a dollar an hour but it is not enough. It doesn't impact nearly enough Americans and won't make a big enough difference. Whereas an increase to $7.25 will help over 5 million Americans, the majority amendment will help only 2. Moreover, our amendment will mean an additional $4,370 a year to help minimum wage earners support their families. An increase of this size can help offset the cost of high gas prices, not to mention the costs of health care, food, and other needs.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to pass a graduated increase of the minimum wage to $7.25 per hour.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I speak today in support of efforts to increase the Federal minimum wage and urge my colleagues to vote in support of Senator KENNEDY's amendment to increase the Federal minimum wage to $7.25 an hour over the next 2 years. This much-needed increase would benefit over 7 million Americans directly and approximately 8 million Americans indirectly. The Federal minimum wage has not been increased in almost 9 years and action by Congress is long overdue. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities notes that after adjusting for inflation, the value of the minimum wage is at its lowest level since 1955. As the costs of housing, health care, energy, and education continue to skyrocket, we must raise the minimum wage to provide millions of hard-working Americans the respect and dignity their work demands.

I think it is unconscionable that in the almost 9 years that we have not raised the minimum wage, Congress has voted to increase its own pay by $31,600. Most recently, last November we allowed the $3,100 pay raise to go through for Members of Congress. People will find it hard to understand why Members of Congress received substantial pay raises at a time when the real value of the minimum wage has eroded by 20 percent since 1997. As my colleagues know, I have long fought against automatic congressional pay increases and will continue to do so. I have introduced legislation that would put an end to automatic cost-of-living adjustments for congressional pay. We have Americans who are working full time, 52 weeks a year and they cannot afford health care, housing, and child care. They don't have the power to automatically raise their pay—they are dependent on Congress to raise the Federal minimum wage. But instead of working to raise the minimum wage, we in Congress have worked to protect our automatic pay raises.

Over 20 States and the District of Columbia have responded to congressional inaction and have passed or are in the process of passing State minimum wage increases above the Federal level. I am proud to report that my State of Wisconsin is one of these States that have passed a minimum wage increase. Last June, Wisconsin raised its minimum wage to $5.70 an hour and earlier this month, raised its minimum wage again to $6.50 an hour. The State Department of Workforce Development estimates that this modest two-step increase will benefit an estimated 200,000 low wage workers in Wisconsin.

While this increase is a step in the right direction, it is still not enough to even ensure that minimum wage employees can pay for affordable housing in Wisconsin. The National Low Income Housing Coalition estimates that the fair market rent for a two-bedroom apartment in Wisconsin is $647 a month and calculates that a full-time minimum wage employee needs to work 77 hours a week, 52 weeks a year to afford a two-bedroom apartment. Mr. President, 77 hours a week is almost the equivalent of two full-time minimum wage workers and the number of hours of work required to cover the costs of an apartment are even higher in States with higher housing costs. It is a disgrace that in many cases, minimum wage workers cannot afford adequate housing or are forced to pay a huge share of their income to cover housing costs.

Housing costs are not the only necessity of life that minimum wage workers have to provide for themselves and their families. They also have to purchase groceries, provide health care, pay for higher education, pay for increasingly expensive gas and electric costs, and provide child care for their children. Some Americans may think that the majority of minimum wage workers are teenagers in the first job; that perception is incorrect. The Economic Policy Institute notes that over 70 percent of minimum wage workers are adults and in Wisconsin, over 80 percent of minimum wage workers are adults. Moreover, of these adult minimum wage workers, over 30 percent are the sole breadwinners of their families.

More and more of these working Americans find themselves mired in poverty or living on the cusp of poverty. Currently, there are 37 million Americans living in poverty, including 13 million children. Among full-time, year-round workers, poverty has increased by 50 percent in the late 1970s. Minimum wage workers who work full time earn $10,700 a year, which is almost $6,000 below the Federal poverty guidelines for a family of three. No American should work full-time, year-round and still live in poverty. This modest increase in the Federal minimum wage will not eliminate poverty, but it will provide hard-working Americans with a much-needed increase in their wages. This increase would provide more money for workers to purchase prescription drugs, to pay utilities and rent, to provide child care for their children, and to invest in higher education opportunities. This increase is needed because the majority of the poor people in our country are working and are holding down low-paying jobs with stagnant wages that do not allow them to finally break free from poverty.

Opponents of this amendment argue that it hurts the economy and job growth. In the 4 years after the last minimum wage increase, nearly 12 million new jobs were created. In the last 4 years, only 4.7 million jobs have been created and the real value minimum wage continues to erode. A 1998 Economic Policy Institute study did not find significant job loss associated with the 1997 minimum wage increase. Additionally, the Center on Wisconsin Strategy examined job growth after the June 2005 increase in Wisconsin's minimum wage and found that Wisconsin had an average growth of 30,000 more jobs, not a job loss. History shows that minimum wage increases have not had a negative impact on unemployment.

I was proud to vote for the 1996–1997 increase bringing the minimum wage to its current level of $5.15 an hour and I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this amendment by Senator KENNEDY to increase the minimum wage to $7.25 an hour. When the minimum wage was established in 1938, its purpose was to ensure that American workers were fairly compensated for a day's work. But today, the minimum wage isn't living up to that promise. Far more work needs to be done to support hard-working American families, and Congress can start by increasing the minimum wage.

Mr. KENNEDY. How much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes 38 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, Senator ENZI says this debate is grating on the Republican side of the aisle. Sorry, that is how it is when you are on the wrong side of the truth. It is grating to have to hear the truth as Senator KENNEDY and others have spoken of.

It has been 9 long years since there has been an increase in the minimum wage. It is a disgrace. While we see our friends on the other side fight for the CEOs of oil companies, in the Committee on Commerce, they would not even swear them in. They are all on that side. When it comes to working families, forget about it.

Then Senator ENZI implies this does not have anything to do with women. Women make up 59 percent of the workers who would be affected as a result of raising the minimum wage; 1.4 million working mothers would benefit directly, 760,000 single moms would get an immediate raise, and over 3 million kids have parents who would get an immediate raise.

What has happened to family values on the other side of the aisle? It seems to me it is just so many empty words.

Then they scare you and say the economy will suffer. All you have to do, again, is look at the facts and look at the truth. In the 4 years after the last minimum wage increase passed, the economy experienced its strongest growth in over three decades. All the talk about how bad a minimum wage increase is for the economy is not true.

I say to my Republican friends, support the Kennedy increase in the minimum wage. The truth shall set you free.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

The Senator from Massachusetts has said: Let's have an up-or-down vote. There are a lot of things around here that we talk about having an up-or-down vote on. We have not been able to have up-or-down votes, and it is always because there are some other amendments that might make the bill better. Sometimes they are even germane to the bill we are talking about.

The one we are talking about, the amendment we are putting this on now is Department of Defense. Yes, you can make some arguments about how this is defense related, I guess, but what we would normally do, if we were serious on an issue such as this, is bring it up as a separate issue and allow amendments to it. But that is not going to happen because there are a few things in my bill that the other side of the aisle would not like to have.

One of those is flextime. They show that chart where the person could make 50 hours this one week and get overtime and then make 30 hours in the next week. That is not how the real world works either. They would earn 40 hours in one week, which would not be overtime, and 40 hours in the next week, which would not be overtime. That is still the same 80 hours. With the agreement of the person asking for the flextime, they could put the 50 hours in one week, the 30 hours in the other week, have the extra day to do whatever they want with their kids.

If flextime is a bad idea, why did we let the Federal employees do it? The problem in my State is with the person who works for a private industry in Wyoming who is married to someone who works for the Federal Government because the Federal Government lets them do the flextime that the Senator from Massachusetts says steals overtime. If it stole overtime, does anyone think our Federal employees would be interested in it? No; they have other values.

When we did flextime for the Federal Government, Senator KENNEDY voted to ensure that the Federal employees would have access to flextime, to have the scheduling options necessary to balance work and family life. Senator KENNEDY, along with 11 other Democrats, cosponsored the Nickles bill that extended flextime and comp time to State and local employees. If it is a bad idea, why would they do it for Federal employees and State and local employees? And why don't we do it for the private employees? The argument is, nasty employers would never let them have the time.

That is a terrible rap for business. Small business understands the needs of their people better than big business because they work with them every day, they go to church with them every weekend, they are in civic organizations with them, their kids go to the same schools, and they are the ones who have to deliver the bad news that they are not going to be allowed to do that flextime, and they cannot afford to do it a different way.

Sometimes the employees in small business make more than the employers in small business. Those are some of the CEOs whom I am worried about, the ones who have to wake up in the middle of the night and say, How am I going to make payroll this week? I would like to be paying my people more, but I don't know how I am going to pay them at all.

That is a reality in small business. I know small businessmen across the country who are hearing me say that are saying: He's got it. He understands our problem. What can you do to help us?

So we put together some provisions that in a normal situation we would be able to debate one of those at a time and decide on some of them and reject some of them. That is how it ought to work. But it is not just as simple as saying we can get everybody and all the kids out of poverty if we were just to raise the minimum wage.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as I understand, I have 2 minutes 50 seconds left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, there are going to be two votes, and the first vote will be on my increase in the minimum wage; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in just about 5 minutes from now the Senate will have an opportunity to make a judgment as to whether we are going to offer a helping hand to some 15 million Americans who are at the lower end of the economic ladder who are earning the minimum wage and just above.

These workers are men and women of dignity. They take pride in their work. They are overwhelmingly women. If you care, this is a women's issue, having an increase in the minimum wage. It is a children's issue because a great majority of the women have children.

So many of these mothers look in the eyes of their child, and they wonder if they are going to be able to feed that child. They are worried whether that child is $80 sick, when they hear that child cry in the night because they know they have to pay $80 to go to an emergency room.

They know they cannot afford a birthday present for their child, to be able to go to a neighbor's house, to be able to enjoy the things every child who is a son or a daughter of a Member of Congress can enjoy.

That is what is happening out across America. It is a women's issue, a children's issue; it is a civil rights issue because so many of those workers are men and women of color. It is a family issue. It is a values issue. Don't talk to us on the other side of the aisle about family values. This is it.

This is an issue of decency and fairness. Americans understand decency. Americans understand fairness. Americans understand that if you work hard, 40 hours a week, 52 weeks of the year, you should not live in poverty. And that is what is happening. Nine years they have waited. Nine years they have waited—but not the Members of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, $30,000 we have increased our salary, and in 9 years we have refused to provide an increase for the men and women who are working on the lowest rung of the economic ladder. That is obscene.

We have a right to alter that and change that now when the roll is called. Let's say that we stand for those workers who are working hard, trying to make a difference for their families, playing by the rules. I hear from my friend from Wyoming they should not be on the Defense authorization bill. How many soldiers who are over there fighting in Iraq, mothers or fathers, might have been earning the minimum wage? What are they fighting for? They are fighting for American values.

American values are to treat people fairly and with respect. Increase the minimum wage, and we will have taken a very important step down that road.

Mr. President, I understand my time has expired.

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

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I would quote the Senator from Massachusetts again who said: Minimum wage jobs don't get you out of poverty, they keep you in poverty. Until we get a Workforce Investment Act passed around here that increases job training for 900,000 people a year so they can get higher-skilled jobs so they can get the jobs of the future, not the jobs of the past, we are going to have problems with the minimum wage and poverty.

We need to be able to give people more choices, not less choices. There is a definite difference in philosophy. We think that free enterprise can work and that it is working and that it does work, and also that States rights work. States are changing the minimum wage to match the economy of their State. Although, if they have really good jobs, they will attract people, I hope. We are having a little problem attracting people to Wyoming, and those are not for the minimum wage jobs, those are for outstanding jobs.

So people need to think a little bit about more training or moving a little bit to get better jobs and get out of the minimum wage rut that will cause a spiral. As we increase the minimum wage, we also cause an upward spiral that eliminates the value of that minimum wage.

I ask you to vote against the Kennedy amendment and to vote for my amendment.

Something that has been overlooked is my amendment includes a $1.10 increase in the minimum wage over 18 months.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated June 13, 2006, to Senator KENNEDY.

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

UNITED STATES COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS, OFFICE OF THE RESIDENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, June 13, 2006.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I understand that you have offered an amendment to the Department of Defense bill that would raise the minimum wage in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI). While I am a proponent for an increase in our minimum wage as a step in creating opportunities for our young indigenous people to find jobs in the CNMI, I want this done in a rational and democratic manner. I object to the manner in which your amendment was offered, and find it rather arbitrary and capricious.

The Northern Marianas joined this great country because of the principles of democracy that are at the heart of almost everything that is done. I will assume that your effort was prompted out of the same frustration that has fueled your colleague Congressman George Miller's desire for a quick fix to a complex problem. I had hoped those days were behind us. It is my desire that we enter into a new era of CNMI/Federal relations, an era which includes open discussion, dialogue, and a shared commitment to reform and to promote sustainable development in the CNMI.

You may not be aware that the CNMI's economy is on the verge of collapse. Unemployment is at 14%, the economy is down 23%, and this downward trend is showing no sign of reversing in the near future. An increase in our minimum wage implemented without economic considerations will surely destroy what is left of our fragile economy. I strongly believe that an appropriate increase must be a component in our economic recovery, but done in isolation will insure that recovery is impossible. Please don't take out your frustration with former CNMI and Congressional leaders on the CNMI as a whole. Your amendment may help a few, but will surely further increase unemployment and the number of business failures. Where is the American commitment to compassion and fairness?

I invite you to come to the CNMI and hold discussions with employers, employees, and the CNMI Enterprise Group, an NGO formed to promote sane and sustainable economic relief. I ask that you support my request for a sound and responsible study of the CNMI economy, and help us, not punish us.

The CNMI is without a Delegate in the House of Representatives. This fact alone prevents us from experiencing the democracy that our people have chosen. The rights of the people of the CNMI are unrepresented in the halls of Congress, and we must rely on members like yourself to see that they are treated with the same respect and integrity that the citizens of your state enjoy. I hope that we have the opportunity to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely,

PEDRO A. TENORIO,
Resident Representative.

Mr. ENZI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 179 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Akaka	Bingaman	Carper
Baucus	Boxer	Chafee
Bayh	Byrd	Clinton
Biden	Cantwell	Coleman
Collins	Kerry	Obama
Conrad	Kohl	Pryor
Dayton	Landrieu	Reed
DeWine	Lautenberg	Reid
Dodd	Leahy	Salazar
Dorgan	Levin	Sarbanes
Durbin	Lieberman	Schumer
Feingold	Lincoln	Snowe
Feinstein	Lugar	Specter
Harkin	Menendez	Stabenow
Inouye	Mikulski	Warner
Jeffords	Murray	Wyden
Johnson	Nelson (FL)	
Kennedy	Nelson (NE)	

NAYS—46

Alexander	Dole	McCain
Allard	Domenici	McConnell
Allen	Ensign	Murkowski
Bennett	Enzi	Roberts
Bond	Frist	Santorum
Brownback	Graham	Sessions
Bunning	Grassley	Smith
Burns	Gregg	Stevens
Burr	Hagel	Sununu
Chambliss	Hatch	Talent
Coburn	Hutchison	Thomas
Cochran	Inhofe	Thune
Cornyn	Isakson	Vitter
Craig	Kyl	Voinovich
Crapo	Lott	
DeMint	Martinez	

NOT VOTING—2

Rockefeller	Shelby

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amendment is automatically withdrawn.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DODD. I move to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4376

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on the Enzi amendment.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 180 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Alexander	Ensign	McConnell
Allen	Enzi	Murkowski
Bennett	Frist	Roberts
Brownback	Graham	Santorum
Bunning	Grassley	Sessions
Burns	Gregg	Smith
Coburn	Hagel	Snowe
Cochran	Hatch	Specter
Coleman	Hutchison	Stevens
Collins	Isakson	Sununu
Craig	Kyl	Talent
Crapo	Lott	Thomas
DeWine	Lugar	Thune
Dole	Martinez	Voinovich
Domenici	McCain	Warner

NAYS—53

Akaka	DeMint	Lieberman
Allard	Dodd	Lincoln
Baucus	Dorgan	Menendez
Bayh	Durbin	Mikulski
Biden	Feingold	Murray
Bingaman	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Inhofe	Obama
Burr	Inouye	Pryor
Byrd	Jeffords	Reed
Cantwell	Johnson	Reid
Carper	Kennedy	Salazar
Chafee	Kerry	Sarbanes
Chambliss	Kohl	Schumer
Clinton	Landrieu	Stabenow
Conrad	Lautenberg	Vitter
Cornyn	Leahy	Wyden
Dayton	Levin	

NOT VOTING—2

Rockefeller Shelby

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amendment is automatically withdrawn.

Mr. LEVIN. 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. LEVIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator SCHUMER be granted 5 minutes to speak as in morning business, and the 5 minutes would come off our time on this side from the Iraq amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I simply wish to acquaint Senators with the fact that we are beginning a 5-hour debate on the Levin amendment; is that correct?

Mr. LEVIN. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. And within that period of time, speaking for my time, I will manage the time, but I would be anxious to have those colleagues who wish to participate to indicate to me the periods which would be most convenient for them, and I will do my very best to accommodate all of the speakers.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I would make the same statement on behalf of our side, that Senators who do wish to speak in support of my amendment let us know, and we will try to work in as many as possible. There is a great demand for time, but it would help us a great deal to know who it is who seeks to speak, and we will try to sequence people to the best of our ability for the convenience of everyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York is recognized.

HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING SHORTAGES FOR NEW YORK

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I want to thank my colleagues from Michigan and Virginia for their graciousness. I am about to speak at a hearing that is occurring across the hall in the House on homeland security funds.

As you know, Madam President, homeland security funds were struck a cruel blow against the city and State of New York. Despite the fact that we are the epicenter of terrorism, despite the fact that every day the New York Police and Fire Departments have to go all out to protect us, our funding was cut by 40 percent in the city funding and 36 percent in New York State funding. It came as a total shock and surprise to all of us, particularly since Secretary Chertoff had promised that he was going to rectify the funding inadequacies and restore New York to full funding. He did that for 1 year, but then we went right back to receiving an inadequate amount.

Just recently we learned from Mr. Suskind's book that New York subways were targeted with cyanide by al-Qaida. The bottom line is very simple. There are threats against New York regularly, and every week and every day the brave police officers and firefighters and others in New York are on vigilance to make sure we are not struck by terror. All of a sudden the funding is cut—a slap in the face to this Nation's promise for New York.

At today's hearing, there is a gentleman who is missing: Secretary Chertoff. He should be testifying and answering questions, not sending a subaltern to answer those questions, but he should be there himself because he made commitments to New York, commitments that have not been lived up to by the Department of Homeland Security.

There are so many questions about why funding was cut. Just take the rationale that they want to fund systems more than they want to fund personnel. First, against cyanide, there are no systems to be funded. Cyanide can be made easily. We don't have any kind of detector. The only way to guard against the threat that occurred in 2003 is better training and more personnel on the subways. That is what New York City did.

Second, New York did apply for funding in terms of equipment. The so-called ring of steel, which would have protected downtown, was part of New York's grant. Yet the funding was cut. Secretary Chertoff bounces from rationale to rationale to rationale as to why our funding was cut, but none of them are satisfactory.

Unfortunately, there is terrorism in the world. Unfortunately, New York City has always been, is today, and will continue to be the No. 1 target of terrorists. And for this Department of Homeland Security and this Government to abdicate its responsibility and not provide New York with the funding that it needs is an absolute disgrace. The funding cut, the percentage that we went down is just unpardonable.

I am urging Secretary Chertoff to come clean and to testify before the House and the Senate and to answer the questions that New Yorkers and all Americans of goodwill have. He is not there today. He should be. But make no mistake about it. As a united delegation, Democrats and Republicans together, we will press the issue to both try and get the kind of funding we deserve this year out of other pots of money and change the formula for next year so that this kind of poor treatment of the No. 1 target of terrorists in America—New York—will not continue.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their graciousness, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

AMENDMENT NO. 4320

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 4320 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], for himself, Mr. REED, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. BIDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 4320.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4320

(Purpose: To state the sense of Congress on United States policy on Iraq)

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. UNITED STATES POLICY ON IRAQ.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''United States Policy on Iraq Act of 2006''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Global terrorist networks, including those that attacked the United States on September 11, 2001, continue to threaten the national security of the United States and are recruiting, planning, and developing capabilities to attack the United States and its allies throughout the world.

(2) Winning the fight against terrorist networks requires an integrated, comprehensive effort that uses all facets of power of the United States and the members of the international community who value democracy, freedom, and the rule of law.

(3) The United States Armed Forces, particularly the Army and Marine Corps, are stretched thin, and many soldiers and Marines have experienced three or more deployments to combat zones.

(4) Sectarian violence has surpassed the insurgency and terrorism as the main security threat in Iraq, increasing the prospects of a broader civil war which could draw in Iraq's neighbors.

(5) United States and coalition forces have trained and equipped more than 116,000 Iraqi soldiers, sailors, and airmen, and more than 148,000 Iraqi police, highway patrol, and other Ministry of Interior forces.

(6) Of the 102 operational Iraqi Army combat battalions, 69 are either in the lead or operating independently, according to the May 2006 report of the Administration to Congress entitled ''Measuring Stability and Security in Iraq'';

(7) Congress expressed its sense in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (119 Stat. 3466) that ''calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq''.

(8) Iraq's security forces are heavily infiltrated by sectarian militia, which has greatly increased sectarian tensions and impeded the development of effective security services loyal to the Iraq Government.

(9) With the approval by the Iraqi Council of Representatives of the ministers of defense, national security, and the interior on June 7, 2006, the entire cabinet of Prime Minister Maliki is now in place.

(10) Pursuant to the Iraq Constitution, the Council of Representatives is to appoint a Panel which will have 4 months to recommend changes to the Iraq Constitution.

(11) Despite pledges of more than $8,000,000,000 in assistance for Iraq by foreign governments other than the United States at the Madrid International Donors' Conference in October 2003, only $3,500,000,000 of such assistance has been forthcoming.

(12) The current open-ended commitment of United States forces in Iraq is unsustainable and a deterrent to the Iraqis making the political compromises and personnel and resource commitments that are needed for the stability and security of Iraq.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that in order to change course from an open-ended commitment and to promote the assumption of security responsibilities by the Iraqis, thus advancing the chances for success in Iraq—

(1) the following actions need to be taken to help achieve the broad-based and sustainable political settlement so essential for defeating the insurgency and preventing all-out civil war—

(A) there must be a fair sharing of political power and economic resources among all the Iraqi groups so as to invest them in the formation of an Iraqi nation by either amendments to the Iraq Constitution or by legislation or other means, within the timeframe provided for in the Iraq Constitution;

(B) the President should convene an international conference so as to more actively involve the international community and Iraq's neighbors, promote a durable political settlement among Iraqis, reduce regional interference in Iraq's internal affairs, encourage more countries to contribute to Iraq's extensive needs, and ensure that pledged funds are forthcoming;

(C) the Iraq Government should promptly and decisively disarm the militias and remove those members of the Iraqi security forces whose loyalty to the Iraq Government is in doubt; and

(D) the President should—

(i) expedite the transition of United States forces in Iraq to a limited presence and mission of training Iraqi security forces, providing logistic support of Iraqi security forces, protecting United States infrastructure and personnel, and participating in targeted counterterrorism activities;

(ii) after consultation with the Government of Iraq, begin the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq this year; and

(iii) submit to Congress a plan by the end of 2006 with estimated dates for the continued phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq, with the understanding that unexpected contingencies may arise;

(2) during and after the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq, the United States will need to sustain a nonmilitary effort to actively support reconstruction, governance, and a durable political solution in Iraq; and

(3) the President should carefully assess the impact that ongoing United States military operations in Iraq are having on the capability of the United States Government to conduct an effective counterterrorism campaign to defeat the broader global terrorist networks that threaten the United States.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, the current open-ended commitment of U.S. forces in Iraq is unsustainable and counterproductive, contributing as much to Iraqi instability as it does to Iraqi security.

Our troops have performed magnificently in Iraq. We are all deeply grateful for their professionalism and their sacrifices. But, ultimately, as our military commanders have repeatedly said, stability in Iraq can only come through a political settlement by the Iraqis, and the best way to bring about that political settlement is to make it clear, in words not yet spoken by the administration, that our commitment is not open-ended, and that a phased redeployment of our forces from Iraq will begin by the end of this year.

The administration's refrain that we are in Iraq as long as the Iraqis need us is creating a dependency of unlimited duration and gives the Iraqis the impression that their security is more in our hands than in theirs.

The hallmarks of the administration's open-ended policy are the President's extraordinarily broad and vague description of our mission—nothing less than ''complete victory,'' as he put it, along with the President's explicit commitment to stay until the Iraqis can ''govern themselves, sustain themselves, and defend themselves.'' The President's statement that American force levels in Iraq ''will be decided by future Presidents'' reinforced that unlimited commitment, as did Secretary Rice's statement that we will stay in Iraq ''as long as we are needed.''

The President of Iraq, Mr. Talabani, reflected the Iraqi perception of the administration's policy when he said that U.S. forces are ''ready to stay as long as we ask them no matter what the period is.'' That is what the President of Iraq says he understands our policy to be, that U.S. forces are ''ready to stay as long as we,'' the Iraqis, ''ask them, no matter what the period is.'' We must change that Iraqi perception and the open-ended commitment which led to it, and that is what our amendment would do.

Our amendment urges the President to begin the phased redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq by the end of 2006—to begin the phased redeployment of U.S. troops by the end of 2006. Our amendment also calls for a number of actions to help achieve the broad-based and sustainable political settlement so essential for defeating the insurgency and preventing all-out civil war.

It calls for adoption by the Iraqis of a fair sharing of political power and economic resources among all the Iraqi groups so as to invest them in the formation of an Iraqi Nation. That can be done by amendment to the Iraq Constitution or by legislation or other means, but it needs to be done within the timeframe provided for in the Iraqi Constitution; namely, 4 months from the beginning of the functioning of their parliament.

An international conference needs to be convened so as to more actively involve the international community and Iraq's neighbors in promoting a durable political settlement among Iraqis and by reducing regional interference in Iraq's internal affairs. It is also important to encourage more countries to contribute to Iraq's extensive needs and to ensure that pledged funds are forthcoming.

Our amendment also points out that it is critically important for the Government of Iraq to promptly and decisively disarm the militias and remove those members of the Iraqi security forces whose loyalty to the Iraqi Government is in doubt.

Now, what does our amendment urge the President to do relative to our troops in Iraq?

First, after consultation with the Government of Iraq, begin a phased redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq by the end of this year.

Second, submit to Congress a plan by the end of 2006 with estimated dates for the continued phased redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq, with the understanding that unexpected contingencies may arise.

Third, expedite the transition of U.S. forces in Iraq to a limited presence and mission of training, providing logistical support, protecting U.S. infrastructure and personnel, and participating in targeted counterterrorism activities.

Our amendment does not establish a fixed ending date for redeployment. It doesn't set out fixed milestones once the phased redeployment has begun. So while it does not establish a timetable, it does establish a fixed, but not precipitous, time for the beginning of a phased redeployment—by the end of this year.

Beginning the phased redeployment of American troops in 2006 would send a very clear message to the Iraqis: We have been in Iraq over 3 years. We have lost 2,500 brave Americans and suffered more than seven times that number of casualties to make it possible for Iraq to become a free Nation. You, the Iraqis, must now decide whether you want a civil war or a nation.

Madam President, sending that message to the Iraqis and ending the open-ended U.S. policy towards Iraq will prod the Iraqis to take the necessary steps to end the dominance of the militias; will reduce the Iraqi dependence on the U.S. security blanket which deters tough choices by the Iraqis; will change the perception that we are permanently occupying Iraq, a perception which plays into the hands of terrorists; will reduce the number of U.S. targets for terrorists and insurgents; and will reduce the strain on U.S. forces.

Supporters of our amendment are just as determined to maximize prospects for success in Iraq as are the opponents of our amendment. We do not accuse opponents of our amendment of wanting failure or of advocating surrender to chaos and terror. We do believe that maintaining the status quo

and the open-ended commitment, which is the hallmark of that status quo and that open-ended commitment, and adhering to a bumper sticker slogan of ''stay the course'' is a recipe for continuing instability and failure.

Success isn't assured in any event, but letting the Iraqis know that we are not there for as long as they want us is key to avoiding a culture of dependency. The bottom line is that our open-ended policy and presence has become a deterrent to the very success that we want to bring about. Although the administration policy is aimed at providing security, it is a major contributor to instability.

The Iraqi leaders themselves have set a 6-month goal for making major progress in assuming their security responsibility. Iraqi Prime Minister al-Maliki said on May 22 that his government could take over security for 16 of Iraq's 18 provinces by the end of this year.

On June 11, the Iraqi National Security Adviser, Mr. Rubaie said:

> I believe by the end of this year the number of the multinational forces will be probably less than 100,000 in this country.

That amounts to a reduction of at least 30,000 U.S. forces by the end of this year. Mr. Rubaie repeated that position in an op-ed in yesterday's Washington Post. He, again, is the National Security Adviser to the Prime Minister. Our amendment's call for the beginning of a phased redeployment by the end of this year fits the very goals Iraq's leaders have set for themselves.

Listen to what Mr. Rubaie wrote about the many benefits of Iraq reducing the number of coalition forces. This is benefits to Iraq of our reducing the number of coalition forces in Iraq:

> It will remove psychological barriers and the reason that many Iraqis joined the so-called resistance in the first place. The removal of troops will also allow the Iraqi government to engage with some of our neighbors that have to date been at the very least sympathetic to the resistance because of what they call the coalition occupation.

''Moreover,'' Mr. Rubaie said:

> the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people . . . the drawdown of foreign troops will strengthen our fledgling government to last the full four years it is supposed to.

Mr. Rubaie's words are similar to those of General George Casey, the commander of the U.S. and coalition forces in Iraq, who told Congress last fall:

> Increased coalition presence feeds the notion of occupation, contributes to the dependency of Iraqi forces on the coalition, extends the time it will take Iraqi security forces to become self-reliant, and exposes more coalition forces to attack at a time when Iraqi security forces are increasingly available and capable.

That is our commander talking about the disadvantages of having a large number of troops remain in Iraq.

Regardless of one's views on whether it was wise to attack Iraq—and I for one thought it was unwise, and so voted—and regardless of one's views on whether the war has been well managed—and I have been critical of the administration's management—all of us want to maximize the chances for success in Iraq. To maximize the chances for success in Iraq, the Iraqis must take control of their country. Our approach, our amendment, maximizes the chance for success.

Last year, by a bipartisan vote of 79 to 16, the Senate adopted an amendment stating that:

> [C]alendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty.

The Senate language remained in the bill and was signed into law. Our amendment implements that policy direction. The Iraqis are standing up. U.S. and coalition forces have trained and equipped more than 250,000 Iraq security forces. More than two-thirds of Iraq's Army combat battalions are either in the lead or operating independently, according to the administration's May 2006 report to Congress. It is now time for the United States to set a date for the beginning—the beginning of a standdown.

Last fall, General Casey said that our presence in Iraq ''fuels the insurgency'' and that ''beginning to reduce our presence in Iraq'' as conditions warrant would result in ''taking away one of the elements that fuels the insurgency.'' That is our commander speaking. Conditions not only warrant the beginning of a reduction of our presence, conditions are such that only a phased, orderly redeployment beginning by the end of this year will maximize the chances of succeeding in Iraq.

By making clear that a phased redeployment of our forces from Iraq needs to begin this year, we will send a clear message to the Iraqis that our presence is not an open-ended security blanket and that they need to assume responsibility for their own future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). Who yields time?

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I see the principal cosponsor, the Senator from Rhode Island, a member of our committee, is waiting to speak. I would just like to inquire the following of my colleague.

I have found in our many years in this body that the most effective means to convey a message, the most effective way for the persons beyond this Chamber to follow proceedings on the floor, is often through a colloquy where we not just read speeches but we begin to exchange interpretations of what is before this body by virtue of your amendment and get the responses.

Might I inquire of my colleague of his willingness to permit the Senator from Virginia, at such time as the Senator from Rhode Island has completed, to get up and propound questions chargeable to my side and responses that you wish to make, to the extent you wish to make them, chargeable to your side? Is that a procedure about which I can be persuasive to my colleague, which I find to be a very effective way to deal with this?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, am I responding on the time of the Senator from Virginia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, you are.

Mr. LEVIN. I am perfectly happy to engage in a colloquy at the instigation of the Senator from Virginia. Indeed, I will probably have some questions which I would want to propound to the Senator from Virginia.

On the other hand, I cannot agree that a colloquy which he instigates would be divided in terms of the time consumption. The usual policy around here is the persons who begin a colloquy have that colloquy charged to their time. I have more speakers than I have the time to allocate. It would be unfair to them for me to say that the time consumed in my answering the questions of the Senator from Virginia would come off the time for their remarks.

I am not only happy to engage in a colloquy, I look forward to it, but I would want to follow the usual procedure, which is that those persons who wish to ask questions of somebody have that colloquy taken from their time rather than from the time of the person of whom they are asking the questions.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would have to respectfully disagree with what is usual. Time and time again, Senators get up and allocate between themselves the question and answer. I have to take it we are confined primarily, I imagine, to the reading of speeches by individuals and limiting the ability to have a colloquy.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator will allow a comment on that, we are not confined to that at all. I expect, when I ask questions of the Senator from Virginia or others who oppose this amendment, that their answers would come from my time and not from their time. I would apply the same rule to me as I suggest would be applied to the questions of the Senator.

Mr. WARNER. The Senator has made clear his statement. I yield the floor as a courtesy to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I join with my colleague, Senator LEVIN, and Senators FEINSTEIN and SALAZAR, to offer this amendment. Too often, the Bush administration deals simply in slogans. We have heard them so often, so many times: mission accomplished; stay the course; don't cut and run; we will stand down when they stand up; complete victory. But a military operation such as this requires much more than slogans. It requires sufficient personnel and adequate equipment. It requires coherent strategic policy, and it requires detailed plans.

At critical junctures in this effort in Iraq, this administration has been extraordinarily insufficient in all of this. We had insufficient personnel on the ground with the collapse of the government of Saddam Hussein. We opened up regions of Iraq so that insurgents could begin to form and begin to conduct this attack against their own people and against our people. Too often we went out to Iraq, visited the country, and were confronted by our own soldiers who complained that they didn't have armored humvees and body armor.

I believe there has never been a really coherent strategic policy here. We heard the initial defenses of the approach to Iraq as we were going after weapons of mass destruction. They were not there. We are going to go after the heart of terrorism, when in fact the terrorists' connection to Saddam Hussein was tangential at most. Then, we are going to build an oasis of freedom and transform the Middle East. It is not an oasis today in Iraq.

Certainly there were not detailed plans. We entered into this occupation without sufficient planning, without sufficient resources in so many different ways. The faults continue to plague us today. Insufficient resources to run detention facilities contributed in a significant way to Abu Ghraib, and that, as even the President admits, has been an extraordinary blot on our record and inhibits us today in our ability to achieve a stable Iraq.

There is something else that you need to conduct military operations, and that is public support. Today, a majority of Americans would like to see a deadline to withdraw our forces from Iraq. They are not unpatriotic. They are not without grit and determination. They are terribly concerned, and they are looking for leadership.

But I believe this leadership comes in not adopting some type of arbitrary timetable or deadline; it comes from adopting what is the most coherent and realistic policy we can today to stabilize the country of Iraq, to assist them in this stability, and to begin the phased redeployment of our forces from Iraq to begin this year. To begin, not with an arbitrary timetable or deadline, but to begin with the notion that these decisions will be based upon the advice of military commanders and based upon the conditions on the ground. But we must begin. We must begin because we have to send a strong signal to the Government of Iraq that they must take their future in their own hands, that they must make difficult choices about their constitution, about sharing political power, about eliminating sectarian elements from their security forces, and a host of other difficult problems. This rests upon the fundamental reality of the situation. Ultimately, it will be the Iraqis who stabilize their country and reform their country. We can help. We have helped. But it is up to them, and it must begin now.

Also, this approach which we are proposing recognizes another reality. Our military forces, our Army and our Marine Corps, have been under tremendous pressure. They have done a magnificent job. The young men and women who wear the uniform of the United States have performed in an extraordinary fashion. But for some of them, it will be their third deployment to Iraq. Others have gone to both Iraq and Afghanistan. The wear and tear on these young Americans and their families is significant. The wear and tear on our equipment is significant. There is a $50 billion pricetag just to repair the equipment that has accumulated over the last several years in Iraq. So we have to recognize also that our forces need a signal that their mission will be coming to a conclusion, not in the next Presidency but, based upon a careful deliberation by the commanders, we hope in the near future.

We also have to recognize that our threats are not confined to Iraq alone. Today we are all waiting anxiously to see what the North Koreans might do with respect to a scheduled—or at least a tentative launch of an intercontinental missile. We are today engaged in serious negotiations with our European colleagues with respect to the situation in Iran. We have seen in the last few weeks an Islamic government takeover on the streets of Mogadishu and Somalia. We have seen other areas of concern and conflict. Our commitment in Iraq, frankly, constrains our flexibility to deal with all these issues.

Senator LEVIN and I have come forward today with a proposal that we believe will be an approach that begins a policy that we can achieve, that it is necessary for us to achieve, so we can move forward to begin to transition the burden from American military shoulders to those of the Iraqis. It begins with a phased redeployment which we believe should commence this year. Let me hasten to add again: There is no specific timetable. There is no deadline. This is based upon the advice of our military officers in the field. This is not cut and run or cut and jog or cut and anything else. It is an attempt to articulate a policy based upon the reality of Iraq, the reality of our present military forces, and the reality of a world which is engaged in conflicts in many different places.

In the past weeks, we have seen some progress in Iraq—the installation of a government, the naming of a Prime Minister of Interior, and the naming of a Prime Minister of Defense. We have seen the death of Zarqawi. But still we recognize how turbulent and uncertain and how hostile the environment remains for our soldiers and the Iraqi security forces.

We have about 127,000 forces there in the last 3 years, or more. We have seen more than 2,500 of these young Americans killed and more than 18,000 wounded. Their sacrifices have to be respected and honored—not simply with force but with wisdom and with a policy that will work, a policy that is attuned with what is happening in Iraq and around the globe and not a policy based upon bumper stickers that have been trotted out at a moment's notice.

We recognize that we have an interest certainly in Iraq in terms of succeeding. And this plan we hope and we believe will be a success. We are putting together a plan—more of a policy than a plan—because the planning is the province of the President, as it should be, as Commander in Chief. But a policy of redeployment beginning now is the right direction. It will require the President to begin to outline those steps. It will also require the Government of Iraq to begin to take responsibility for their own situation. It will require them to begin deliberations for constitutional changes. These changes are necessary to ensure that this is an inclusive Government in Iraq, that the Sunni community feels that they can have a future in the new Iraq.

It also recognizes that we have to have a sharing of political power in Iraq so that Iraq will succeed.

In addition, the Iraqis must address the issue of sectarian militias, and the infiltration of security forces by sectarian elements have to be dealt with and dealt with decisively.

We also have to recognize that ultimately these decisions will be made and must be made by the Iraqis.

In this proposal there is a clear signal to the Iraqis that they must make these decisions beginning now for their future and, we hope, for a stable region and a much more stable world.

We also understand that we have to bring together the international community.

Since October of 2002, I have argued that this unilateral approach to Iraq is not destined for success; that we have to have a multinational approach to be successful. We have carried the burden both militarily and in many other ways. It is time that the administration engage and energize the regional neighbors and the broader international community to help address the issues that are presented to us all throughout the world by Iraq.

We understand, on a financial basis, that this is an expensive undertaking.

Originally, the administration suggested that this would be $50 billion or $60 billion. We understand now that we have already spent $320 billion, and the end is not in sight.

In a recent study by Joseph Stiglitz, the Nobel prize economist, if you added all the costs, all the costs of rehabilitating our equipment when comes home, all of the cost of veterans' benefits and caring for those who have served so well, the price will reach perhaps $1 trillion, if our commitment extends until 2010.

Also, the international community has to do much more. The international community has pledged $8 billion, and only $3.5 billion of that money has been forthcoming. They need to do more, and we need to make them do more.

This approach of going it alone has to end. And part of our amendment is to request that we engage in a much more multilateral approach to Iraq.

We have trained 116,000 Iraqi soldiers, sailors, 148,000 Iraqi police and highway patrol and other Ministry of Interior forces. There are 102 operational Iraqi combat battalions in their Army, and 69 are either in the lead or operating independently.

We have made progress. We hope that they are ready, but we think that we have made enough progress to begin our redeployment. Again, the pace of that redeployment will be set by our military commanders.

As General Casey pointed out:

As we are able to draw down our forces, we will receive additional benefits. A reduction in American forces will essentially push more Iraqi troops to the front lines. This is about the dependency.

Those are General Casey's words.

As long as we are there to do the heavy lifting, we will do the heavy lifting. That is an important point to be made and emphasized again and again.

The Government of Iraq was formed. Their National Security Adviser, Mr. Rubaie, stated this week in an editorial that Iraq's position is that it have full control of the country by the end of 2008, and this will mean a significant foreign troop reduction. We envision U.S. troop presence by the year's end to be under 100,000 with the most of remaining troops to return home by 2007. The eventual removal of coalition troops will help the Iraqis who now see foreign troops occupying rather than as liberators. Moreover, the removal of foreign troops will legitimize the Iraqi Government in the eyes of its people.

I do not know if my colleagues will come and accuse the Iraqi National Security Adviser of cutting and running on its own country. Perhaps they will, but they will be wrong.

That is what a leading figure in the Government of Iraq is suggesting. A phased redeployment beginning this year, hopefully concluding by the end of 2007—but again we will leave that up to our military commanders. The benefits will be that the Iraqis will step forward, and also this notion of occupiers will be diminished substantially.

From many different perspectives, this is the right policy at the right time. I hope that our colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, will embrace this policy.

I retain the remainder of any time I have and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. President, I remember so well last year when we debated an amendment of great importance, and our colleague from Michigan laid down an amendment. Then I took that amendment and rewrote certain portions of it. A great majority of the Senate—I can't remember exactly how many but a vast majority of the Senate—supported that.

I have waited patiently for this amendment. It was given to me yesterday. I have studied it ever so carefully. I didn't denounce the amendment. I said it was a serious amendment. It is a serious amendment. It deserves serious thought.

But, regrettably, there is no way in which I can truthfully say to my side of the aisle and others that this amendment can be revised or modified such that we could hope to get what we achieved last year—a large majority of the Senate supporting the amendment.

That is unfortunate because we start out on a basis of where we could well end up today along strong partisan lines. That comes at a time when our Nation—indeed, the world and, most importantly, the men and women of the Armed Forces—would like to see the Senate and, indeed, hopefully, the Congress standing behind them with strong bipartisanship. But I fear that it is going to be lost with this amendment.

First, I carefully point out to those who are following this debate that this amendment in effect is nonbinding. It is the sense of the Senate, or Congress, as the case may be. But nevertheless it sends signals. It sort of states what this body feels should be done by the President of the United States as he continues to exercise his constitutional powers—I underline ''constitutional powers.'' He is the Commander in Chief, not Members of the Senate—constitutional powers in carrying forward the actions of our Armed Forces, and the actions of our Government as we try to support the newly elected unified Government of Iraq.

As the nature of this free advice may be, my burden—and those of us on this side—is to point out how this can be misconstrued as the message crosses the ocean and as the Congress is trying to order the President to do certain things. That is not going to be the case.

I have had recently the opportunity to have some private conversations with the President of the United States. My gray hair indicates that I have been privileged to serve in this institution now in my 28th year and before that for a number of years in the Department of Defense. I have worked with, I say with a sense of humility, many Presidents through many chapters of American history. But I must say I have yet to find any President with a stronger resolve, a stronger conviction to do what he believes is in the best interests of the American people, employing the forces of our men and women of the Armed Forces, employing every means this Government has to bring about solutions which he has outlined time and time again in Iraq and, indeed, Afghanistan. It is remarkable, unwavering, listening to advice, taking into consideration the views of others but clearly looking into the future, a future that generations long after we are gone will look back on this chapter of American history and I believe will decide that we pursued the correct course. Hopefully, those generations will be enjoying the measure of freedom that we have today. But that will only come to pass if the Congress of the United States provides this President the support that he needs.

Therefore, it may be in the nature of free advice, but I want to clearly indicate to all following that there is much to be done to try and explain where I see there is fault in this amendment.

Last week, the Senate overwhelmingly rejected a proposal to establish an arbitrary deadline of a timetable for withdrawal of United States forces from Iraq. An arbitrary deadline of a timetable would have been a serious strategic error, and a historic mistake of withdrawing our forces prior to the Iraqis being able to defend themselves. It would encourage terrorism, embolden al-Qaida, and threaten American security.

Regrettably, the various courses of action that spring forth from the Democratic side of this aisle concern me greatly. They may not say it is a timetable.

It is interesting that in the course of the presentation of this amendment in the media, I have watched my colleagues from that side of the aisle explain what it is they are going to put before the Senate today. Time and time again, they keep saying it is not a timetable; it is not a timetable.

Why must they keep saying that the language is clear, that it is not a timetable?

But let us start with the key paragraph in the amendment of my good friend and long-time colleague.

I repeat it. It is on page 6.

Submit to the Congress a plan by the end of 2006 with estimated dates for the continued phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq.

Folks, I don't mean to demean this, but that is the English language. It reads very clearly. It is a timetable, no matter how many times people protest it is not a timetable. It is the English language written with clarity.

We cannot accept that.

Our colleagues today on this side of the aisle will vigorously give their views as to why we cannot accept that.

Foremost in my mind is the loss of our men and women of the Armed Forces, now 2,500 in number, that have given the ultimate that any human being, any soldier, any sailor, any marine, any airman can give and that of their families.

I wonder how these individuals would look at this clause and find any other conclusion to draw but that this is a timetable—a timetable that could well cripple the ability of this new government created by the courageous actions of the Iraqi people time and time again in elections, after a hard fought political situation, in which emerges, hopefully, a strong Prime Minister.

They are just beginning to take full seizure of the reins of sovereignty, something this Nation has not had for

a very long time. As they are seizing those reins, we are asked to stand in the Senate and to lay out in writing for all those who want to destabilize this new government the timetable on which we will remove our Armed Forces.

Of course, there is a collateral question that is not addressed in this amendment. Maybe my colleague will address it. The United States, albeit, is the principal force of military. Great Britain, commensurate with the size of their armed forces and their nation and their population, has made a very significant contribution, as has Poland, and I could enumerate the other nations; modest though they may be, they are there. How are they to respond to this amendment? Are they to go on and pursue the missions they have laid out or are they to devise a timetable? That is one of the many unanswered questions I find in this amendment. Perhaps my colleagues will be forthcoming.

The major events certainly of the last 10 days—the elimination of al-Zarqawi, a terrorist without parallel in the contemporary times of all mankind, his elimination, the formation of this new government—has given a momentum forward. It has spawned a measure of hope among the Iraqi people. It has spawned a measure of hope within our Armed Forces that there is clear proof our many sacrifices to date are beginning to produce concrete, visible results that cannot be challenged.

We are moving toward establishing a secure and prosperous nation that will be an inspiration for the entire region of that world, and it is hard to think at this time we would take any action in this Senate to set back that momentum. The only way we are going to see our troops come home is if they seize that sovereignty, exercise that sovereignty, produce their own security and begin to reestablish their infrastructure.

I do not see this amendment in any way helping. I see this amendment as impeding the progress.

Give this new government a timetable. I ask my colleague, give them a timetable if you have to give a timetable to establish their goals, seize the reins of sovereignty. Do not broadcast through this amendment a timetable with regard to our forces.

We all know there have been some very difficult days, tragic hours, the most recent of which is the loss of our two brave soldiers seized, and although not fully confirmed, certainly the probability is they were badly abused, not treated as prisoners of war but badly abused by someone in Iraq. Who knows who they may have been? Obviously, the insurgents, presumably al-Qaida.

Our President, Secretaries of State and Defense, and our military commanders have all stood and said forthrightly, these are painful losses. Each one of these individuals I know and have worked with personally. They feel the loss of life. They feel for the injured. They feel for their families. But to attain the freedom, not just for the Iraqis but for this country, from terrorism, that pain has to be endured, those losses are likely to continue. I commend all for being forthright that the days ahead pose challenges and further losses.

Any amendment requiring phased redeployment as our policy on a timetable to begin in 2006 sends that signal that begins to set back the progress we have achieved to date. That phrase about the timetable of redeployment will be examined with utmost care by those who are trying to destabilize this government—be they al-Qaida, insurgents, or, unfortunately, the sectarian violence. They are likely to say, we will wait out the timetable and then we will resume the violence and with every means we can to destabilize this government. That will be the result of this amendment.

This is an inopportune time because in the last 10 days we witnessed the death of the most prominent terrorist in Iraq, the complete formation of the Iraqi Government, a historic meeting in Baghdad between President Bush and Prime Minister Maliki, more raids against al-Qaida cells in Iraq, and a plan for the way ahead for this new democratically elected government in Iraq. We have the momentum. We must take advantage of this moment and this opportunity and move forward.

I know other colleagues are anxious to speak. I want to share this time.

I pose a question to my distinguished colleague from Michigan about another paragraph in his amendment. This one I find particularly puzzling. It is written, again, in very clear language, so I feel the meaning of it is written explicitly on page 5.

It says that the President of the United States should do the following:

> (i) expedite the transition of United States forces in Iraq to a limited presence . . .

What do you mean by ''limited presence''?

> . . . limited presence and mission of training Iraqi security forces . . .

That we are doing with every bit of vigor we can possibly muster.

> . . . providing logistic support of Iraqi security forces . . .

We are doing that as best we can.

> . . . protecting United States infrastructure and personnel, and participating in targeted counterterrorism activities;

Does that mean we limit our force structure to the special ops forces? What is it that the balance of our forces do? Do they begin to rotate back under this timetable?

I hope at some point in this debate those questions can be fully answered because the President is the Commander in Chief. He makes the decisions with regard to how our Armed Forces are employed utilizing the advice of the professional military commanders to direct specifically the actions to carry out the missions to achieve our goals.

I say to my good friend, this paragraph D, the President should expedite the transition, what is the nature of the transition of United States forces in Iraq to a limited presence?

I see no contingency phrase in this as there is elsewhere in this amendment. If they were to have a tremendous insurrection, what do we do if we have transitioned our forces? Does that mean they are moved somewhere? Does that mean they stay in their bases?

This paragraph, in effect, is usurping the rights under the Constitution of the Commander in Chief to direct the day-by-day operations and deployment and disposition of our Armed Forces. I hope in the course of this debate they will find time to explain with greater clarity what is meant by that paragraph.

After consultation, No. 2, ''with the Government of Iraq, begin the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq this year,'' to me, again, lays down a marker that something is in the hip pocket regarding a timetable.

Yes, we start with the government, and the Senator from Michigan cited some of the current government officials and some of the statements they have made. I freely say some of those statements do raise questions in my mind, but this government has only been in business a bare month. We have to give them time. We have to give the new Congress of the Iraqi Government an opportunity to voice its views in conjunction with those of the government officials.

This word ''after consultation . . . begin the phased redeployment,'' how about if the government said we did not want a phased redeployment at this time? What would be the purpose of the consultation if they said, We do not want it at this time?

That statement, in effect, has been stated time and time again while there have been remarks that, yes, we hope you will lure your forces away, the bottom line is, they know they cannot survive with this new government if we begin any major withdrawal of forces in the coming 2 or 3 months while this government is taking root.

That is clear. No one disputes that.

But you say ''consultation,'' then ''begin the phased redeployment . . . from Iraq.'' That is not my idea of consultation. My idea of consultation is to take into consideration the viewpoints of both sides.

So we come back to submit to Congress a plan by the end of the year 2006 with estimated dates for the continued phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq with the understanding that unexpected contingencies may arise.

That is fortunate to have that in there, but that is sort of lost because of the prominence of the first sentence. That is what is going to be read and interpreted by the insurgents, all those who want to bring down this new government. That signal must not be sent by the Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor at this time and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let me inquire of colleagues on this side who wish to speak. We started this morning by according the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Rhode Island their opportunities. I have spoken on this side. I know Senator MCCAIN has just arrived, and Senator CORNYN.

So I say to Senator MCCAIN, I think you were the first on the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. I think Senator CORNYN was.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I yield to Senator MCCAIN and ask to be recognized following him.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask that Senator MCCAIN follow me, and then we will rotate to this side and back to Senator CORNYN.

So at this time, I yield the floor and ask unanimous consent that recognition be given to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am wondering if we could sequence speakers.

Mr. WARNER. Why don't you designate someone?

Mr. LEVIN. After Senator MCCAIN is done, we would then seek to sequence the Senator from New York immediately after the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WARNER. Following that, Senator CORNYN will speak.

Mr. LEVIN. And then Senator SALAZAR is here.

Mr. WARNER. He would follow Senator MCCAIN and the distinguished Senator from New York and the Senator from Texas.

Mr. LEVIN. Let's leave it at that——

Mr. WARNER. Then the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. LEVIN. Because Senator FEINSTEIN is now on the floor.

Mr. WARNER. You designate that Senator.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank you. And I express my appreciation for the courtesy of the Senator from Texas who was on the floor before I was, and I appreciate his courtesy very much. I intend to take about 12 minutes, if that is agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we grant 12 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I strongly oppose the amendment offered by the Senators from Michigan and Rhode Island and the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. These amendments share the same problem: calling for a withdrawal of American troops tied to arbitrary timetables rather than conditions in-country.

The amendment we are debating now states the sense of Congress that the President should begin the phased redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq this year and that he should submit to Congress a plan with dates for this redeployment. I believe such a move would be a significant step on the road to disaster.

There is an understandable desire, 3 years after our invasion, to seek a quick and easy end to our intervention in Iraq. We face real difficulties there, we have made serious mistakes, and the costs have been very high. But these would pale in comparison to what is likely to unfold should we follow the course advocated by this resolution.

The violence we see on Iraqi streets today illustrates one fundamental fact: Iraqi forces are not yet capable of securing the country on their own. On the contrary, even with current troop levels, a level of violence in Iraq remains unacceptably high. To withdraw our forces would have one, all-too-predictable outcome—the violence currently constrained by our security operations around the country would rise commensurately. If the main enforcer of Government authority—coalition troops—draws down prematurely, the only questions will be the degree to which the increased violence engulfs the country and whether full-scale civil war erupts.

Much has been said about the effect of an American withdrawal on the Iraqi Government, and the sponsors of this amendment argue that a withdrawal would somehow force the Government to take on responsibilities it currently evades. But consider for a moment the effect of a withdrawal timetable on individual Iraqis outside the Government. An Iraqi Shi'a living in Baghdad or perhaps a Sunni living in Kirkuk learns that the Congress has called on our President to begin withdrawing troops this year and to present a timetable by which they will all return home. This knowledge changes the calculation made by individuals like these, decisions critical to the eventual security of Iraq. It makes joining the police forces or the Iraqi Government look like an increasingly bad bet. Participation in a militia appears better by comparison. And by changing these calculations across the country, we have made the goal of stability in Iraq more difficult to achieve. By signaling that an end to the American intervention is near, we will alienate our friends, who fear an insurgent victory, and tempt undecideds to join the antigovernment ranks.

Not every Member of this body agreed with the decision to topple Saddam Hussein, but when our country went to war, we incurred a moral duty to not abandon the people of Iraq to terrorists and killers. If we withdraw prematurely, risking all-out civil war, we will have done precisely that. I can hardly imagine that any U.S. Senator would want our Nation to suffer that moral stain.

But the implications of premature withdrawal from Iraq are not moral alone; they directly involve our national security. Greater instability in Iraq would invite further Syrian and Iranian interference, bolstering the influence of two terror-sponsoring states firmly opposed to America's policy. Iraq's neighbors—from Saudi Arabia to Israel to Turkey—would feel their own security eroding and might be induced to act. This uncertain swirl of events would have a damaging impact on our ability to promote positive change in the Middle East, to say the least.

Withdrawing before Iraqis can bring stability to the country on their own would turn that land into a failed state in the heart of the Middle East. We have seen once before a failed state emerge after U.S. disengagement, and it cost us terribly. In pre-9/11 Afghanistan, terrorists found sanctuary to train and plan attacks with impunity. We know that there are today in Iraq terrorists who are planning attacks against Americans. We cannot make this fatal mistake twice.

Whether or not Members of this body believe that Iraq was part of the war on terror in 2003, it is simply incontrovertible that the war on terror is being fought there today. Al-Qaida is present in Iraq. Jihadists continue to cross the borders. Suicide bombers target American troops, Government personnel, and civilians. If we leave Iraq prematurely, the jihadists will interpret the withdrawal as a triumph of their brutal tactics against our power. And I do not believe they will stop with Iraq.

The letter released last year from Ayman al-Zawahiri, bin Laden's lieutenant, to Abu Mus'ab al-Zarqawi draws out the implications. The Zawahiri letter is predicated on the assumption that the United States will leave Iraq and that al-Qaida's real game begins as soon as we abandon the country. In his missive, Zawahiri lays out a four-stage plan—establish a caliphate in Iraq, extend the ''jihad wave'' to the secular countries neighboring Iraq, clash with Israel—none of which shall commence until the completion of stage one: expel the Americans from Iraq. Zawahiri observes that the collapse of American power in Vietnam, ''and how they ran and left their agents,'' suggests that ''we must be ready starting now.'' We cannot let them start, now or ever. We must stay in Iraq until the Government there has fully functioning security forces that can keep the insurgents at bay and ultimately defeat them.

Some argue that it is our very presence in Iraq that has created the insurgency and that if we end the occupation, we end the insurgency. But, in fact, by ending military operations, we are likely to empower the insurgency. The fighting is not simply against coalition forces; rather, the insurgents target the Iraqi Government, opposing militias, and various sects and ethnicities. There is no reason to think that an American drawdown would discourage these fights.

Those who support a withdrawal might wish to examine the assumptions that lie behind their suggestion. What if we withdraw and the violence actually worsens, full-scale civil war ensues, or terrorists enjoy safe-haven to plan attacks against America and our friends? Do we then face the options only of tolerating this situation in perpetuity or reinvading the country?

A few observers have argued that the United States has an option of somehow pulling our troops from Iraq but still managing things from afar. This is nonsense. The United States will have no leverage to manage things once we have left the country. The battle in Iraq, which is likely to remain counterinsurgency in character, is ill-suited to the extensive use of air power, which would be the foremost instrument available to us from outside. We could no more prevail in Iraq from outside than we could win the war in Vietnam by continuing to bomb the North. As tempting as it is to seek a solution that would let us both draw down our troops and preserve our military options in Iraq, that solution does not exist. The options on the table have been there from the beginning: withdraw and fail or commit and succeed.

Don't take my word for it. Ask those whose security is at stake every day. The Iraqi Government does not want us to set an arbitrary timeline for withdrawal. As the Iraqi Minister for National Security wrote in yesterday's Washington Post, more important than some series of dates is the achievement of set objectives for restoring security. Similarly, our friends in the neighborhood fear a precipitous American withdrawal. Allies in Europe and Asia encourage us to see this war through to its end.

Because we cannot pull out and hope for the best, because we cannot withdraw and manage things from afar, because morality and our security compel it, we have to see this mission through to completion. Drawdowns must be based on conditions in-country, not an arbitrary deadline rooted in our domestic politics.

Our domestic politics do have an effect on the war in Iraq, and again I fear that this amendment would have a deleterious effect. Anyone reading it gets the sense that the Senate's foremost objective is the drawdown of American troops. The sense they should get is that America's first goal in Iraq is to win the war—that is what they should get—and that all other policy decisions support and are subordinate to the successful completion of our mission. Like the sponsors of this legislation, I hope we bring home American troops as soon as possible. But suggesting to the American people that withdrawal is at hand, we risk once again raising unrealistic expectations that can only cost domestic support for America's role in this conflict, a war we must win.

None of this is to say that success in Iraq will be quick or easy. On the contrary, this war is long and it is hard and it is tough. We will see significant achievements, like the killing of Zarqawi and the completion of the Iraqi Cabinet, but we will see steps backward as well, like the continuing violence in Baghdad and the insurgency in Ramadi. No one should have any illusions about the costs of this conflict as it has been waged thus far or as it will be waged as we move ahead, but neither should anyone have illusions about the role of Iraq in the war on terror today. It has become a central battleground in our fight against those who wish us grave harm, and we cannot wish away this fundamental truth. We cannot fall prey to wishful thinking that we can put the costs and the difficulties and the frustrations aside by ignoring our challenges and responsibilities.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator ROCKEFELLER be added as a cosponsor of our amendment.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the information of Senators—if I could get Senator WARNER's attention—the order on our side will be Senators CLINTON, FEINSTEIN, and SALAZAR.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the same order with the addition of SALAZAR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THUNE). The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Levin amendment of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor. At a moment when 130,000 soldiers, sailors, Marines, airmen, active duty, Guard and Reserve are serving bravely in Iraq and when the debate in Congress over our Nation's Iraq policy has grown particularly divisive and heated, I believe it is time for the Members of this body to put politics aside and choose between success and the status quo.

By playing politics and blindly following the President, too many are deaf to the hue and cry about the failures of this administration in the execution of its policies. And too often, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle in both Chambers are asking politically motivated questions, not engaging in the kinds of fruitful discussion that asks the tough national security questions we need to address and answer.

I think it is time to choose whether we believe we have the right roadmap for success in Iraq. While our troops are serving bravely and with our national security in the balance, it is time to choose what is more important—a strategy to win in Iraq or a strategy for Republicans to win elections here at home.

There are no easy answers as to how we solve the problems created by this administration. There are no easy answers as to how we work to enable the Iraqis to hold their country together and to keep it from becoming a terrorist refuge and launching pad.

I simply do not believe it is a strategy or a solution for the President to continue declaring an open-ended and unconditional commitment, nor do I believe it is a solution or a strategy to set a date certain for withdrawal without regard to the consequences. Instead, I support this responsible way forward, a roadmap for success that will more quickly and effectively take advantage of Iraqi oil revenues, build up Iraqi infrastructure, foster Iraqi civil society, challenge Iraq's neighbors to do more to ensure stability in Iraq, and allow our troops to begin coming home.

We all know that our troops are in harm's way right now in a volatile region of the world for which America has significant interests at stake. We are at a profound turning point for our Nation. We are entrusted by our constituents, both those who serve and those who do not, to do what we think is right for them, for our States, and our country.

Let's be clear about what this debate is about. My friends on the other side of the aisle believe that the status quo is working in Iraq. They do not believe we need a fundamental change in policy. They choose to continue blindly following the President.

We Democrats disagree. We believe we need a new direction in Iraq that will increase the chances for success on the ground. I may disagree with those who call for a date certain for withdrawal, but I do not doubt their patriotism. I may disagree with those who believe in an unconditional commitment without end, but I do not doubt their patriotism either.

Sadly, however, there are those who do doubt the patriotism of many who raise serious questions about this war. They choose to tar all who disagree with an open-ended, unconditional commitment as unpatriotic, as waving the white flag of surrender.

They may not have a war strategy, but they do have an election strategy. This is the road they took America down in 2002. It was a dead end for our country then; it is a dead end now.

The politically motivated resolutions put forth by leading Republicans to gain tactical partisan advantage are a disgrace. In so doing, they have broken faith with those who serve and those of us who support our troops and who work for the success of this mission.

It is wrong, plain and simple, to turn this serious debate about our policies and national security into a partisan squabble designed to mislead voters.

This is politics at its worst, played over war. And that is no way to honor the service and sacrifices of our troops and their families or to find a better way forward in Iraq.

Like many in this Chamber, I have traveled to Iraq and to Afghanistan. I have met there and here with tough, smart, patriotic men and women who fill me with tremendous pride. They have been performing magnificently under difficult conditions. They have paid a heavy price since the war began in 2003.

Last week we had a moment of silence to mark the day that the number of American servicemembers killed in Iraq reached 2,500. And more than 18,000 others have been wounded. As of June 17, New York has lost 116 soldiers. The combined number of New York soldiers killed and wounded is 1,038.

I have spent time with wounded soldiers and Marines. I spent time on Saturday with grieving families, mourning lost loved ones. I have tried to answer the questions they ask. I have shared the grief they feel. Those who have not lost a loved one or seen him or her return injured still are anxious every day while a parent or a child or a spouse serves far from home. Not a day goes by that I do not pray for the safe return of every man and woman now stationed in dangerous places around the world—not a single day.

This is not a time for partisanship. It is past time for this administration to level with the American people, for this Congress to find its voice and fulfill its constitutional duties to check and balance the executive branch, and for the Iraqis to chart a clear and responsible path to stability and peace.

I call on our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to fairly and honestly consider the Levin amendment as an alternative to the status quo, when we know that the status quo has not, is not, and will not create the conditions needed for the Iraqis to achieve the stability and security they seek and for us to bring home our troops.

The conflict in Iraq has now gone on longer than U.S. fighting in the Korean war before the armistice. We ought not to attack one another for asking the tough questions and presenting alternatives about how to achieve success, limit the loss and sacrifice of our young men and women.

As we debate our next steps in Iraq, it is critical that we recognize and fix, as best we can, the mistakes that have already been made and not repeat them. The Bush administration misused the authority granted to it, choosing to act without allowing the inspectors to finish the job in order to rush to war, without a plan for securing the country, without an understanding of the insurgency or the true human, financial, and strategic cost of this war, all the while viewing the dangerous and unstable conditions in Iraq through rose-colored glasses and the prism of electoral politics here at home.

It is time to put policy ahead of politics and success ahead of the status quo. It is time for a new strategy to produce what we need, a stable Iraq Government that takes over for its own people so our troops can finish their job.

That is what the Levin amendment does. It calls for a comprehensive roadmap to achieve peace and stability. It also sets into motion the steps that should be taken for Iraq to move itself forward and become more capable of defending its territory, ending the sectarian violence, and purging the insurgency.

The Levin amendment does put us on a responsible path by calling for stronger nonmilitary actions, such as a conference of neighboring nations, greater rebuilding efforts, and better internal political reconciliation, by requiring the Iraqis to disarm road militias and take over more of their own security.

The only way the new Iraqi Government can gain credibility is by proving they can handle an increasing share of the security of the country with fewer, not more, U.S. troops.

It is clear in the Levin amendment that we recognize the President's role as Commander in Chief. It is the President who will make these decisions. What the amendment attempts to do is to provide a different roadmap, to set some conditions in contrast to the unconditional, open-ended commitment that we have had for the last 3 years and 3 months.

In yesterday's Washington Post, one expert laid out such a roadmap which described the importance of reducing our military presence in Iraq so as to enhance the legitimacy of the Iraqi Government in the eyes of both Iraqis and Iraq's neighbors. That expert was Iraq's own national security adviser.

I commend the entire article to be read because as the national security adviser sets forth a roadmap for the way out of Iraq, he makes very clear that the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people. That is not an American. That is not a Democrat. That is an Iraqi in this new government who recognizes what some, apparently, in this Chamber refuse to, which is, yes, we need conditions. The current policy has no conditions. It is unconditional.

The Levin amendment sets forth conditions, sets forth the kind of steps and benchmarks that we as Americans in positions of responsibility have every right to expect that the Iraqis will step up and meet. Clearly, that is also the position of the new Iraqi Government. In fact, one can read this statement and find much in the Levin amendment that supports the position put forth by the Iraqi national security adviser.

No war since Vietnam has stirred the emotion to the extent of our people as this one. I hear it all the time as I travel from one end of New York to the other. People stop and ask if there will be an end to the loss of American lives. They wonder what the goal is; how do we define success? The rhetoric on the other side is all about symbols and slogans, but how do we define success?

They believe that we in Congress should not be wasting this country's time with partisan political slogans while we have troops in the field. They grieve over the mistakes that have been committed by an administration that failed at every turn to see the difficulties ahead of it or the benefits of using all the nonmilitary means available to it.

Of course, there are always unexpected events in war that can change the best plan or put some detours into the roadmap. The Levin amendment takes that into account. But I believe we must end the current open-ended, unconditional policy and focus on clear goals on all fronts and to make that absolutely clear to the Iraqi Government.

If we do that, we can begin to bring our troops home this year. That is why I fervently believe members of both parties should support this resolution.

How much time do I have left, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 15½ minutes.

Mrs. CLINTON. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to start my remarks this afternoon by recognizing the ultimate sacrifice paid by one of our soldiers, one of my fellow Texans, who gave his life this week in Iraq.

PFC Kristian Menchaca, age 23, of Houston, joined the military last year and was soon deployed to Iraq as part of the 1st Battalion, 502nd Infantry, 2nd Brigade, of the 101st Airborne based in Fort Campbell, KY.

According to military reports, Menchaca and his fellow soldier, PFC Thomas Tucker of Oregon, were part of a unit checking vehicles near the Euphrates River south of Baghdad. They were taken when their checkpoint was attacked and, as we now know, they died in service to their Nation, and their bodies have since been recovered.

Private First Class Menchaca is described by his family in various reports as a man who loved basketball and Mexican food. His cousin, Sylvia Grice, is quoted as saying:

> He talked about how happy he was that he was serving his country. Everyone he met liked him. He had that kind of personality. He liked to help people. He was just the kind of person that you enjoyed being with.

Private First Class Menchaca was married in September of last year, and he often talked of joining the Border Patrol when he finished his military service.

Mr. President, I know I speak for a grateful Nation when I say I am thankful for the service of good men and women like Private First Class Menchaca who serve our country day in and day out and who place themselves in harm's way in the service of

freedom. I am glad there are people like Private First Class Menchaca, who was happy to serve his country, not knowing perhaps that that service to his country would end in the ultimate sacrifice for the cause of freedom.

Mr. President, I have been listening to the debate so far on the amendments on the floor. I cannot help but be struck by those who would cast the only options available to America, when it comes to what is now the central front in the global war on terror in Iraq, as open-ended, unconditional commitment versus arbitrary deadlines. We have more choices than that, and it is indeed the policy of our Government at the present time not to offer open-ended, unconditional commitments, or to set arbitrary deadlines that serve as an encouragement to the enemy, knowing that if they hunker down long enough and wait us out long enough, the American people will lose their resolve and simply give up.

Mr. President, our policy is one based on conditions on the ground, and based on the sound advice of our professional military experts, people such as GEN John Abizaid, head of Central Command, and General Casey, head of the coalition forces in Iraq. These are the professional generals—those with knowledge of the facts on the ground—who are making the judgments and recommendations to the President and the Secretary of Defense and to this Congress about what our policy should be, and that policy is based on conditions on the ground.

Those who suggest that our only choice is between open-ended, unconditional commitments and arbitrary deadlines are presenting us with a false choice, one that, in the end, simply looks a lot like giving up. I speak in opposition to any proposal to impose an arbitrary deadline for the removal of our troops from Iraq and to speak about what I believe and know others of my colleagues believe is our need to win the war on terror and, while doing so, to stand beside the Iraqi people as they work to build their fledgling democracy and work to expand their growing ability to secure themselves.

The fundamental question we have before us today is: Are we going to base our military strategy in Iraq on an arbitrary timetable for withdrawal based upon defeatism, a policy of retreat, a policy of appeasement, a policy of surrender, or are we going to rely upon the military judgment of those who are currently leading us to victory in Iraq?

It is clear, as in all wars, that our Nation is being tested. This is not so much a test for our professional military, which is the preeminent fighting force in the world today and no doubt the premier fighting force that the world has ever known—there is no military force that can defeat the United States of America—the only thing that can defeat the United States of America, when it comes to the global war on terror, is America itself, if we lose the courage of our convictions, if we simply give up.

On October 11, 2002, 77 Members of this body voted to authorize the use of force to remove Saddam Hussein in Iraq. I will be interested to see, when we vote on these various amendments, how many of our colleagues have simply lost the courage or conviction they displayed then, in saying it was important to remove a terrible, bloodthirsty tyrant from Iraq. I have stood on the mass burial grave sites in Iraq where at least 400,000 Iraqis lie who were victims of that bloodthirsty dictator.

We know that Abu Musab al-Zarqawi was in Iraq more than a year before American forces went in. We all know that Saddam Hussein, with his fantasies of developing weapons of mass destruction, teamed up with terrorists and presented a clear and imminent threat to the safety and security of the United States.

We have much unfinished work to do. But we must not forget to honor the sacrifices of those 2,500 people, like Private First Class Menchaca of Texas, who have made the ultimate sacrifice for their country. Are we going to tell those brave patriots and their families that they have sacrificed in vain, that we were not really serious about our commitments both to the American people, to preserve their safety and security, as well as to our allies, the Iraqi people? I hope not.

There is no victory in arbitrary withdrawal from Iraq, and victory must remain our sole resolve. Any suggestion that a withdrawal from Iraq would somehow accelerate or pressure the Iraqi Government, and Iraqis themselves, into supporting democracy more fervently is simply inconsistent with the facts. The people who are probably most anxious for the American and coalition forces to leave Iraq—second only to the American people's desire to have their sons and daughters come home—the people most eager to see them come home, beyond their family members, are probably the Iraqi people themselves. But they understand that they are not yet prepared to defend themselves against the terrorists, against the insurgents, against the sectarian strife that is currently racking that country. Yet we find that the armchair generals in Washington, DC, are hardly in a position to determine the best military strategy. How could it be any other way? Who is in a better position to determine what that strategy should be, based on conditions on the ground, than those professional military men and women who study this issue daily, who live with it daily, and who have tremendous experience? Surely, they have a better idea about how we can win the war in Iraq than the armchair generals in Washington who are resigned to defeat and simply giving up.

The Senator from New York quoted from a Washington Post article of yesterday and suggested that the National Security Adviser in Iraq had somehow endorsed the provisions of the Levin amendment. But I want to quote one sentence that clearly refutes that suggestion. The National Security Adviser said:

> This roadmap on foreign troop withdrawals is based not just on a series of dates but, most important, on achievement of set objectives for restoring security in Iraq.

In other words, Iraq's National Security Adviser understands the foolishness of setting arbitrary deadlines that have no relationship to achievement of set objectives for restoring security in Iraq. Do we all wish that our troops could come home sooner rather than later? Of course we do. But it is simply foolishness and folly to impose an arbitrary timetable on our forces, requiring them to withdraw from Iraq before the job is done and while the going gets tough.

I have in my hands a report from the U.S. Department of State that is 19 pages long. Anybody with access to the Internet could copy this or view it online. It is called ''Significant Terrorist Incidents, 1961 to 2003; A Brief Chronology.'' It is 19 pages long. I ask our colleagues who counsel retreat, who counsel self-defeatism, what do they think is going to happen if we leave Iraq prematurely, before the Iraqi security forces can defend themselves in that new democracy? What do they expect will happen? I think what we know will happen is that power void would be filled by those who are currently fighting and killing innocent people in Iraq and who, given the opportunity, would use that failed state, if we were to retreat prematurely, as a platform to plot, plan, finance, and export terrorist acts to the United States and elsewhere around the world.

It is pure folly to think that the terrorists somehow would simply give up if we decided to come home prematurely, or that Iraq could stand on its own to fight and defend itself and have any chance of nursing this fledgling democracy into full maturity.

Just yesterday I heard some of the Members on the other side of the aisle say that they, too, thought that troop withdrawal should be based upon the judgment of military commanders. But they added: As long as the generals agree with them, that withdrawal will take place within 6 months.

Another one of our colleagues who has a resolution that has been much discussed announced he would extend his initial proposal of a 6-month deadline to a 1-year deadline. I wonder what sort of wisdom he acquired over the course of a weekend that told him, no, the arbitrary deadline should not be 6 months but should now be a year. What sort of new information did he acquire that led him to the conclusion that a withdrawal in 1 year was better than a withdrawal 6 months from now?

It is clear that such arbitrary decisions have no basis in military strategy. According to one news story last week, there were colleagues of ours on the other side of the aisle who were up all hours searching for a troop withdrawal position on the war on terror that would unite their political party.

My question is: Can they really be serious? Can they really be serious that they are still searching for some unifying position? It appears that they have no unifying position, and they have no plan to lead the victory in Iraq, or to lead the American people during one of the toughest fights that our Nation has ever endured.

It is indeed a time of testing for our Nation, and we must pass the test, not just for the safety and security of the Iraqi people, but for our own safety and security, and for the safety and security of our children and our children's children.

So far, it appears that the only thing the critics can agree on is their willingness to criticize the efforts in the global war on terror, to harp on those things in a way that is not productive and certainly not helpful. And it has the consequence, unintended or not, of undermining public support and confidence for our efforts in Iraq and in the global war on terror.

So it makes me wonder—and I am sure the American people must be wondering—are they more interested in the upcoming elections not in Iraq, but in America in November, or are they more interested in winning the global war on terror without regard to politics or elections?

It is important that we put the situation in Iraq in perspective. We are moving forward. Every single day we are making progress. The Iraqi people and their military forces are reaching out and taking responsibility in their own country and the hope we are extending to them for democracy and freedom.

Just over 3 years ago, Saddam Hussein ruled that country. We all know he killed hundreds of thousands of his own people whose only crime was to oppose his tyranny. Our military performed flawlessly in their march to Baghdad and overthrew Saddam Hussein. Then, in January 2005, the Iraqis held elections for a transitional national assembly to begin the drafting of the Iraqi Constitution. They overwhelmingly approved that Constitution in October of 2005. And then in December of 2005, they held elections for a permanent national assembly.

The Iraqi Parliament then approved the Cabinet, including the most controversial post of Defense and Interior Ministers. I remind my colleagues that the Iraqi voter turnout during last year's elections for their national assembly and referendum on their Constitution was respectively 58 percent, 77 percent, and 63 percent. It is clear that the Iraqi people are participating in their political process and building their own institutions that will eventually allow them to govern themselves and determine their own future.

On the security side, we have trained more than 260,000 Iraqi security forces and these forces are daily becoming more and more competent. They are now leading daily operations against insurgents and al-Qaida and the sectarian strife in Iraq.

We know there is a price to be paid, and I guess in the end, the difference between those who would retreat prematurely and simply give up and those of us who believe the fight is worth fighting for and the sacrifices that this Nation has made in the cause of freedom are unfortunate but worth it, the differences between those who believe war is bad and must never be fought and those who believe that war is bad but sometimes must be fought for the right reasons.

It is dispiriting that some politicians reading the polls in Iraq want us to set an arbitrary timetable for withdrawal, and this despite they have no plan for success for winning the war or what to do in the vacuum that will be created once we give up.

We know that terrorists remain on the attack and, given our willingness to retreat, will simply take advantage of that vulnerability and attack America and other innocent people again.

In conclusion, I think the policy of retreat and defeatism and simply giving up is not one that serves our Nation well. It does not serve the interests of the Iraqi people, and it would simply be the wrong decision for this Senate to make at this time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to thank our colleague from Texas for his powerful message and also for his work on the Senate Armed Services Committee where he has labored long and hard and well into the future, I hope. I thank the Senator.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, as has been said, more than 2,500 brave men and women of America's fighting forces have now been killed in Iraq. Another 18,500 have been wounded. The victims of this violence include two American soldiers captured in an ambush at a checkpoint south of Baghdad who were brutally tortured, killed, and left surrounded by roadside bombs. I join with all of my colleagues in offering our deepest sympathies.

Yet with American troops now caught in the middle of raging sectarian violence, it is all too likely that such heinous acts will go on and on. This war, originally projected to last but a few months, has gone on for 39 months with no end in sight.

Our Nation is spending $2.5 billion a week on the conflict, and the violence has worsened.

Iraqis have suffered greatly. More than 30,000 civilians have been killed, including 4,000 in the past 3 months alone. And another 90,000 Iraqis have had to flee their homes and their country to avoid the bloodshed.

In the past 5 days alone, according to news reports, nearly 100 civilians have been murdered in car bombings, shootings and other attacks, despite a new security crackdown by Iraqi and American forces.

For example, on Friday, 16 people were killed and 28 wounded when a shoe bomber blew himself up inside the Buratha mosque during religious services.

Saturday, one of the bloodiest days yet in recent months, over 40 civilians died in a series of car bombs and mortar attacks around Baghdad.

Day after day and month after month, we see that an open-ended commitment of United States forces neither controls nor abates the insurgency but, rather, it appears to inflame it.

What is becoming very apparent is that the murderous conflicts that bloody Baghdad and other cities daily can only be reduced by Iraqis—Iraqis who are willing and able to come together and stop this brutal and ruthless violence.

So I rise today to say that the time has come for the United States to recognize that United States troops cannot abate this kind of sectarian violence; only Iraqis can.

Late last year, Congress approved and President Bush signed into law an amendment that was in this very Defense authorization bill. That amendment pointed out that:

> Calendar year 2006—
>
> That this year—
>
> should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq.

Mr. President, 79 Senators from both sides of the aisle voted for this amendment, and I believe the amendment presented today that we are debating right now is the right way to follow up on this earlier Senate initiative. It is not cut-and-run by any stretch of the imagination.

When President Bush staged his brief visit to Baghdad last week, he told Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki that he came to look him ''in the eye.'' Now it is time for the President of the United States to look the American people in the eye.

As a nation, we have had enough repetition of slogans and reassurances that have become increasingly hollow in the continuing blast of roadside bombs and the rattle of automatic gunfire. No longer will ''we stand down when they stand up'' suffice for policy. No, Mr. President, we want you to recognize this.

Three years ago, the United States may have been misguided into war in Iraq, but now most certainly the country must not be misguided about the realities in Iraq today and the need to change our mission.

What is victory in a land torn by its own warring factions? Is it quite possibly allowing Iraqis to solve Iraqi problems and to remove the shibboleth of an ongoing occupying army making decisions that should be left to Iraqis?

Despite what may have been said these past few days, our amendment is not about cutting and running. Rather,

our amendment acknowledges that staying the course is a strategy that shows no promise of success, and it is time to change that strategy.

There remains a thunderstorm of conflicting forces over much of Iraq. Questing for dominance are al-Qaida, nationalistic Baathists left over from the days of Saddam's tyranny, and an array of rival religious armies.

The battle lines are as uncertain and diverse as are the competing objectives of the various combatants. True, there have been some other positive developments. Iraq finally put a constitutional government in place last month, 5 months after the December 15 election.

After extensive deliberation and debate, the Iraqi Government is finally functioning, but much work remains to be done by the Iraqi people and their elected leaders, for only they can ultimately defeat the forces that have left the Iraqi nation on the brink of civil war. There are now over 260,000 Iraqi military and police personnel who have been trained and equipped, well over three-quarters of the way to reaching the Pentagon's stated goal of establishing an Iraqi force of 325,000 troops. Of the 102 operational Iraqi Army combat battalions, 69 are either in the lead or operating independently. That is over 60,000 soldiers.

Now that Iraqis have assumed the reins of control, it is critical that the United States not be caught in the middle of the ongoing carnage, sectarian violence, and civil strife.

I believe strongly that our mission in Iraq needs to change—train police and military, provide necessary infrastructure assistance, advise when asked—but now that the entire Iraqi leadership is in place, it is time for the phased redeployment promised last year in this bill to begin.

Our amendment calls on the administration to prepare and present to Congress and the American people by the end of this year a plan outlining the steps needed to proceed with the redeployment of our troops, either back to the United States or to other critical areas of potential terrorist conflict around the globe.

This amendment would place the Senate on record asking that the President expedite the transition of U.S. forces in Iraq to a limited presence and confine the mission to training and providing logistical support to Iraqi security forces.

We request the President to begin the phased redeployment of forces this year. It would ask that the President submit a plan to the Congress by the end of 2006 with estimated—estimated—days for the continued phased redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq. Is this too much to ask 3 years and 3 months into the most costly conflict the United States has yet entered into?

It would also ask the President to convene an international conference to bring together the international community to discuss and implement a strategy to assisting Iraq's development and infrastructure.

This amendment also calls on the Iraqi Government to, one, achieve a broad-based and sustainable political settlement within its own groups of people; two, share political power and economic resources among all Iraqi groups; three, develop a unifying constitution; and, four, disarm the militias and remove members of the Iraqi security forces whose loyalty to the new government is in doubt.

Moreover, and most importantly, it is increasingly clear that the Iraqis themselves wish to see a structured downsizing of American troops in their country. Why don't we listen?

Senator CLINTON eloquently pointed this out, and it bears repeating. The new Iraqi National Security Adviser first said a week ago, and then more recently in a Washington Post op-ed just yesterday, that the Iraqi Government hopes that by year's end, United States troop levels will be under 100,000, and that most of the remaining troops will return home by the end of 2007.

We don't make accusations of the Iraqi National Security Adviser. I have a hard time understanding why the opposite side makes accusations of us when we simply say we agree with the Iraqis, whose business it is to know this, chart this, advise this, and carry this out.

He states unequivocally that Iraq's ambition is to have full control of his country by the end of 2008. He says: The removal of coalition troops from Iraqi streets will help the Iraqis, who now see our troops as occupiers rather than the liberators they were meant to be.

Members, this is the Iraqi National Security Adviser saying that the Iraqi people now see our troops as occupiers rather than the liberators they were once meant to be. This is a point worthy of serious consideration by this body.

Al-Rubaie goes on to suggest that such a drawdown: ''Will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people'' and ''strengthen it to last the full 4 years it is supposed to.'' A drawdown, he says, will legitimize Iraq's Government in the eyes of its people and strengthen it to last the 4 years it is supposed to. Why don't we listen?

And he concludes yesterday's op-ed by stating—and I find this eloquent:

> Iraq has to grow out of the shadow of the United States and the coalition, take responsibility for its own decisions, learn from its own mistakes, and find Iraqi solutions to Iraqi problems, with the knowledge that our friends and allies are standing by with support and help should we need it.

This is exactly what this legislation would do. If the Iraqi National Security Adviser is willing to put forward goals and timetables for the downsizing of the American troop presence in Iraq, why shouldn't the President of the United States?

I hope this body will join together in a bipartisan fashion, as we did last year, and call for the redeployment and transition of the United States mission in Iraq beginning this year. Three years and 3 months. This hasn't been 30 days, it hasn't been 60 days or 90 days. It has been 3 years and 3 months with ''stay the course,'' and things get worse and worse. Now we have the National Security Adviser in Iraq saying essentially exactly what the amendment before us today says. Are we going to listen to him or do we think we know better?

I believe this is the right thing to do for our troops who have sacrificed so much. It is the right thing to do for their families who wait anxiously for them to return home. It is the right thing to do for the overwhelming majority of the American people who have stated clearly their desire for a change of course in Iraq.

I believe it is the right thing to do for the Iraqi people. They are prepared to stand up. They are prepared to handle their own destiny. I believe Iraq should be for Iraqis.

Thank you, and I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield myself just a minute or two. I listened carefully, as I do to all the comments made by my colleagues, and I believe I heard my distinguished colleague from California say that the most costly war ever is the one we are engaged in.

I would like to remind my colleague and all those listening and all in America—we deeply grieve the 2,500 lives we have lost thus far and the 18,000 wounded—but I remember so well when I was but 17 or just turned 18. I was in the Navy during the last battle of World War II; just one of those battles in World War II. I was in the training command at that time awaiting my orders to go to the Pacific. It began on Easter Sunday morning, and it ended 81 days later. One battle, 81 days, in 1945. Let me tell my colleague what America suffered. Twelve thousand men, and I expect some women, were killed or missing and never accounted for; 38,000 were wounded, 763 aircraft were lost, 368 U.S. naval ships either sunk or were severely damaged.

We have to be cautious and put this conflict in context with the sacrifices that Americans have made. That was just one battle in World War II. The casualties eventually went over a half a million. That was only one battle.

As we look at this conflict, yes, we grieve the losses, but we have to maintain this steadfast commitment, as we did in World War II, to put an end to this tyranny of terrorism. If not, we will not see casualties like Okinawa in any military conflict in the years to come between soldiers, sailors, airmen, and their counterparts, but we could see those casualties here at home if these terrorists acquire weapons of mass destruction or are given places in the world to have their training camps, and if they perceive that this Nation is in any way wavering its commitment to fight terrorism in every aspect we can.

So I would say to my dear colleague, I don't think this is the most costly

war ever, as I believe the record will reflect.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, may I respond to that?

Mr. WARNER. I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I would respond just for a brief moment. I believe the total cost of World War II was $210 billion in real dollars. The cost thus far of just Iraq has been $320 billion; and if we include Afghanistan, my understanding is it is about $370 billion. So I did not mean it in terms of lives lost; I meant it in terms of dollars spent.

Mr. WARNER. Well, that was not clear in the statement that you made. You used the word ''cost.'' I did not put down the cost of all the military equipment of the wars. But I think when we look at cost, we should think of lives expended. And we are here today exercising that freedom from that generation of World War II, the generation that fought in Korea, the generation that fought in Vietnam, and the generation that is fighting today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to start my remarks in opposition to this resolution by sharing the story of Marine First Lieutenant David Lewis from Spring, TX. Following participation in the Corps of Cadets at Texas A&M University, he was commissioned on August 10, 2001. He wanted to serve his country, and he found very quickly after he graduated that he would have that opportunity.

Lieutenant Lewis has served two terms in Iraq, two tours in Operation Iraqi Freedom I and II. During his second tour, on August 5, 2004, Lieutenant Lewis was badly wounded in Najaf, while leading his platoon of 35 Marines into conflict against a group of insurgents. A rocket-propelled grenade grazed off his helmet and exploded, leaving him blinded and severely wounded. He survived the blast, and following numerous surgeries after returning home, he has regained partial vision in one eye. He was awarded the Purple Heart, and the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal with V for his service.

But he still wanted to serve his country. He was frustrated by the negative image of the war portrayed by the media. So Lieutenant Lewis came to Washington and applied for a job on my staff. And I am very pleased to report that he is sitting with me on the floor today, a valuable member of my staff.

Lieutenant Lewis, like so many of his brothers and sisters in the Armed Forces, has sacrificed for our country, none more than the three who were ambushed just last week and have given the ultimate sacrifice for our country. Private First Class Menchaca from Houston, TX, Private First Class Tucker from Madras, OR, and Specialist David Babineau from Springfield, MA. We are horrified by what we have heard of the deaths of Private First Class Menchaca and Private First Class Tucker. My thoughts and prayers go out to them and their families. But I cannot imagine anything worse than what has already happened to those two people and their families, along with Specialist Babineau and Lieutenant Lewis, I cannot imagine anything worse than for us to pass a resolution that says we are going to stop our commitment because we just can't take it anymore. It is like saying, the cause for which they have paid such a price really wasn't worth sticking with it.

This war on terror must be won at all costs. If we step back and say we are willing to walk away because times are too tough, we have jeopardized the 2,502 who have given the ultimate sacrifice in this war on terror. Furthermore, we are giving away the security of future generations. We are saying that we are not going to protect freedom because it might be too tough.

If we did this, the terrorists would surely be emboldened. They attacked us, according to Osama bin Laden, on 9/11 because of our reaction to previous attacks: The USS *Cole*, the bombings of our embassies in East Africa, Somalia, the bombing of Khobar Towers, and the first attacks on the World Trade Center. We treated it like this was going to be a criminal case, and we had to have justice in court. The terrorists got the message that America's attention span wouldn't last very long, not long enough certainly to see through an entire war on these people who would take away the freedom of our children.

I cannot imagine telling the terrorists that if times get too tough, if you are too horrible, if you do things that we cannot even imagine because we are a civilized society, we are going to turn around and run away. I cannot imagine saying that America will not have the stamina to stand up and fight and win a war at all costs for the freedom of future generations.

That is the message we would send to our enemies. What about the message we would send to our allies? You know, this resolution and previous resolutions have called on President Bush to get more international involvement in the war on terror. I know President Bush has tried to get international involvement, and we have international involvement. But what country would ever step up to the plate and be by the side of the United States of America in the future if we say: We are going to set a timetable, and if it gets too tough we are going to leave, but we sure appreciate your coming and being with us, until it gets too hard? That cannot be the role of the greatest country on Earth. If we show that kind of weakness, we will no longer have allies, and we will certainly have plenty of enemies.

If we establish a timetable for redeploying our troops from Iraq by the end of the year or by July of next year, we are handing the enemy our playbook. We would be saying that in 194 days our commitment is going to end. Why they picked 194 days to say that our attention span would last, I don't know. But it would be 194 days for the Government of Iraq to get up and going, for the security forces to be trained, 194 days to root out the insurgency, and 194 days to stand beside our allies and by the Government that is forming in Iraq. That is not the role of the United States of America.

It has been mentioned on the floor that there is an opinion piece in the Washington Post yesterday from an Iraqi adviser saying Iraq needs to learn from its mistakes and Iraq needs to stand on its own. No one wants Iraq to be able to stand on its own more than the United States of America. We have shown that. But does anyone in this body believe that Iraq is totally in control of Iraqis today? Does anyone believe there are not insurgents and agitators from other parts of the world? Al-Qaida? Iran? Other terrorist organizations that have come into Iraq for the specific purpose of destabilizing that country?

If you do believe it is just Iraqis who are there and if everyone else leaves they will be able to settle their differences, then this resolution would be just fine. But that is just a fantasy. Of course there are insurgents from other parts of the world. Of course there is al-Qaida right in the middle of Iraq. The last thing the terrorists want is a stabilized Iraq. That is why they are fighting so hard. So we would say to this fledgling Government that has just been able to get on its feet but is still struggling, that has trained soldiers but not nearly enough because the insurgents continue to bomb their police headquarters and recruiting headquarters, we would say to them: We are going to leave you on your own and hope for the best.

Can you imagine what would happen in Iraq if America says we are leaving at the end of this year, we are going to start to pull out troops, and then we are going to finish by July of next year or whatever date would be determined by the authors of this amendment? Who would be in control of Iraq? Anybody who believes that it would be Iraqis, with the condition they are in, is just not looking at the reality. So I cannot think of anything worse that I could say to the family of Private Menchaca, from Houston, TX, or his 18-year-old wife who is with her family, than—the very week that this young man paid a terrible price for a cause he believed in—that we are not really committed to the cause. I cannot imagine anything more disheartening to Lieutenant Lewis, who has already served twice in Iraq and wanted to come and do more for his country, than to say: I am glad you are committed, but the Senate just isn't there with you.

No. No. The United States of America and the Senate representing the 50 States of this Nation must not pass a resolution that would walk away from our commitment to the cause of freedom for the citizens of the United

States, because that is what is at stake here. It is not the Iraqi people alone in this fight. We are fighting terrorists on their turf. We have not had an attack in the United States of America because we have been vigilant in keeping them on their turf, containing them on their turf, and building up our homeland security at the same time. We must keep the word and the commitment of the greatest Nation on Earth, and we must keep the trust of the people that we are going to keep the will to fight for freedom for their children and their children's children. That is what is at stake in this resolution.

I urge my colleagues to think of the consequences of cutting and running from a fight that is much bigger than the stabilization of Iraq. It is for the freedom and the way of life of Americans and our allies throughout the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, would you advise the managers as to the allocation of time still remaining under the control of each?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 1 hour 14 minutes; the minority has 1 hour 26 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 10 minutes to Senator SALAZAR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Levin-Reed amendment on our Iraq policy.

The United States of America has already invested mightily in helping the Iraqi people. It is now time for the United States to make a clear and specific statement that the Iraqi people must assume the responsibility for finding Iraqi solutions to the challenges they face.

Indeed, that is exactly what the Iraqi government has said it wants. Just a few days ago, the new Iraqi National Security Advisor, Mowaffak al-Rubaie, stated that the Iraqi government anticipates some drawdown in U.S. troop numbers by the end of this year and continuing in 2007. He also said:

> The removal of troops will also allow the Iraqi government to engage with some of our neighbors that have to date been at the very least sympathetic to the resistance because of what they call the ''coalition occupation.''

Finally, he made the statement:

> The removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people.

The security adviser continued and essentially said that there would be a gradual transition from the American troop presence there in Iraq. So our amendment builds on what the Iraqi Government is telling us that they want.

America has invested life, blood, and treasure in Iraq over the past 3½ years. Mr. President, 2,506 U.S. servicemen and women have been killed; Over 18,500 servicemen and women have been wounded: and some $320 billion taxpayer dollars have been appropriated.

We all recognize that U.S. forces cannot and should not remain in Iraq indefinitely. Yesterday the House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly to retain language indicating that the U.S. will not construct permanent bases in Iraq precisely because they wanted to send a signal to Americans and to Iraqis—we don't plan on staying forever.

Last year the Senate joined together in calling for 2006 to be the year of transition in Iraq. That was a positive step, one that helped bring unity and cohesion to a debate too often marked by partisan rancor. Now we can take another constructive step together by supporting this well-thought-out amendment.

The Levin-Reed amendment affirms the statement that the Senate made last year: 2006 should be a year of transition in Iraq. It asks the President to present a flexible plan for that ongoing transition—one that can give some shape and direction to the oft-repeated mantra that ''as the Iraqis stand up, we will stand down.''

Let me just outline what this amendment does.

It states that an open-ended commitment in Iraq is unsustainable, and urges the following actions be undertaken to help the American people and the Iraqi people achieve success.

The Iraqis should take steps to promote more power sharing in Iraq, including through Constitutional changes, to avert civil conflict.

The President of the United States should convene an international summit on Iraq to increase burden-sharing in efforts to stabilize the country.

The government of Iraq should disarm militias and insist on integrity in the Iraqi armed forces and police.

The U.S. President should begin the transition of U.S. forces to a limited, three-fold mission. That mission would involve continued training of Iraqi forces, protecting U.S. assets and personnel, and targeted counter-terrorism activities, and by the end of 2006, the President should submit a plan to Congress for continuing the phased redeployment.

The U.S. should continue heavy diplomatic engagement in Iraq for the foreseeable future.

The President should assess the impact that our operations in Iraq are having on the overall US campaign against terrorism worldwide.

One thing that has become apparent in recent months is that many Americans are losing confidence in our Iraq policy—not in our servicemen and women, but in our policy. I know that history tells us that the U.S. is most successful in undertakings of this magnitude and difficulty when the American people are wholeheartedly behind the effort. It is my sincere hope that this amendment, and the plan for phased redeployment appropriate to conditions on the ground that it calls for, will help contribute to success in Iraq by giving the American people new confidence that we are moving toward a clear destination, along a distinct path.

It is precisely because I recognize that stability in Iraq is important, and because I want this mission to succeed, that I am pleased to cosponsor this amendment. The only path to sustainable stability in Iraq requires Iraqis assuming responsibility for their own security and making the political accommodations necessary to avert civil war. The U.S. cannot do this for them. An open-ended policy in Iraq is not helping matters—it is letting extremist and divisive elements hide behind the cloak of nationalism, and it is providing a rationale for postponing tough choices which must be made by the Iraqi people.

And so those who would rather engage in mudslinging, those who would rather politicize this vital national security issue than deal with the reality that the only choices before us are tough choices, need to think again. We all in this Chamber, I believe, want success in Iraq. We need to work with the democratically-elected Iraqi government to get there. This amendment is in step with their vision.

I want to succeed in Iraq, and I also want our broader foreign policy goal to succeed—the goal of defeating the terrorist networks that wish to do us harm. It is precisely because I am concerned about the consequences for our national security of an open-ended commitment to keep large numbers of American troops deployed in Iraq that I support the Levin-Reed amendment. The fight against terrorism is a global endeavor, and for years Iraq has been sucking up most the resources, the troops, and the political will and capital in this room. This amendment calls on the administration to responsibly assess and adjust our policies so that we don't strain our military to the breaking point even as a global struggle rages on for years and perhaps decades to come.

The very fact that this amendment is likely to be criticized from both sides in the Iraq debate is, in my view, an endorsement of its language. This amendment rejects any call for an immediate withdrawal, because that would be irresponsible and would not serve our national interests. A failed Iraqi state would further destabilize an already volatile region, creating a lasting haven for terrorists. Our national security imperatives mandate our commitment to Iraq's success. There is no cutting, there is no running in this language. There is no deadline. There is no arbitrary timeframe.

But it also rejects the fingers-crossed, stay the meandering-course approach favored by those whose strategy seems to involve little more than hoping for the best. Optimism is a terrific attitude, but it's not a policy.

Success in Iraq is dependent on several factors: controlling violence, creating a stable government of national unity, delivering basic services and the promise of economic development to the Iraqi people, and establishing strong and supportive relations between Iraq and its neighbors in the region. If any of these pillars are missing, Iraq's future becomes uncertain and unstable. America can help, but ultimately the Iraqis must achieve these goals on their own.

This amendment calls for us to begin shifting that responsibility, even as we work to shore up international cooperation and support and reaffirm our commitment to intense ongoing engagement.

Since I became a United States Senator, I have twice traveled to Iraq to get a better sense of the status of our mission. Each time, I have been overwhelmed with admiration for our servicemen and women who are serving so honorably, and who, along with their families, are sacrificing so much.

I am so proud of our troops and we must do right by them. Sitting on our hands while policy drifts from one goal and mission to another with no end in sight just isn't good enough. By the end of this year, we will have been in Iraq nearly as long as we were engaged in World War II, but as sectarian violence is on the rise, the picture is getting murkier and murkier. Congress needs to get into the mix—but to get in responsibly. I hope that my colleagues, both those who support this amendment and those who find fault with it, will engage in this debate in that spirit. Our men and women in uniform, and the American people, deserve nothing less.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINEZ). Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, since the conflict in Afghanistan and Iraq, 2,808 American men and women have paid the ultimate sacrifice. Of that number, 63 are Oregonians, or those who have Oregon ties. There are 63 patriots among that total.

I rise today to honor them, but I also feel compelled to come here this afternoon to pay particular honor to Tom Tucker who recently lost his life and to do what I can through my words to assuage in some possible way, if possible, the grief of his parents, Wes and Meg Tucker of Madras, OR. Army PVT Thomas Tucker was born in Pineville, OR, in central Oregon, in the beautiful rimrock country of that part of our State. He grew up in Madras and graduated from Madras High School in 1999. He worked in a variety of jobs before feeling the call to serve his country and enlisted in the U.S. Army in July of 2005. He was attached to the First Battalion of the 502nd Infantry Regiment of the Second Brigade, 101st Airborne Division. He has been in Iraq since February of 2006.

When word came through that he had been taken hostage by al-Qaida fighters in Iraq, I called his father Wes. I wasn't very far into the conversation when it was clear to me that I was talking to a dad who was also a patriot, was proud of his son and fearful for the consequences that may befall him.

The worst-of-all news came out when the whole country, and particularly my State, learned not only that Thomas had given his life but that he had been tortured, that his body had been defiled and had been booby-trapped to take the lives of other American soldiers.

I have no words sufficient to tell the Tucker family how truly sorry I am for the extent of their loss. Yet I stand in awe and amazement that this morning on the NBC ''Today'' program there came Wes Tucker's face. And he said: ''Our son, as far as we are concerned, has died for the freedom of everyone in the United States.''

I could not agree with him more.

Wes and Meg Tucker are made of sterner stuff. They did not blame the President. They did not blame the military. They simply acknowledged that their son was in the service of his country knowing the risk and willing to sacrifice it all.

I salute them, and I will never forget them or their son.

I am told by news accounts that Madras, OR, a town of 6,000 people, has now become a family of 6,000 people, gathering around the Tucker family, to offer whatever consolation they can and the support that is required, to let the Tucker family know that their son is an American hero now and forever.

Many wonder, what did Tom die for? I believe, as his father said, that he died for his country, that he died for freedom's sake, and the cause of freedom is one that comes with a very high price. It has hit home hard in Oregon today.

Al-Qaida is a serpent with many heads. It found Tom, and in finding him revealed the ugliness, the barbarity, the brutality of the enemy that we face.

Understand, al-Qaida's words in this war, their purposes, their intentions, their objectives are to create—these are not George Bush's words, these are their words—a new califate in the Middle East such as existed for several centuries, ranging from Spain as far as Pakistan, to establish sharia law.

If you want to know what sharia law is, look at the governments of the Taliban and the brutality that attended their government. It is for the extermination of the state of Israel, and it is for the holding hostage of western civilization. I believe Tom Tucker died in opposition to these hideous aims of our enemies on Earth today.

Anyone who believes that America does not have a stake in this is deeply mistaking themselves.

During my first term in the U.S. Senate I served on the Foreign Relations Committee. I wasn't on that committee long until I was simply amazed and overwhelmed in terms of my schedule by the number of foreign leaders who sought out an audience in my office seeking trade, aid, and military alliance with the United States.

I used to wonder, why do they come to us? Why must we solve their problems? It was evident because they knew America had values for which it was willing to pay a high price.

So I have to ask, why us? And history's answer is, why not us?

In the 20th century, the United States of America and a number of our stalwart friends—the British come quickly to mind—have filled the void to stop tyranny when our defense, first, our interests, our values and our allies required our help. It is no different now in 21st century.

We all want our kids to come home. I pray for that daily. And I am thankful that their numbers are declining and that they are coming home.

What this debate is about and the difference we share with our friends on the other side of the aisle is simply the wisdom of announcing a date for withdrawal.

As I have studied history, I have never found an instance whereby victory is won by announcing retreat. Wisdom counsels, I believe, that we hold our cards closer to our vest.

Al-Qaida is counting on us to go home just as they cite in their Web sites our retreat from Beirut, our inaction in the face of innumerable, outrageous terrorist attacks during the 1990s—and they took it all for weakness.

I want our kids to come home. But I want us to see the ugly face of al-Qaida and understand the deadliness and earnestness of their purposes and how antithetical they are to the future of this Nation and to the future of our children and to the civilization that we enjoy in such abundance in this blessed land.

Al-Qaida is counting on us to set a date. It is for that reason that I will vote against any amendment that sets a date.

I want to express to my colleagues on the other side that the rhetoric is too heated. When I hear things like ''Bush lied, kids died,'' or even on our side, ''retreat''—and whatever the mantra is—my soul cries out for something more dignified.

I don't believe their dissent is unpatriotic. I simply believe it to be unwise. It is a tactical mistake of monumental proportions.

I do not know how long the war on terror will go. But I do know that we have an interest in it. We learned that interest on 9/11. We learn that interest with the death of every soldier.

I yield the floor with a plea that we keep our tactics to ourselves and that we understand that America will not be defeated but that we can defeat ourselves.

I urge opposition to the Levin amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my colleague, what a truly heartfelt, remarkable set of comments. I thank the Senator for contributing to this important debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as I begin my remarks, by coincidence, I am following my good friend from Oregon, GORDON SMITH. It is purely by coincidence that we are lined up to address our thoughts on this important and most critical issue facing our country. I say to my colleague from Oregon, my opening comments are exactly the Senator's closing comments.

I plead with my colleagues during the remaining hours of this debate to try to stay away from the personal attacks and the mindless use of labels that we are tempted to gravitate to in order to impassion our constituencies. Such approaches do little to contribute to an understanding of the important subject before the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon eloquently described the loss of Thomas Tucker and of Kristian Menchaca from Houston, TX, the insane and hideous loss of life, and how it occurred. These young men and the 2,500 others who have lost their lives, along with the 18,000 who have been permanently injured, deserve better than some of the rhetoric and some of the discussion I have heard over the last number of days in talking about this issue.

I believe all 100 Senators in this Chamber care deeply about what happens to our men and women in uniform. I don't question for a single minute the patriotism of a single colleague. While we may disagree about how to successfully conduct our policies with respect to Iraq, we all deserve to give to our constituencies an intelligent discussion of these matters rather than resort to language of ''cut and run'' or ''lie and die'' or other such talk. It is that kind of rhetoric which causes most of our constituents to become disgusted with Congress.

I may disagree with my colleague from Oregon over the Levin amendment. In fact, I am a cosponsor of this amendment, and I believe CARL LEVIN and JACK REED have put us on the right track, which I am going to explain. I can fully respect those with a different point of view in all of this, while disagreeing with them. I do not question for a minute any Senator's goals or patriotism. I hope the rest of my colleagues over the remaining hours will conduct themselves accordingly. Before giving your speech, read the speech of GORDON SMITH and then decide whether you are going to engage in the kind of talk you may have prepared in your remarks in this Senate.

I thank CARL LEVIN, JACK REED, and others who put this amendment together, which I have asked to be a supporter of. It is a major step in getting our Iraq policy headed in the right direction. I also thank our colleagues who met on numerous occasions over the last several weeks, to have discussions about how best to frame this amendment. They were thoughtful discussions which I was pleased to participate in with Senators CARL LEVIN, JOE BIDEN, HARRY REID, JACK REED, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, DICK DURBIN, JOHN KERRY, and RUSS FEINGOLD. The Levin amendment is a consensus product of those conversations. Any one of us developing an amendment on this subject might have done it somewhat differently, emphasized some ideas more than others, included more specificity in the information we are seeking from the President with respect to benchmarks and a timeframe for the significant redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq. But I believe that the amendment that emerged from that process is useful for a serious and important debate on the need to begin the process of redeploying our forces this year from Iraq and turning over full responsibility for governing that country to Iraq's democratically elected leaders.

I believe very strongly that it is very appropriate we begin any discussion about Iraq by first commending our men and women in uniform who have served so nobly there. Whatever else your views may be, it is critically important that they know this great Senate respects and honors their service. Our men and women in uniform have performed with honor, bravery, and skill in attempting to bring order and stability into the post-Saddam Iraq. They have put themselves in harm's way, as I said a moment ago. More than 2,500 of our sons and daughters have given their lives serving our Nation. Thousands more have suffered life-altering injuries. The American people and the Iraqi people owe them, more than any other group, in my view, a great debt of gratitude for their service.

We in Congress must continue to provide them with every resource to ensure they return home safely and as expeditiously as possible. Whatever disagreements may arise during the course of our debate about the administration's Iraq policy, those disagreements should in no way be interpreted as criticisms of our troops. Every one of my colleagues, as I said a moment ago, cares deeply and respects deeply the service of these men and women in uniform.

Our disagreement with the President and his administration is that we believed we were misled in 2002 about the rationale for going to war in Iraq. There was hyped intelligence, cherry-picking of intelligence data to paint a picture of a threat, in my view, that did not exist at the time. That is and was unconscionable.

After the war began, the President continued to mislead America about the course of the war, the adequacy of planning, the postwar reconstruction, and the bill the American people would be asked to pay for the cost of U.S. involvement. Key members of the administration played critical roles in disseminating information that was inaccurate.

I have said on a number of occasions that if I had known then what I know now—namely, that Saddam Hussein possessed no weapons of mass destruction—I would not have given the President my vote for a resolution to use force in Iraq. I doubt there would have been a vote had all Members been aware of the information we now know exists.

Having said all of that, it is not possible to turn back the clock. We are where we are with respect to our involvement in Iraq. Sectarian violence has now outpaced that of foreign jihadists and ex-Baathists and insurgents as the greatest threat confronting American and Iraqi forces and Iraqi civilians. Ethnic mistrust, according to a recent cable from our Ambassador in Iraq to Secretary of State Rice, is increasingly ripping that country apart at the seams. That is from our Ambassador in Baghdad.

According to that same cable from our Ambassador—and I am not quoting, but this is the substance—the Iraqi people largely blame, unfortunately, the United States for the current situation, seeing their own Government as a puppet of the United States and believing that much of the violence in Iraq is being allowed by the United States as a type of retribution for the problems we faced in our mission to Iraq. Those are not my views but the views expressed by the American Ambassador in Baghdad writing to the Secretary of State saying this is how we are perceived. I strongly object to that kind of conclusion, but that is the conclusion of our Ambassador.

Iraq's economy is also in a shambles. Three years after major combat operations ended, the Iraqi infrastructure remains inadequate by every measure. Oil production, electricity generation, and the availability of clean water are all below prewar levels. Schools and hospitals lack adequate supplies and personnel. No matter how the administration tries to paint the picture, the reality which we all accept and know is that the chaos in Iraq is transparent and it is growing.

Most importantly, Iraq's elected Government is now poised to function, but only after 5 months of political haggling over key Cabinet and sub-Cabinet posts. That is the reality, colleagues, that the U.S. policy must now address in Iraq.

To be fair, there has been some good news. Over the last 10 days, particularly with the announcement that U.S. forces were able to detect and eliminate the Jordanian terrorist Abu

Mus'ab Al-Zarqawi, al-Qaida's henchman in Iraq and the architect of the brutal attacks against U.S. military personnel and Iraqi civilians alike. We can be justifiably proud, and should be, of how the United States and Iraqi forces, together, carried out this extremely dangerous and important mission. It is also a positive development that the Iraqi Government is now as its full capacity, with all Cabinet positions filled, particularly the critical national security posts. That is the good news. It is important to cite that as well.

Now that this Government of Iraq is a reality, it is also an important and appropriate moment for U.S. policymakers to take stock of our policy in Iraq and consider the next steps to turning over full responsibility to Iraq's democratically elected government.

Let me remind our colleagues, last year, President Bush signed into law as part of the fiscal year 2006 Defense Authorization Act a provision that states:

> Calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq.

I commend, as I should have at the outset, the chairman of the committee, my good friend from Virginia, JOHN WARNER. He has done a wonderful job allowing debate in the committee, bringing witnesses forward, allowing dissent to occur where appropriate, and authoring this language last year in that Defense authorization bill which the President signed into law calling for this year to be a year of transition. Those words were important. They were not crafted in a cavalier fashion; they were put together carefully in a bipartisan fashion as a message to the American people and to the Iraqi people and their Government. This year—2006—would be a year of transition for Iraq's leaders to assume greater responsibility over security matters and other challenges facing their country.

There have now been national elections in Iraq. A permanent broad-based government has been formed. It is important that the Iraqis now take on a significant role in establishing domestic security. Ultimately, a solution in Iraq will not be achieved through U.S. military action alone but, rather, through the political will and substantive action on the part of the new Iraqi Government to bring various factions in their country together.

In short, the future of Iraq ultimately rests with the Iraqi people, not with U.S. military might, not with the size of our treasury, but on the resolve of the Iraqi people and their leaders. That is where their future rests. Let's be clear however about our role in that process.

We should continue to assist this nascent Government in Iraq during these difficult times. But at the same time, we must also refocus the nature of that assistance if we are going to succeed and if Iraq is going to succeed. Iraq's problems are essentially political problems that call out for political solutions. It is becoming increasingly evident, I think to all of us, that a continuing substantial U.S. troop presence in and around Iraqi cities is not the answer at all. In fact, the road to any success in Iraq will be contingent on a lessening of U.S. military presence, if, in fact, the U.S. Ambassador is right in his message to our Secretary of State. And having visited Iraq on two occasions I believe he is right.

We have won the larger war against Iraq's dictator but at no small cost. It has been a successful effort in that regard. Saddam has been toppled and is on trial. A new democratically elected Iraqi Government is now in place. Al-Zarqawi has been killed. Those are successes.

The remaining mission, however, of stabilizing Iraq and bringing factions together is something that can only be done by Iraq's new Government and its citizens. An indefinite and prolonged U.S. troop presence in that country is quickly reaching a point of diminishing returns.

I am a realist and an optimist. I recognize American involvement in Iraq and the gulf region will be required for years to come. It is a very important neighborhood in which we have very important interests. It is a dangerous neighborhood, as well. And we have vital national interests at stake there. But we have other important global interests, as well; among these combating the threat of global terrorism and terrorist organizations. Global terrorism is and remains our greatest threat.

In that context, I don't think it is unpatriotic or otherwise inappropriate for the supporters of the pending amendment to ask President Bush to tell the American people, tell the U.S. Congress, when and how he plans to successfully conclude the U.S. military presence in Iraq so that U.S. forces can be redeployed to more effectively combat global terrorism and protect our vital national interests.

Why was it reasonable and appropriate for the administration to set deadlines for Iraqis and unreasonable to set deadlines for itself? The Bush administration set a deadline for the establishment of an interim government, a deadline for writing a Constitution and for holding a referendum to approve it, and a deadline for holding elections for a permanent Iraqi government. Guess what. It worked. The Iraqi political leadership met the challenges. It wasn't always easy and the process wasn't perfect, but it produced results because we insisted upon those deadlines. In fact, I would argue had we not set deadlines, I believe we would be facing a very different picture in Iraq today.

I believe U.S. interests in Iraq can be advanced by developing benchmarks and a timeframe for getting done what needs to be done to produce the success we all need and want in Iraq. I don't mean to suggest that U.S. forces should in any way be precipitously redeployed from Iraq next week or next month—that would be a mistake, in my view—but I do believe it is imperative for planning purposes to think about benchmarks and a realistic timeframe within which U.S. force levels can be significantly reduced below the current level of 130,000.

The benchmarks are fairly obvious: a unity government that equitably represents the interests of and distributes resources to all sectors of Iraq; professionalism of Iraq's security and police forces; disbanding of sectarian militias; the creation of a gulf regional security umbrella to enhance stability and deter unwanted interference by Iraqi's neighbors; and greater international participation and resources in Iraq's reconstruction agenda.

These are all obvious and necessary benchmarks. The more quickly the benchmarks are realized, the more hopeful we can be for Iraq's future.

It is both realistic and, in my view, possible to achieve these benchmarks within the next 12 to 18 months. Whether we achieve them depends on the determination of the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi people to assume responsibility for their shared future—not on the military might of the United States.

And in conjunction with such progress, I think it is also realistic and possible to undertake the phased strategic redeployment of our forces from Iraq to other nations in the gulf and to other regions posing significant terrorist threats to our country. The details of any redeployment should appropriately be left to our military commanders on the ground to work out, in consultation with Iraqi leaders. This is a very critical and central point. Let me repeat it. The details of any redeployment should be appropriately left to our military commanders on the ground to work out, in consultation with Iraqi leaders. But we must no longer remain in an open-ended commitment.

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator.

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

Mr. DODD. The Iraqis are going to have to take responsibility for their future. This, in my view, is a strategy for success in Iraq. This is a reasoned and responsible approach. It is realistic. This is not cut-and-run. The alternative is for more of the same, in my view—endless occupation, violence, instability, and the erosion of America's global leadership and national security.

I do not underestimate the challenges facing the Iraqi people. They

will need to make an extraordinary effort in the coming months and years to secure their future. But we have been giving them the necessary tools to do so. Let's not forget when the President signed the Defense authorization bill into law last year, again, those words: This should be the year of transition.

We have given the Iraqis the necessary tools. Now it is up to them. The sage words of Benjamin Franklin, following the success of the 1787 Constitutional Convention come to mind in thinking about Iraq at this moment in history. When Franklin was approached by a Mrs. Powell of Philadelphia on the streets of Philadelphia and said to him: What have you given us?—Ben Franklin said to that woman: Mrs. Powell, we have given you ''a republic, if you can keep it.'' The Iraqi people are asking a similar question of us: What have we given them? We have given them a republic, if they can keep it. But it is up to them to keep it.

I urge the adoption of the Levin amendment. It puts us on the right road for success.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the terrorists have had a very difficult almost 5 years since 9/11. That was clearly the high-water mark, their attack on America, the killing of over 3,000 people.

Ever since that day, they have been on defense because the President, with widespread support in the Congress, decided to go on offense. And for the last 4½ years, we have been killing terrorists, capturing terrorists. Many are hiding in their caves. We have liberated 50 million people in Afghanistan and Iraq. The number of rogue regimes, which numbered four when President Bush took office—at that time there was Libya, Iraq, Iran, and North Korea—is now down to two. Libya and Iraq no longer threaten their neighbors. The terrorists have had a very difficult 5 years.

Now, the President made it clear at the beginning of this war—and we all agreed—that there was not going to be a sort of clear end date. I have heard this conflict compared, by many of our colleagues, to the length of time in Korea or the length of time in World War II. It seems to me those comparisons are not apt. They do not apply to the current war in which we are engaged.

No one predicts a kind of ticker-tape parade at the end of this conflict. We are dealing with international gangsters who move across borders, who are adept at using the Internet and other modern means of communication.

The best way, then, to measure success in the war on terrorism is this: Have we been attacked again here at home since 9/11? While none of us would confidently predict that will never happen again, it is truly remarkable that we have not been attacked again since 9/11. I wonder why that is. Just good luck? A quirk of fate? Or good policy? It is no accident we have not been attacked again since 9/11. We have been on offense going after the terrorists where they are so they have to confine their mischief to their territory and not here.

So it is a statement of the obvious that they want us out of Iraq. They saw what happened in Beirut in the 1980s. They saw what happened in Somalia in the 1990s. In fact, they are anticipating it, and we have their own words. We have their own words. Ayman al-Zawahiri, No. 2 to Osama bin Laden, in a message to the late Abu Musab al-Zarqawi killed 2 weeks ago in Iraq—last year intercepted by us—this is what al-Zawahiri had said to say: The Jihad in Iraq requires several incremental goals . . . The first stage: Expel the Americans from Iraq. . . . The second stage: Establish an Islamic authority . . . in order to fill the void stemming from the departure of the Americans, immediately upon their exit and before un-Islamic forces attempt to fill this void. . . . The third stage: Extend the Jihad wave to the secular countries neighboring Iraq . . . the mujahedin must not have their mission end with the expulsion of the Americans from Iraq . . . their ongoing mission is to establish an Islamic state, and defend it, and for every generation to hand over the banner to the one after it until the Hour of Resurrection. . . . The Americans will exit soon, God willing.

We do not have to guess about what their goals are. They have been quite clear about it—quite clear about it.

So here we are debating which kind of exit date, which kind of announcement of imminent departure we are going to send in a message to them.

Our good friend from Massachusetts, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, has had no less than four different plans over the last 12 months or so. The first plan of the Senator from Massachusetts was to withdraw 20,000 troops by the end of 2005 and the bulk of troops out by the end of 2006. That was Senator KERRY's first plan.

Senator KERRY's second plan: to withdraw if the Iraq Government was not finalized by May 15 of this year. The third plan of the Senator from Massachusetts, which we had an opportunity to vote on last week, was to have all the troops out by the end of this year. Fortunately, only six Senators—six—voted to have all the troops out by the end of this year.

And tomorrow we will have Senator KERRY's fourth plan, which is to have the withdrawal consummated by July 1 of next year—about a year from now.

So four different plans—a kind of floating withdrawal date. But the one thing all the plans have in common is they send a message to the other side that if you can hang on until a date certain, we are on the way out.

We heard the distinguished Senator from Oregon mention earlier he had not been able to find a single time in history in which setting a specific time for withdrawal produced a positive result.

One thing we know for sure, if they drive us out of Iraq, they will soon be back here. If they drive us out of Iraq, they will soon be back here. And they have already demonstrated they had the capacity, the intelligence, to carry out catastrophic attacks on us here at home.

We all regret and have great anguish over the death of every single American soldier. And it is a fact that we have lost 2,500 of our finest in this war. We revere human life, unlike the gangsters in Baghdad who mutilated two of our soldiers in the last couple of days.

But it is noteworthy that in liberating 50 million people in Afghanistan and Iraq, we have lost fewer soldiers than we had Americans killed in one day on 9/11, 2001, and fewer soldiers than we lost in Normandy on one day in World War II.

We hurt with every loss, but the losses have been quite minimal given the enormity of the task. And the job, of course, has not been completed. We have to keep on offense, keep after the terrorists, or they will be back here.

So I think this is an extremely important debate. I am glad the Senate is having it. We have sort of different versions of what kind of notice we are going to give to the enemy—that we are either on the way out by a certain day or beginning to pack up to go next door or pack up to go somewhere else by a certain time.

All of those are not good messages for our own troops, who are involved in trying to win the conflict, not a good message to the new Iraqi Government, which is trying to establish itself and get control of Baghdad, and the worst possible news to every terrorist anywhere in the world, just aching for an American defeat, after almost 5 years of a tough situation for them, because they know a lot of their colleagues are dead, they know some of their colleagues are at Guantanamo, they know a bunch of their colleagues are hiding in caves, and they know all the rest of their colleagues are occupied on their turf and not on ours.

They would love to get back on offense. They would love to come back over here and kill Americans right here at home. But as long as we are forward deployed, as long as we are taking out the terrorists where they are, we are winning the war on terror. But we need to keep reminding ourselves what the war was about. It was about protecting us here at home. And so far, I would have to say the policy has been extraordinarily successful.

This is a great debate. We are going to hear from a number of our colleagues over the next day or so. When we finally have votes on both the Levin amendment and the Kerry amendment, I hope they will be defeated, and it will be made clear to the terrorists, once again, that we do not intend to send

them a notice, do not intend to send them a notice that we are on the way out by a certain date.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I intend to support the Levin-Reed amendment, and I also intend to support the Kerry amendment.

Both amendments make clear that Democrats are united in our belief that it is time to shift to the Iraqis the responsibility for their own future and to begin to withdraw our troops from Iraq. It is wrong for the Republican-controlled Congress to be a rubber-stamp for the President's failed policy. We cannot ignore our responsibility to our men and women in uniform.

America was wrong to go to war in Iraq in the way we did, when we did, and for the false reasons we were given. There was no immediate threat. There was no persuasive link to al-Qaida. Saddam Hussein was not close to acquiring a nuclear weapon.

But as my brother Robert Kennedy said in 1968:

> Past error is no excuse for its own perpetuation.

Mindless determination and foolish consistency don't make a better outcome likely. With each passing day, the American people are growing more and more impatient with the war in Iraq.

They want a policy worthy of the sacrifice of our men and women in uniform, not sloganeering and accusations of ''cut and run.'' The American people don't want our troops deployed in Iraq indefinitely, defending the same flawed strategy. Staying the course is not an acceptable strategy when the course is a failed course.

Our military forces have now been deployed in Iraq for 39 months, more than 3 years. That's longer than the 37 months of combat in the Korean war. By the end of this year, it will be longer than it took to fight and win World War II.

The American people want a realistic strategy for our troops to be redeployed out of Iraq, and this amendment provides it. It sends clear message: now that a democratic government has been elected by the Iraqi people, it is time for American troops to begin to come home.

We need to view disengagement as part of the solution in Iraq. Our overwhelming military presence and our open-ended military commitment have only fueled the insurgency, made America a crutch for the Iraqi Government, made our country more hated in the world, and made the war on terrorism harder to win.

The best hope for the success of the new Iraqi Government to succeed is for us to begin disengaging from Iraq, and they from us. The Iraqi Government must begin to make its own decisions, make necessary compromises to avoid full-scale civil war, and take responsibility for its own future.

As Iraq's National Security Adviser wrote in the Washington Post yesterday: ''Iraq has to grow out of the shadow of the United States and the coalition, take responsibility for its own decisions, learn from its own mistakes, and find Iraqi solutions to Iraqi problems.''

Iraq has had elections, a permanent government has been established, more than 200,000 members of Iraqi security forces have been trained, and it is time to begin bringing Americans home. The Levin amendment and the Kerry amendment can help us achieve that goal and prevent our troops from being caught in an endless quagmire.

The cost of this war in blood and treasure has been far too great. More than $320 billion has already been spent, with no end in sight. A recent estimate by Nobel Prize winning economist Joseph Stiglitz suggests the total cost will exceed $1 trillion.

Our military is stretched to the breaking point. Many soldiers have been deployed more than three times to Iraq.

More than 2,500 American lives have been lost, including more than 50 sons of Massachusetts. More than 18,000 of our troops have been wounded. Clearly, despite the death of Zarqawi, al-Qaida terrorists and insurgents remain determined to kill American soldiers.

Despite what Vice President CHENEY says about the insurgency being in its last throes, the insurgency rages on. Last month, 68 American soldiers were killed in Iraq. Insurgents attacked American soldiers 90 times a day.

We always knew that deposing Saddam Hussein would be easy, but the administration should have foreseen that winning the peace would be difficult. Unfortunately, for our men and women in uniform, the arrogance of the administration blinded it to the cold, hard realities that our troops would face every day in Iraq.

Alarm bells had been ringing, but the Bush administration ignored them.

As General Hoar, former head of the Central Command, warned before the war, in September 2002, winning the peace would be bloody. He said: ''In urban warfare . . . It looks like the last 15 minutes of Saving Private Ryan.''

General John M. Shalikashvili, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, warned, before the war, in September of 2002: ''I think if it gets to urban warfare, and the likelihood is certainly great that it could . . . it could get very messy. The collateral damage could be very great, and our own casualties could increase significantly.''

In fact, in their 1997 book, A World Transformed the first President Bush and his National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft explained why they didn't go on to Baghdad in the first gulf war. They wrote that it: ''would have incurred incalculable human and political costs . . . We would have been forced to occupy Baghdad and, in effect, rule Iraq. The coalition would instantly have collapsed, the Arabs deserting it in anger and other allies pulling out as well. Under those circumstances, there was no viable exit strategy we could see. . . . Had we gone the invasion route, the United States could conceivably still be an occupying power in a bitterly hostile land.''

Those words eerily describe what happened when the current President Bush ignored that wise advice and invaded Iraq.

We must not forget that ultimately this is a debate about real people who are risking their lives every day. With this amendment and the Kerry amendment, we provide a realistic way out of the quagmire in Iraq, and I urge my colleagues to support both.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, this is a very important debate. There is a lot of interest in this debate throughout the world. I am sure everybody at home is probably not sitting on the edge of their seats listening to what I am saying, but in many ways this debate will define the U.S. relationship with the Middle East and the world at large for a long time.

The authors of this amendment are as patriotic as anyone I have ever met. They are fine Senators. They are smart. They are trying to do what they believe is in the best interest of the country and the world at large. The problem I have with the amendment and the reason I rise in opposition to it is that there is an underlying premise about this amendment that we need to set timetables to send a signal to the Iraqi people to do their part and to get on with the transition and to stand up faster and to get political solutions to hard problems faster so that we can come home, and without this amendment, the Iraqi people may just draw this thing out and rely on us too much.

I understand your concern, but I take a different view of the Iraqi people. I am here today publicly to say that I could not be more proud of standing with the Iraqi people and their Government than I am now. What we have asked of them, they have delivered. Senator DODD was right. Every time we tried to set deadlines, they delivered. They delivered on some of the most difficult circumstances imaginable. If you want to run for office in Iraq—it is tough in America; they say awful, bad things about us in this body when we run—they try to kill you, and they come after your family. So to those

Iraqis who have joined the police force for the right reasons, to those who are serving in the military for the right reasons, to those politicians trying to bring that country together with a unity coalition government, my hat is off to you. I admire you. I am proud to stand by your side. I have no desire to leave you in a lurch. I have every confidence that you want us gone as much as we want to leave, but you understand your capacity is limited right now.

The National Security Adviser said there is a roadmap for us to leave, and the Iraqi people want to have the ability to chart their own destiny sooner rather than later.

To my friends in the Senate, if the U.S. Congress sets a timetable, it is a rebuke of the Government in Iraq. It is a vote of no confidence in the Iraqi people, and it will be seen as such on al-Jazeera and throughout the Middle East.

There will be a timetable for us to leave. It will be performance driven, and it will be authored by the Iraqi people themselves. The day they set the timetable and they set the benchmarks, it will empower their Government and their people and it will diminish the terrorists. If we set those timetables and the benchmarks, it will diminish the Iraqi Government, all of the efforts of the Iraqi people, and empower the terrorists.

I hate to say that I disagree with my good friends, but I do. We are going to come home one day. That day is not so far away. History will judge us by not when we left but by what we left behind. I want to leave behind a regime capable of pulling off something no one else has been able to do in the Middle East, a functioning democracy so the Shias and Sunnis and Kurds can live together under the rule of law and they can take out their differences at the ballot box and the courtroom. It has been 3½ years almost. They have come a long way. We have been at this over 200 years. We still have our problems. Under the best of circumstances it is very difficult to bring people together of different backgrounds, religions, and ethnic groups. We had our own Civil War. It started in my State. When we wrote our Constitution, after 11 years, women couldn't vote. African Americans were not even recognized as people. We have come a long way, and it has taken us a long time to get there.

Our Iraqi friends, the moderates are fighting and dying for their own freedom. They have come a long way in 3½ years. I am begging this body, let us not, as a body, set a timetable that would diminish their sacrifice and not recognize it for what it is. The truth is, the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi people are doing historic things in the Mideast that no one else has been able to accomplish. They are not lazy. They are not indifferent. They are not letting us fight their war. They are fighting it alongside us and dying. They are dying in larger numbers than we are. If they pull this off with our help, the world will be eminently safer. If they fail, moderate forces in the Mideast will be less likely to rear their head and stand up against terrorists, and the terrorists will seize the moment in the decades to come.

Never has so much been at stake for mankind and with so few people sacrificing. Stand with the Iraqi people. They want us out, but don't diminish their sacrifice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the situation in Iraq and to ask several questions about the withdrawal proposals being offered by the other side.

Why would we risk our success by a premature withdrawal? Why would we risk handing over Iraq to the terrorists when they are on the run? Why would we send a message to the families who had loved ones die fighting for freedom that it was all in vain? Why would we pass legislation that calls for the withdrawal of our troops and that undermines everything we have achieved? These same questions are being asked by many of my constituents in Colorado.

According to the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel, a key newspaper in Colorado's western slope:

> President Bush and Congress are right not to set a date certain for moving all the troops out of Iraq. That would signal terrorists they only need to hide out until the Americans leave, then reignite their attacks. . . . And it would tell others that our commitment to freedom in the Middle East is limited.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Daily Sentinel, June 18, 2006]

IT WOULD BE FOLLY FOR CONGRESS TO CUT AND RUN

Days after President George W. Bush told the new prime minister of Iraq that the United States would not abandon the fledgling democratic nation to terrorists, both houses of Congress gave the president much-needed overwhelming support for his position.

Late Thursday the Senate voted 93–6 to reject a deadline by the end of this year to withdraw all U.S. troops from Iraq. On Friday, the House voted 256–153 to kill a deadline for withdrawal from Iraq.

No one wants to keep American military personnel in that dangerous country indefinitely and risk more than the 2,500 U.S. military personnel who have already sacrificed their lives there. Fortunately, there are encouraging signs that the United States may be able to start reducing its military presence before long.

The raid on the safehouse of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi proved to be successful far beyond the death of one important leader. It provided a treasure trove of computer documents and other intelligence that led to more than 400 additional raids and the arrests of more than 700 suspected terrorists.

What's more, 140 of the additional raids and many of the arrests were handled entirely by Iraqi forces, without back-up from U.S. troops, a sign that the Iraqi forces are becoming more capable of protecting their country.

Additionally, with an Iraqi Cabinet finally in place, the government has initiated much-needed security efforts in and around Baghdad. Those measures haven't eliminated terrorist attacks, but they may be slowing them.

Even so, Bush and Congress are right not to set a date-certain for moving all of the troops out of Iraq. That would signal terrorists they only need to hide out until the Americans leave, then reignite their attacks. And it would tell others that our commitment to freedom in the Middle East is limited.

There was, to be sure, a good deal of politics involved in the Republicans' push for a vote on Iraq. But it was not entirely the GOP's doing.

It was Democrats such as Sen. John Kerry of Massachusetts and Rep. John Murtha of Pennsylvania who have been loudly calling for an immediate troop withdrawal from Iraq. With congressional elections in November, it makes sense to let voters see how their senators and representatives feel about withdrawing now.

Nobody should read these votes as unqualified support for Bush administration and the mistakes it has made, especially in underestimating the strength of the terrorists. But the votes do recognize it would be wrong to abandon the Iraqis even as they are beginning to take control of their country. And that's good news, not so much for either party's election prospects, but for the ongoing efforts to overcome the savage forces of Islamofascism.

Mr. ALLARD. Relationships between the 3rd Armored Cavalry and the local community were so strong that the Iraqi mayor of the city of Tall Afar actually traveled to Colorado Springs to present these soldiers with a proclamation from the city.

I ask unanimous consent that the full copy of the proclamation be printed in the RECORD.

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

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR, CITY OF TALL'AFAR

IN THE NAME OF GOD THE COMPASSIONATE AND MERCIFUL

To the Courageous Men and Women of the 3d Armored Cavalry Regiment, who have changed the city of Tall'Afar from a ghost town, in which terrorists spread death and destruction, to a secure city flourishing with life.

To the lion-hearts who liberated our city from the grasp of terrorists who were beheading men, women and children in the streets for many months.

To those who spread smiles on the faces of our children, and gave us restored hope, through their personal sacrifice and brave fighting, and gave new life to the city after hopelessness darkened our days, and stole our confidence in our ability to reestablish our city.

Our city was the main base of operations for Abu Mousab Al Zarqawi. The city was completely held hostage in the hands of his henchmen. Our schools, governmental services, businesses and offices were closed. Our

streets were silent, and no one dared to walk them. Our people were barricaded in their homes out of fear; death awaited them around every corner. Terrorists occupied and controlled the only hospital in the city. Their savagery reached such a level that they stuffed the corpses of children with explosives and tossed them into the streets in order to kill grieving parents attempting to retrieve the bodies of their young. This was the situation of our city until God prepared and delivered unto them the courageous soldiers of the 3d Armored Cavalry Regiment, who liberated this city, ridding it of Zarqawi's followers after harsh fighting, killing many terrorists, and forcing the remaining butchers to flee the city like rats to the surrounding areas, where the bravery of other 3d ACR soldiers in Sinjar, Rabiah, Zumar and Avgani finally destroyed them.

I have met many soldiers of the 3d Armored Cavalry Regiment; they are not only courageous men and women, but avenging angels sent by The God Himself to fight the evil of terrorism.

The leaders of this Regiment; COL McMaster, COL Armstrong, LTC Hickey, LTC Gibson, and LTC Reilly embody courage, strength, vision and wisdom. Officers and soldiers alike bristle with the confidence and character of knights in a bygone era. The mission they have accomplished, by means of a unique military operation, stands among the finest military feats to date in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and truly deserves to be studied in military science. This military operation was clean, with little collateral damage, despite the ferocity of the enemy. With the skill and precision of surgeons they dealt with the terrorist cancers in the city without causing unnecessary damage.

God bless this brave Regiment; God bless the families who dedicated these brave men and women. From the bottom of our hearts we thank the families. They have given us something we will never forget. To the families of those who have given their holy blood for our land, we all bow to you in reverence and to the souls of your loved ones. Their sacrifice was not in vain. They are not dead, but alive, and their souls hovering around us every second of every minute. They will never be forgotten for giving their precious lives. They have sacrificed that which is most valuable. We see them in the smile of every child, and in every flower growing in this land. Let America, their families, and the world be proud of their sacrifice for humanity and life.

Finally, no matter how much I write or speak about this brave Regiment, I haven't the words to describe the courage of its officers and soldiers. I pray to God to grant happiness and health to these legendary heroes and their brave families.

NAJIM ABDULLAH ABID AL-JIBOURI,
Mayor of Tall'Afar, Ninewa, Iraq.

Mr. ALLARD. Let me read a portion of the proclamation as written by the Najim Abdullah Al-Jibouri, Iraqi mayor of Tall Afar:

To the Courageous Men and Women of the 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment, who have changed the city of Tall' Afar from a ghost town, in which terrorists spread death and destruction, to a secure city flourishing with life. . . . Our city was the main base of operations for Abu Mousab Zarqawi. The city was completely held hostage in the hands of his henchmen. . . . Their savagery reached such a level that they stuffed the corpses of children with explosives and tossed them into the streets in order to kill grieving parents . . . this was the situation of our city until God prepared and delivered unto them the courageous soldiers of the 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment, who liberated this city, ridding it of Zarqawi's followers after harsh fighting.

The commander of Iraq's 3rd Army Infantry Division, MG Khorsheed Al-Dosekey, wrote the following in a letter to our soldiers:

Your ability to plan, the excellent coordination, the overall supervising and the right decisive decisions along with your great leadership have helped us build up the individual soldier and increase his abilities. Your leadership and devotion to duty have helped form an army from the gathered people. Your behavior and your actions have built strong friendships that will last a lifetime.

I ask unanimous consent that letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

3RD IRAQI ARMY INFANTRY DIVISION,
Headquarters in AKMTB.

3rd Armored Calvary,
Regiment Headquarters.

Bravery, strength, determination, correct thought, flexibility, knowledge, and impartiality. These are the features of your regiment's leadership that are displayed through participation with our division headquarters, our troops, and their units in all the daily occasions. Your wise daily, operational, and successful leadership was the decisive factor in achieving victory. We noticed clearly the main features for victory in your leadership. They are the same for each people or army who are looking for victory, and it is the common purpose of your troopers and faith in their goal along with their principles, high morals and focus on their mission, coupled with perfect logistics support and impartiality and sincere leadership that makes you the right people for this mission.

Your abilities to plan, the excellent coordination, the overall supervising and the right decisive decisions along with your great leadership have helped us to build up the individual soldier and increase his abilities as well as those for the platoons, companies, battalions, brigades and division. It is said that heaps of construction materials cannot build a house and the gathered people cannot be considered an army. Your leadership and devotion to duty have helped us form an army from the gathered people.

Your behavior and your actions have built strong friendships that will last a lifetime. Your behavior is a feature of the wise leadership, which is the tree and the reputation you leave behind is the shadow of the tree.

So we present our heartfelt thanks, appreciation and respect to you as we touched during this past period of cooperation and coordination and fighting side by side. We also offer the thanks of the division's staff, NCOS, and enlisted. You will disappear from our eyes, but you will stay in our hearts.

We send our greetings to the 3rd ACR fighters and to their families and we wish all of you to get back home safely under victory's flag.

With God's Care,
MAJOR GENERAL KHORSHEED SALEEM AL-DOSEKEY,
3rd IA Infantry Division Commander.

Mr. ALLARD. That is the message from the Iraqi people for the heroic efforts fighting for freedom. I know most if not all the Members of this body share in their appreciation for the valiant service of our men and women in uniform. I was pleased last night when we passed my sense-of-the-Senate amendment which commends the members of our Armed Forces for their outstanding service to our Nation in Iraq and for their commitment to the highest ideals and values of our Nation. It also honors the families of our servicemembers who have given so much in the fight against terror. Our soldiers deserve our support and our trust.

In conclusion, I ask, why would we risk all this by a premature withdrawal and set a specific date for withdrawal?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I understand that Senator CARPER is on his way over. He is next on our side. I wonder if I may inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 50 minutes 40 seconds. The Senator from Virginia has 41 minutes 29 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, is the other side ready?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Virginia is next, to be followed then by the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HAGEL.

Mr. LEVIN. I wonder if I may list the sequence on our side so it would be understood that after Senator CARPER, we would expect Senator LAUTENBERG and then Senator MURRAY, Senator OBAMA, Senator BIDEN, and Senator DURBIN.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we will go from one side to the other. I have waiting the Senator from Virginia, Senator HAGEL, Senator ROBERTS, Senator BOND, and Senator THUNE. I will try to get them all in order of appearance. The Senator from Virginia is next on our side. I will sort out the sequence of the others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia, Mr. ALLEN, is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, before I speak on these amendments, I will share with my colleagues three amendments I have introduced.

The first amendment will double the current referral bonus from $1,000 to $2,000, which will encourage more men and women to enter the U.S. Armed Forces.

The second amendment will provide statutory authority to the Army to pay $8,000 dollar enlistment bonuses to individuals who enlist in Officer Candidate School. The Army has made this promise—and this amendment provides statutory authority to fulfill that promise.

And finally, I have offered—with Senators CRAIG, HUTCHISON, BURNS and SNOWE as cosponsors—an amendment that will provide financial protection to the 25.6 million military personnel and veterans whose personal data and Social Security information were stolen from the home of a Veterans Affairs employee in May of this year.

Under the terms of my amendment, the VA would be required to provide credit monitoring and data theft protection to these veterans at no cost to

our veterans. My amendment is supported by the VFW.

I spoke to Secretary of Veterans Affairs Jim Nicholson earlier today, and he informed me that he had announced that the VA will provide credit monitoring and data theft protection, and at no cost to the servicemembers and veterans. I thank Secretary Nicholson for making this sound and responsible decision.

I also rise in strong opposition to the amendments brought forth by Senators KERRY and LEVIN which, in my view, is a vacillating strategic plan of retreat. We don't need a plan of retreat. We need to have a steady, strategic plan for success in the war on terror and, in particular, in the theater of Iraq. We need to honor our troops and honor their families, whether they are serving now, or those who have fallen in the midst of this battlefront in Iraq.

We need to move forward in Iraq, and we need to unite all Americans behind our mission, unite Americans behind a strategic plan for success, bringing Americans together, and also our NATO partners and other allies, and get the neighbors of Iraq together, whether they be Jordan, Turkey, Kuwait or Saudi Arabia—they are all important—rather than Senator KERRY's plan, which is a plan for retreat, a tuck-tail-and-run approach. That is not what is need.

We want to see this new unity, diverse Government elected by the people of Iraq, have a chance to stand on its own feet and defend its own interests. We want to see measured, tangible success as quickly as possible, and we want to bring home our troops as soon as possible. But I believe some on the other side of the aisle are too anxious, and that would be retreating. This is not the sort of steady leadership that I believe would unite the American people.

Moreover, I think this approach can embolden our enemies. It would show a weakened resolve in the midst of this war on terror. The terrorists always talk about the United States and Mogadishu or the Beirut bombing and how Americans will retreat. We don't need to be emboldening our enemies. Moreover, it can cause discouragement and dismay to the Iraqi leaders who are bravely trying to stand up for a free and just society. It also can be a discredit to the United States in the eyes of some of our allies. Our European allies came out strongly in support of us today, for example, in our negotiations with Iran and telling the Iranian leaders: You ought to take the carrot, take the right approach. It is important as we deal with the Iranians that the United States shows there is a resolve and a commitment to sticking to a path of security and peace.

Just a few weeks ago, I was on a bipartisan delegation to Iraq. Everyone we spoke with, whether they were Kurds, Sunnis, or Shiites, was grateful to the United States for liberating them from that repressive regime. We asked what would happen if we left in 6 months. They all said it would be a ''disaster.'' That was the word we heard more than anything else. Even the Sunni speaker of the new assembly, who was once imprisoned by the United States, said that if the U.S. military left—as a Sunni who was once imprisoned and was against the United States being there in the first place—he said to us, as he said subsequently to the President, that: We are grateful, and the U.S. military presence in Iraq is helpful to them. If we left, then those who would come in would be the Iranians, the Syrians, or potentially, of course, in the north, the Turks.

We are making progress. We are fighting vile terrorists. We need to understand who we are fighting. These terrorists are beheading men and women in Iraq. Meanwhile, the United States and our coalition partners are trying to give the Iraqis the chance to vote, to have a say on their public servants in that country.

We are also making progress on the security fronts. General Casey relayed to us that, right now, maybe a quarter of military operations are led by Iraqis. He said that by the end of the year, as much as three-quarters of the military operations will be led by the Iraqis, with the United States being in a supportive role for medical, intelligence, and military efforts.

Mr. President, I know Iraq has been tough. It is a tough battlefront for Americans. But it is a war and a theater in this war on terror that we can win and must win. The next few months will be vitally important. This is not the time to get weak in the knees. The future of Iraq is ultimately the responsibility of the Iraqi people. It is going to be the Iraqis' hands, backs, and minds that will be needed to build a secure and free Iraq. We don't want to stay a day longer than absolutely necessary. We are supporting Iraq in this because we are a generous people, but it is also good for our national security.

So I think we need to make sure that Senator KERRY's strategic plan for retreat—a tuck-tail-and-fail approach—must be rejected. We must unite as Americans for a renewed commitment for a strategic plan for success. It is important for Iraq, important for the Middle East, and it is vitally important for the security of the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I thank the sponsors of this amendment, Senators LEVIN and REED, for offering a thoughtful amendment. They are making a responsible contribution to this debate. All Americans want a successful outcome in Iraq. Congress has an obligation to help craft a responsible policy to help achieve a successful outcome in Iraq. Congress fails in its duty when we do not probe, when we do not ask tough questions, and we fail when we don't debate the great issues of our day.

There is no issue more important than war. The war in Iraq is the defining issue on which this Congress and the administration will be judged. The American people want to see serious debate about serious issues from serious leaders. They deserve more than a political debate. This debate should transcend cynical attempts to turn public frustration with the war in Iraq into an electoral advantage. It should be taken more seriously than to simply use the focus group-tested buzzwords like ''cut and run'' and political slogans and debase the seriousness of war. War is not a partisan issue. It should not be held hostage to political agendas. War should not be dragged into the political muck. America deserves better. Our men and women fighting and dying deserve better.

As mentioned earlier by Senator FEINSTEIN and others, there was a very important piece in yesterday's Washington Post, written by Iraq's National Security Adviser. It was titled ''The Way Out of Iraq; A Roadmap.'' The National Security Adviser's op-ed mentions three very important things we need to clearly understand. The first thing this op-ed provides is measurable goals for the progress of the Iraqi Government with regard to U.S. troop presence. The Iraqi National Security Adviser says this:

> Iraq's ambition is to have full control of their country by the end of 2008. In practice, this will mean a significant foreign troop reduction. We envision the U.S. troop presence by year's ends to be under 100,000, with most of the remaining troops to return home by the year 2007.

The second point the op-ed makes clear is the unavoidable reality that an endless U.S. troop presence is not in the interest of the new Iraqi Government. The Iraqi National Security Adviser says this:

> The eventual removal of coalition troops from Iraqi streets will help Iraqis who now see foreign troops as occupiers rather than the liberators they were meant to be. The removal of troops will also allow the Iraqi government to engage with some of our neighbors that have, to date, been at the very least sympathetic to the resistance because of what they call the ''coalition occupation.'' The removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of the people.

He makes clear that it will be the Iraqis who determine the success of the Iraqi Government. He says:

> The government in Iraq is trying to gain its independence from the United States and the coalition, in terms of taking greater responsibility for its actions, particularly in terms of security. There are still some influential foreign figures trying to spoon feed our government and take a very proactive role in many key decisions. Though this may provide benefits in the short-term, in the long term it will only serve to make the Iraqi government weaker and will lead to a culture of dependency.

I believe the Iraqi national security adviser has it exactly right. After all, he is the Iraqi national security adviser. Americans listening to this debate on Iraq are too often being given

false choices between, one, supporting the Iraqis with no end of troop deployments in sight or staying the course, or, two, laying down arbitrary deadlines for troop withdrawals. The reality is more complicated than this.

We should not limit the Commander in Chief's options in Iraq. That is why I will vote against the Levin amendment. However, anyone who believes we will be in Iraq indefinitely ignores the forces of reality, as the Iraqi Security Adviser's op-ed makes very clear. It is not in Iraq's interest for the United States to remain in Iraq. Our influence is limited and becoming more limited every day.

I note another story in yesterday's Washington Post that detailed the reaction of Vietnam veterans to the war in Iraq. I know a little something about this. My generation worries about Iraq becoming not the failure of our sons and daughters fighting in Iraq, but our failure as policymakers—policymakers—because I believe our policymakers failed us in Vietnam.

Our troops today are doing what we did a generation ago in Vietnam. They are fighting bravely. They are doing their very best. They believe in their country, they have faith in their leaders, and we cannot let them down.

I would say that there may be two Members of Congress today—Congressman MURTHA in the House and myself—who served in Vietnam and were both here working in the Congress in the spring of 1975. Many might recall that time because that was the time the House of Representatives essentially voted to cut off funding for American presence in Vietnam. That was a disastrous decision for disastrous reasons, but it was the result of having a Congress absent and not involved in the policy formation, not involved in asking the tough questions, not involved in doing its job.

This debate today is critical. It is important for our country, agree or disagree with it. Amendments such as the Levin amendment are relevant, and they are an important contribution. When we debate these issues, Congress is doing its job. We do not want our legacy as a Congress to be no congressional oversight. We do not want it to be said we were irrelevant when it becomes too late. We do not want to repeat the history of Vietnam. We must not allow what happened in the Congress in April of 1975 to happen with Iraq, and it happened because we didn't debate the issues. It happened because the Congress was absent; it forfeited its responsibilities. It debased the very responsibility of elected officials. And that is why to debate these issues in a legitimate, honest, open manner is so important to our country, and to keep it out of politics, the ''gotcha'' kind of amendments, the ''gotcha'' kind of phraseology of which America is sick.

This is a serious issue. We have lost over 2,500 men and women in Iraq. We have been in Iraq longer than the Korean war. We have over 18,000 wounded. We are spending around $10 billion a month. The Congress must be present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is advised he has now consumed 8 minutes.

Mr. HAGEL. I ask for 15 seconds.

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, take a minute or so.

Mr. HAGEL. I thank the chairman.

I conclude, Mr. President, with this: What would be the real disaster for America, the real disaster for Iraq, the disaster for the Middle East, the disaster for the world is if this Congress is not present and accounted for and is not part of a policy formation for not just Iraq but the Middle East and the future of our country and the world. That would be the disaster. That is why it is so important today that we debate this issue; it is so important that we have amendments, such as the Levin-Reed amendment, that are offered in an important way that make a contribution to the understanding of America's presence and commitment and our responsibilities as a free nation and the beacon of freedom in the world.

Mr. President, I appreciate the time. I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank our colleague for his remarks. He speaks from a body of personal experience and considerable courage as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, which he has exhibited in these years.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, may I have 10 seconds? I wish to add my thanks to the Senator from Nebraska for his very constructive, positive remarks.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we have on our side Senators THUNE and ROBERTS who are waiting. I know Senator BOND has indicated he wishes to speak, and Senator INHOFE. I wish to advise those Senators I have to recognize those on the floor; otherwise, we lose time to a quorum call or otherwise. So we are going to alternate at this time. We are going to shift to the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, 6 months ago, I was in Iraq with Senator HAGEL. We met with a number of people. Among the people with whom we met in one of the beautiful palaces of Saddam Hussein not far from Baghdad Airport, were the leaders of our American military forces in that country.

During the course of that conversation, we heard these words from our top military leader: It is time for America to move toward the door. He didn't say it is time for us to walk out of the door, leave, close the door. He said: It is time for us to move toward the door.

Subsequent to that, we met with Iraqi military and political leaders and our own diplomatic leaders, and the message I heard in almost all of those meetings was: it is time for America to begin moving toward the door.

We have had a policy in Iraq, at least in the last couple of years, of stay the course. ''Stay the course'' is a good slogan, and there have been times in our history as a nation when staying the course was actually a pretty good strategy. This is not one of those times.

What is needed is a different—not a different slogan, but a different strategy, and the strategy we need would be not stay the course but change the course.

The American people would like for us to begin to bring our men and women home and, as it turns out, so would the Iraqi people. In talking with the President upon our return, I said: You know, Mr. President, sometimes less is more. In this instance, having a smaller presence, a less visible presence would actually be more supportive of our efforts in Iraq than not.

The Iraqi people don't want us to cut and run. They don't want us to leave. They want us to be close by. They want us to be not far away and to be helpful if we can be, if needed. But they don't want us to leave this year. They don't want us to leave entirely next year.

Senator HAGEL just quoted the words of the Iraqi National Security Council. That is what we heard in Iraq last December. Their message has been pretty consistent, and it has been pretty much the same.

Last year in the Senate we voted by an overwhelming majority that 2006 needs to be a year of significant transition in Iraq. In other words, the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, called on the Bush administration to take action this year in 2006 to change course in Iraq to make clear to the Iraqis and the rest of the world that the United States does not intend to stay in Iraq forever.

The amendment before us today, the Levin-Reed amendment, builds on that resolution we passed barely a year ago. It rejects the extremes on both sides of the Iraqi debate—the one side of the extreme that would say either we should stay in Iraq on an open-ended basis, and the other extreme to say we ought to withdraw all of our troops by an arbitrary deadline. This amendment rejects both of those, and it says instead: Why don't we find a way to change the course going forward?

The policy of ''stay the course'' isn't working for our troops. They have served bravely, they have served honorably despite very difficult circumstances in extended tours of duty. More than 2,500 of our finest have been killed in action. Almost 18,000 have been injured, including a former member of my staff, Marine Corps LCpl Sean Barney, who was shot in the neck last month in Fallujah. Fortunately, he is alive. He is going to live.

The President's ''stay the course'' plan also is not working for the Iraqis. Insurgent violence is on the upswing, and our efforts to help rebuild Iraq are at a standstill. Electricity output has been pretty much flat-lined in the last couple of years, and we haven't been able to finish building the schools and hospitals they want and need and that we would like to help them build.

''Stay the course,'' I say to my friends, is not working. This amendment is about a new direction in Iraq. It is about accountability. It is about being tough. It is about being smart. It is about changing the course, not staying the course. It is about laying out a plan for victory in Iraq.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and the advice I heard not 6 months ago that it is time for America to move toward the door—not to leave, not to leave precipitously but to move toward the door and to allow the Iraqi people themselves to carry more of the burden in an effort to relieve from us some of that burden, an effort to make sure they have, in the end, a democracy and a country of their own to govern.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, I advise colleagues on my side, there is one Republican waiting, and others who have indicated a desire to speak. I urge them to come to the floor because I have under my control roughly 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COBURN). The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we face a difficult choice in Iraq and the war on terror at large. Iraqis are desperately trying to form a fragile government in the face of overwhelming odds. They are, as John Dickinson once said of American independence, ''braving the storm in a skiff made of paper.''

Despite that, the odds they face, look at the progress that has been made just of late. Prime Minister Maliki just completed the formation of a new Iraqi Government, including filling three national security positions. In the past few weeks, U.S. forces have taken out terrorist leader al-Zarqawi, the head of the snake, and many of his henchmen. This was a huge blow to al-Qaida and a major victory in the war on terror.

Iraqi security forces are growing in number every day. Only a year and a half ago, Iraqi security forces had just begun to form. Today there are 264,400 trained and equipped Iraqi security forces, more than double the number of U.S. troops in the region.

At the beginning of this year, the Iraqi forces had 10 brigades and 43 battalions. They controlled areas of responsibility. Only a few months later and those numbers have nearly doubled to 18 brigades and 71 battalions.

Large- and small-scale water treatment facilities have been rehabilitated or constructed for an estimated 3 million people at a standard level of service, with plans underway to deliver clean, safe drinking water to 5 million more.

May oil production was over 2.1 million barrels of oil per day, and the Treasury Department, from the United States, is sending additional professionals to Iraq to provide technical support for the creation of a public finance system that is accountable and transparent. And our State Department is coordinating a broad effort to support an economic policy framework that enhances investment, job creation, and growth.

As Americans, we know, as Thomas Jefferson once said, ''the price of freedom is eternal vigilance.'' In America, we like things to happen in a 24-hour news cycle, but it doesn't always happen that way. If we look throughout the pages of history, we have countless examples of those who have come before who have understood the stakes and the risks that were at work in the conflicts they faced. A great figure from history of the last century, Winston Churchill, said wars are not won by evacuations. Churchill and those of his generation knew they were in a pitched battle for future generations, a titanic struggle between good and evil.

A more recent example is, as I was growing up in the State of South Dakota and going through what at that time we knew was the Cold War, I remember a great leader at the end of the last century, Ronald Reagan, when asked his strategy for winning the Cold War, who said: It is very simple, Mr. President, we win; they lose.

I believe that is the same strategy and same objective we need to apply to the war on terror because the evil we face today—it has a different name—is equally deadly. Failure to confront and prevail in this war on terror and we will be creating huge problems for the next generations of Americans.

When we hear this debate on the floor of the Senate and, I believe people have sincere motivations—I don't doubt the motivations of anyone who comes to the floor to debate this issue, and I think it is appropriate to have this debate, but this is not and should not ever be about partisanship. It is not about politics. It is about the future and the security of future generations of Americans.

We have heard lots of people come here and say, Well, staying the course is not a strategy, it is not a solution. Yet at the same time, we know full well that as we look at the threat that we face from the war on terror, failure is not an option either. We cannot afford a strategy that includes running away from our responsibility not only to the people of Iraq but to the people of this country who are counting on us to protect them and to provide security and safety for generations of Americans to come.

I think some simple questions we have to ask are these: Is Iraq a frontline in the war on terror? I believe it is. We have demonstrated that in the last few weeks as we have eliminated many of the leading terrorist figures. We have to ask the question: Are the people we are fighting in Iraq terrorists who want the kill Americans? The answer clearly is yes. We also have to ask the question: If we don't have them pinned down there, will they not be planning and launching attacks against the United States? I believe the answer to that question also is yes.

The good men and women of the United States military are doing good work in Iraq. They are doing the job that we asked them to do. We need to make sure they understand we are there to win.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I would ask simply that as we vote on this amendment and the one that will follow, that we vote them down and give our generals and our troops the ability to complete the work that we have asked them to do, and that is to win, to prevail, and to make this country safer for future generations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, and then following the Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from Kansas, Mr. ROBERTS, will be recognized, and then following Senator ROBERTS, the Senator from Missouri, Mr. BOND.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, may I claim my full 8 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senatorcan claim his full 8 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the resolution put forward by the senior Senator from Michigan. I appreciate the fact that he has framed the debate on the war in Iraq both for the Senate and for the American people.

Last week the American death toll in Iraq passed 2,500. It is a tragic milestone and the American people are not happy about it, because our President has yet to articulate exactly what we are trying to accomplish in Iraq.

I maintain a gallery of pictures of U.S. servicepeople who have died in Iraq and Afghanistan outside the front door of my office. It reminds me and all who visit my office about the loss of young lives and the terrible cost of this war.

As a war veteran, I know what these troops and their families are going through. I heard the Bush administration say that some Iraqis are worried about us leaving. But I say this: The American people are worried about us staying.

What more can we do for the Iraqi people? We have spent over $300 billion of U.S. taxpayer funds there. We have

helped them hold three elections. We have trained and armed their police and their military.

I say it is time for them to take control of their country.

I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that we would bring dishonor to those who lost their lives if we begin to leave Iraq. But ask the families with loved ones over there how they feel. I met with a group in my Newark office with loved ones in Iraq, including a mother who lost her son there. As far as they were concerned, it would bring dishonor to other families if we just stay there with no plans for the future.

So why are we having so much trouble securing Iraq? The answer is clear: The administration has no plan in place to do it. When they tried, we saw misstep after misstep by the civilian leaders in the Pentagon. And the leadership problems at the Pentagon start at the top.

This administration went to war on the cheap: Not enough troops, not enough body armor, not enough help from our allies. I think we are down to a coalition that has very little coalescence attached to it. No help. And our troops have paid the price for these mistakes.

There were so many mistakes and miscalculations by the Bush administration that it is hard to believe it at all.

Secretary Rumsfeld said the Iraqis would welcome U.S. troops and that the Iraqi resistance would be limited. He was obviously wrong.

He also failed to build coalitions with our allies. One of the few major allies that did join the coalition was Poland, which sent about 1,600 troops. But they began withdrawing early this year. Half are already gone, and by the end of the year, Poland will have all of its troops out of Iraq. Just this week, the Japanese announced they will withdraw their troops.

We ask, when are we going to start withdrawing our troops?

So far, 16 nations who have provided some assistance in Iraq have withdrawn their troops. The administration's failure to build a real coalition has caused our troops to bear the vast majority of the risk and suffer the casualties.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. No, I will not yield. I don't have enough time, I am sorry to say. Perhaps afterwards, the Senator from Oklahoma can use his own time to have an exchange.

Secretary Rumsfeld said the war would be short. He said, ''I doubt 6 months.'' More than 3 years later, we know how tragically wrong that assessment was.

Additionally, Secretary Rumsfeld was also way off on the cost of the war. He said it would cost no more than $100 billion. But the staggering reality is that it has cost $320 billion thus far, and we expect it will get close to half a trillion dollars before this year is over.

Now we are experiencing a crisis in military recruiting. But about that, Secretary Rumsfeld is in denial. Whether in public or in private, he claims that recruiting is fine. Well, it is not. Here is the reality: The Army National Guard and Reserve are falling well short of their goals, and the only reason other branches are meeting goals is because the Pentagon has reduced the target numbers.

Eight retired generals have come forward to say what many in the military have been thinking for years, and that is: It is time for a change at the top as well as the recovery of our people back home. One of the generals, General Eaton, who served in Iraq, said the following about Secretary Rumsfeld:

> In sum, he has shown himself incompetent strategically, operationally, and tactically, and is far more than anyone else responsible for what has happened to our important mission in Iraq. Mr. Rumsfeld must step down.

But instead of taking a stand like the generals, we have heard our colleagues on the other side of the aisle simply repeating talking points that were handed to them by the Bush administration: ''Cut and run''—disgusting words when you look at the reflection of what is intended there.

We know this because the Secretary of Defense sent a Republican briefing booklet to Democrats by mistake last week. This briefing book is a three-ring binder of spin. It contains the same spin that we hear today from the other side of the Chamber.

Instead of developing talking points and spin for Republican Senators, we should concentrate on putting together a plan for our troops in Iraq: For our troops to come home.

I think my Republican colleagues should have stamped that briefing book ''Return to Sender'' and told the administration that they will think for themselves. That is what I would hope my colleagues across the aisle would do.

I know that they want to protect our troops and I know that they care as much about loss of life. But we have a different approach on it. We need a fresh start, honest leadership, and we are not going to get either one as long as those in charge maintain their positions.

In sum, I think it is time for Secretary Rumsfeld to go, and it is time for our troops to start to go home.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, how much time remains for the Senator from Virginia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nineteen minutes and 22 seconds.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I recognize on the floor Senator ROBERTS, Senator BOND, and Senator INHOFE, and Senator KYL intends to come. So with the balance of that time, I will try to allocate it as equally as we can. I think Senator ROBERTS is next in line, so I yield to Senator ROBERTS 4 to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 4 to 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the President and I thank the chairman. I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Senator LEVIN. I would just tell the Senator from New Jersey that nobody gave me my billet points; I wrote this myself out of conviction, and I know he speaks from conviction as well.

There is nobody in the U.S. Congress, nobody in America that does not want stability in Iraq and to get our troops home as soon as possible. But there is a right way and a wrong way. Last week the Senate voted overwhelmingly against adopting a strategy focused on an arbitrary date for the withdrawal of U.S. forces. We are back again. Despite that lopsided vote of last week, we are again debating yet another withdrawal amendment. By the time we are done, no less than three withdrawal amendments, three messages to our troops, three messages to our adversaries, and three very damaging blows for I think the resolve of this country.

Senator HAGEL brought this up. As a careful reading of the amendment clearly shows, I think we are setting a disturbing and counterproductive precedent. We, the U.S. Senate, are now getting into micromanaging the military and the military's plans and the military's strategy—not the President, not the commanders in the field, but the Senate. This is the same body, by the way, that has a little difficulty trying to decide when to adjourn.

While we may wish otherwise, the blunt truth of it is there is no exit from either Iraq or the global war on terrorism but through success. So in that regard, we did not ask for this war, but in fighting worldwide terrorism, a war that must be successful, we must be willing to use force if necessary and to protect our security and that of our allies or we invite more insurgency, more terrorist acts for the next President, the President after that, and on down the line. So regardless of future policy, current or future Presidents, our ultimate success against terrorism will only be won through resolve.

Let's talk about one thing that has been missing in this debate, and that is consequences. Calling for withdrawal is one thing; facing the consequences of that action and the responsibility for it is another. I fully understand the need and the value of full debate on this issue, but we should do so with the understanding that words do have consequences, and their effect not only influences the intended audience, the partisan base or otherwise, but they also affect the morale of our troops in the midst of war and the terrorists who question our resolve.

Make no mistake: if America leaves—all at once or in stages—our adversaries will rejoice—all at once or in stages.

Last year we received an intercepted letter that Osama bin Laden's deputy sent to Abu Musab al-Zarqawi which urged Zarqawi to prepare for what the terrorists clearly believe will be a U.S.

retreat from Iraq. Ironically, while the terrorists are preparing for what they hope will be a premature U.S. retreat, we are making real, tough, step-by-step progress, highlighted with the recent killing of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.

But of all things, in a paradox of enormous consequence and irony, we stand here today debating this withdrawal commensurate with the predicted retreat by al-Zarqawi and his terrorist associates.

Now is not the time to abandon our momentum and retreat. Such a retreat would do more than encourage the bin Ladens of the world. Jihadist terrorist cells throughout the world, and in our own country, would be rethinking their attack plans with ominous repercussions.

Let us not ignore the very nature of our adversaries. Senator ALLEN spoke to that. They think of us as dust. We have no human value. And they are not giving up. They are planning attacks as we speak—everybody knows that—within the U.S. Capitol. Imagine how such a withdrawal would be viewed in places like Iran, in the midst of aggressively building up its nuclear capacity; North Korea, with its existing capacity; China, with its continued military expansion, the greatest since World War II; and Russia, where we are now witnessing a return to totalitarianism round II, especially with Ukrainian democracy; and Venezuela, where Hugo Chavez has become the next Castro.

Imagine what doubts the lack of resolve would really create in the minds of our allies now working with us with unprecedented intelligence cooperation, and the impact on the progress we have made in Pakistan and Afghanistan, leading to a radical Islamic takeover of the Mushariff and Karzi governments and further leading to increased threats within the next terrorist nerve centers in Indonesia and Africa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, what is the time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fourteen minutes and 40 seconds.

Mr. WARNER. I will yield the 2 minutes, and then the two other colleagues can divide equally the time that is remaining.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, this amendment has consequences to our allies, including Libya, Tunisia, Jordan, Egypt, even Saudi Arabia, and Israel. Basically, this amendment has consequences, introducing it on the floor of the Senate has consequences, debating it has consequences, and voting for it has consequences.

I am going to close by calling to mind a lesson of historical precedent. Upon learning of the attack on Pearl Harbor, Sir Winston Churchill said this:

> Silly people; that was the description many gave in discounting the force of the United States. Some said they were soft, others that they would never be united, that they would never come to grips. They would never stand for bloodletting, that their system of government and democracy would paralyze their effort.
>
> Now we will see the weakness of this numerous but remote, wealthy and talkative people. But, American blood flows in my veins. I thought of a remark made to me years before—the United States is like a gigantic boiler. Once the fire of freedom is lighted under it, there is no limit to the power it can generate. It is a matter of resolve.

I say to my colleagues that, if approved, this amendment could, in a matter of minutes, undo that resolve now, and for the next generation who will face new threats to our way of life. Setting an artificial timetable will send the wrong message to the Iraqi's, who need to know that America will not leave before the job is done, and our troops, who must know that we are serious about the mission that they are risking their lives to achieve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want the same thing all Americans do, for our troops to complete their mission in Iraq and return home safely and quickly. To accomplish that, the President must define what our current mission is and how that mission serves our Nation's security interests.

The men and women of our military have done everything we have asked them to do. They looked for weapons of mass destruction and found none. We got rid of Saddam Hussein. We helped the Iraqis hold elections and set up their government and security forces. So what is our mission today?

Right now, our Nation's policy on Iraq is adrift. Instead of addressing this head on, the administration and this Congress continue to build on the miscalculation and incompetence of the past and are dismissing any serious discussion of the challenge the American people now face.

Instead of working to unite this Nation behind a common purpose in defense of our security and freedom, the President and his aides are using the war as political fodder for the next election cycle. Instead of being honest with the American people about the costs of our effort and the sacrifice necessary to support them, the Congress continues to hand a blank check to the administration to continue the status quo. That approach has left us with heated rhetoric and a long series of bad choices.

True security for the American people depends on an honest assessment of the threats we face, a very clear mission, and an honest discussion about the costs of confronting those threats.

On Iraq we do not have any of those components. Continuing the status quo is unacceptable. We need the President to tell us what the mission in Iraq is so we, as Congress and as a country, can decide if it is worth the continued price we are paying.

Like all of us, I want the troops home as soon as possible. In fact, I think they should start coming home this year. It is absolutely time for a new strategy in Iraq. An arbitrary, specific date for full withdrawal, however, could force us to ignore facts on the ground, facts that have a direct impact on the security of our troops or the interests of our Nation. I appreciate those who ask for a date certain. I, too, am frustrated with where we find ourselves today. But what we do need is change. What we do need is leadership. What we do need is a defined mission. And what we do need is a plan for success.

The troops on the ground, as well as the American people, deserve an honest discussion and a plan for victory and a goal to achieve that. That is why I support the Levin amendment.

This administration, this Congress, and this Nation should be focused like a laser on how we can be successful and bring our troops home safely. Our troops and the American people deserve a plan that brings us all together to accomplish that goal.

I yield my remaining time.

Mr. WARNER. What is the time remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains 13 minutes 2 seconds.

Mr. WARNER. I am going to relinquish the time I hoped to use to do wrapup remarks and divide it equally between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 6 minutes 30 seconds.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the floor manager of the bill. As we have heard, the end of al-Zarqawi is a significant blow to al-Qaida operations in Iraq. It is another clear indication of the progress we are making. In addition, the documents we captured at that time indicate that the al-Qaida terrorists themselves know that we are making progress. They are worried that time is now on our side. They know they cannot withstand our military forces.

But even before our troops eliminated one of America's fiercest enemies, some at home had described the current situation in Iraq as bleak. Now they are introducing measures for a timetable for withdrawal from the region.

The insurgents will no doubt consider the debating of this measure one of the best pieces of news they have had this year. That is because the terrorists know that time is on our side unless we give them a timetable for withdrawal. We know that a timetable for withdrawal will undercut the momentum that the insurgents themselves say we have gained in Iraq.

As I have talked to our troops who have been in the field, they say, doesn't

anybody understand that the terrorists watch our media? They have calendars. If they know we are going to get out on a certain date they will declare victory, lay back and wait to take over the country after we have departed.

I would imagine that the terrorists are dumbfounded, yet ecstatic with this self-destructive proposal. I am dumbfounded and aghast. If insurgents had any representation in the Senate, I am sure they would support it. I am not saying my Democratic colleagues are in any way intentionally aiding the insurgents or undermining our troops, but regrettably that is what it would do. I implore my colleagues on both sides to consider the facts and the words of the insurgents themselves, who view this as a time when they are losing.

Last Monday night, when our President was addressing a group outlining in detail the program of progress and how we are going to build up the security forces in Iraq so they can take over, and committing to finishing the job we in Congress overwhelmingly endorsed, Mr. Howard Dean was on national television claiming that Republicans were sitting in air-conditioned offices asking others to do the work in Iraq. He stated:

> Republicans are great about sending other people's children to war.

I take issue with the words of Mr. Dean, the voice of the Democratic National Party. First, our brave young men and women volunteered to serve, to go to war to keep America safe from the terrorists who struck on 9/11 and who would strike again if they had the chance.

Second, 77 of us on this floor, Democrats and Republicans, voted to support the President to carry out the mission that President Clinton first outlined about regime change in Iraq.

Finally, I say to Mr. Dean personally, my only son returned from Iraq over a year ago and is preparing to go back. When I told him we were going to have this debate, I asked him: What is your view on it? I got this e-mail back. He said:

> In case anyone is paying attention, there is progress being made. AMZ himself indicated as much in the confiscated letters around the time of his death. If al-Qaida, No. 1, confesses the U.S. is having good success, who here in conus has the standing to contradict us?
>
> I don't get it. I am not wild about going back to Iraq but I'd sure as heck would rather do that than essentially invalidate everything we have done to date by leaving too early and inviting chaos.
>
> Happy Father's Day.

That was a message from one of the people who are serving us in Iraq, and he speaks for all the other young people he knows.

I implore my colleagues, let our troops finish what we started, what most of us voted for. Let's leave Iraq self-sufficient, free, and stable, an Iraq no longer a safe haven for terrorists, threatening to bring WMD and terrorist attacks to our shore. Let's leave when the job is done, not before. Let's not defeat our mission with political attacks on the President and the Secretary of Defense as we have heard today, and on those of us in Congress, giving the terrorists a victory politically by laying out for them a ''get out of jail free'' card, giving them a timetable for withdrawal whether or not Iraqi security forces are fully capable of controlling their country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 10 minutes to Senator BIDEN.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I will just yield a minute to myself. I compliment the Senator from Missouri. That was a heartfelt message. I hope Mr. Dean gets it verbatim because your son, whom I have watched grow up through these many years, is proud to be a United States Marine and to take on his duty.

Mr. President, I wish to advise colleagues at the hour of 5 o'clock this debate on the Levin amendment is concluded. My understanding is we proceed to an amendment by the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. LEAHY. In examining that amendment, I say to my colleagues who are anxious to continue addressing the issues of the amendment of Senator LEVIN, I think the basic format in this amendment lays a clear predicate for all those who are desiring to speak to have their word tonight sometime because we are to conclude this debate tonight. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, how much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. You have 34 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. How much?

Mr. LEVIN. We started at 12:15. I would then yield for 10 minutes to Senator BIDEN. I then yield 8 minutes to Senator OBAMA, and then Senator DURBIN will be next. Depending on how much time is left we can determine the time allocation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Was this a unanimous consent request made by the Senator from Michigan? We are still going back and forth?

Mr. LEVIN. No. We understand that.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan. I, too, compliment the Senator from Missouri for the service of his son. My son is not—he is in the military, in the National Guard. He is not in Iraq, although he did spend some time in Kosovo. I admire the patriotism of his son and respect the point of view his son expressed. But I think it confuses things.

Mr. President, last Thursday, we passed by a 99—1 vote an emergency spending bill to support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and provide relief to the victims of Hurricane Katrina.

Unfortunately, behind closed conference doors, a key provision of both the House and Senate versions was stripped out—an amendment, introduced by Representative BARBARA LEE and myself that would bar any funds from being used to establish permanent U.S. military bases in Iraq or to control Iraq's oil.

I voted to support our troops, though I was surprised that my amendment was stripped after not a single Senator publicly spoke against it during the floor debate.

But what bothers me is that by removing the ''no permanent bases'' amendment, we make life more difficult for our men and women in uniform and undercut our Nation's broader effort against terrorism.

So I will reintroduce my amendment as part of the Defense authorization bill.

It is straightforward, clear, and simple. It affirms that the United States will not seek to establish permanent military bases in Iraq and has no intention of controlling Iraqi oil.

I will repeat what I said 6 weeks ago:

While it may be obvious to Americans that we don't intend to stay in Iraq indefinitely, such conspiracy theories are accepted as fact by most Iraqis.

In an opinion poll conducted by the University of Maryland in January, 80 percent of Iraqis—and 92 percent of the Sunni Arabs—believe we have plans to establish permanent military bases.

The same poll found that an astounding 88 percent of Sunni Arabs approve of attacks on American forces in part.

Why do Iraqis believe we want permanent bases? Why do they think we would subject ourselves to the enormous ongoing costs in Iraq in blood and treasure? Do they think we want their sand? No, they think we want their oil.

To my mind, the connection between these two public opinion findings is incontrovertible.

Before you dismiss these as simple conspiracy theories, remember what Iraqis have been through in the past 3 decades:

Three wars and a tyrannical regime that turned brother against brother and made paranoia a way of life.

And there is a longer history, too: 400 years of British and Ottoman occupation have led to a deeply ingrained suspicion of a foreign military presence.

These views extend well beyond Iraq. In a 2004 Pew Charitable Trust survey, majorities in all four Muslim states surveyed—Turkey, Pakistan, Jordan, and Morocco—believed that control of Mideast oil was an important factor in our invasion of Iraq.

Our enemies understand the boon these misconceptions provide to their recruiting efforts and use them as a rallying cry in their calls-to-arms.

Last year in a letter intercepted by the United States military, Ayman al-Zawahiri, the deputy leader of al-Qaeda, wrote to the recently killed

Jordanian terrorist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi:

The Muslim masses . . . do not rally except against an outside occupying enemy.

Our military and diplomatic leaders understand that countering this vicious propaganda requires clear signals about our intentions in Iraq. And they have done just this.

General George Casey, the ground force commander in Iraq, told the Committee on Armed Services last September:

Increased coalition presence feeds the notion of occupation.

At the same hearing, General John Abizaid, the commander of all U.S. troops in the Middle East, told Congress:

We must make clear to the people of the region we have no designs on their territory or resources.

In March, the American ambassador to Iraq, Zalmay Khalilzad, told an Iraqi television station that the United States has ''no goal in establishing permanent bases in Iraq.''

Unfortunately, this clarity has been clouded by mixed messages from the senior-most decision-makers in the Bush administration.

To my knowledge, President Bush has never explicitly stated that we will not establish permanent bases in Iraq, and both the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State have left the door open to do just that.

On February 17, 2005, Secretary Rumsfeld told the Committee on Armed Services:

We have no intention, at the present time, of putting permanent bases in Iraq.

''At the present time'' is not exactly an unequivocal statement.

On February 15, 2006, at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing, my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, asked Secretary Rice:

Is it, in fact, the policy of the administration not to have permanent bases in Iraq?

Rather than answering the simple one word, ''Yes,'' Secretary Rice said during a 400 word exchange on the question:

I don't want to in this forum try to prejudice everything that might happen way into the future.

Just last Thursday, columnist Helen Thomas asked the White House press secretary to unambiguously declare that the United States will not seek permanent bases in Iraq. Again, the press secretary could not unequivocally declare this to be the case.

These mixed messages are confusing to the American people and the Iraqi people alike. They feed conspiracy theories and cede rhetorical space to our enemies. They make it that much more difficult to win the battle for the hearts and minds of 1.2 billion Muslims in the world. Our success in that battle will determine our success in the struggle between freedom and radical fundamentalism.

Against this backdrop, I believe that it is incumbent upon us to speak where the administration has not.

My amendment will have no detrimental effect on the military operations of our Armed Forces in Iraq or their ability to provide security for Iraqi oil infrastructure.

United Nations Council Resolution 1546 recognizes that the American and coalition forces are present in Iraq at the invitation of the Iraqi Government and that their operations are essential to Iraq's political, economic, and social well-being.

In his first speech to the Iraqi parliament last month, Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki endorsed that resolution. We are anxious for the day when Iraqis can take control of their own destiny, but the Iraqis are suspicious of our intentions and growing increasingly impatient.

This amendment may not in itself change a lot of minds on the ground or in the region.

But it can mark the beginning of a sustained effort to demonstrate through words and deeds that we have no intention of controlling Iraq's oil or staying there forever.

I believe it is our duty to do so.

I want to point out a couple of things. I have listened to some of this debate. Sometimes I wonder whether we are debating the Levin amendment or not. The Levin-Reed amendment says two things. It lays out a plan. The front part of it is the part that is being ignored by most people. The amendment lays out a specific plan to avoid trading a dictatorship for chaos in Iraq. Right now, I respectfully suggest the President has a plan how not to lose but no plan how to win. In my view, a plan to arbitrarily set a date to leave is not a plan. It is an expression of overwhelming frustration and maybe on the part of some a conclusion reached that it is not winnable because it has been so badly handled the last 2 years. I respect that position. I don't agree with it, but I respect it.

The fact is, what is before us in the Levin amendment is it first calls for a political settlement and the sharing of economic resources. That is another way of saying the Iraqis need a deal on oil that gives the Sunnis a fair share of the revenues; and, secondly, it calls for the President to convene what not just JOE BIDEN and this amendment but BIDEN before, and before that Henry Kissinger, and Secretary Shultz and others called for, and that is convening of an international conference to promote a durable political settlement and reduce the interference by Iraq's neighbors in Iraq. And it calls for the things that everyone agrees have to be done, purging the sectarian militia which has infiltrated the security forces.

My friend from Missouri stood up and talked about the Iraqi security forces. The Iraqi security forces are riddled with sectarian infiltration. There is overwhelming evidence that Sadr suggests his Mahdi militia join the military. There is overwhelming evidence that the SCIRI and Dawa Parties have moved their people into the military as have the Sadr militia. There is evidence of the fact that the Peshmerja are in the north. So let me ask a question: How is it remotely possible that this government, assuming it is really good government, has a lot of personal courage and wisdom?

How can it run a country when it does not have a military that—at least at any one time—one-third of the country doesn't trust?

Did you all notice what happened today? Saddam's defense lawyer, for whom I have no particular empathy or sympathy—guess what. Five cops or four cops—Iraqi police—show up with identification, take him away, and shoot him.

What has been going on? Pick up the paper. Every day—almost every day for the past months—a bus gets stopped, a group of Iraqi policemen take people off the bus identified as Sunnis and blow their brains out; or the next morning—every morning—you read the paper. What do you find? You find 9, 12, or 30 Sunnis handcuffed with bullets in their heads.

So I ask you the question, imagine the United States of America trying to unite the North and the South, and if you had hit squads in the South after the Civil War going after anybody who fought in the Confederacy—this is a big deal.

There is no possibility of avoiding a civil war, in my humble opinion, if you don't purge the police and then purge the military of the sectarian thugs.

Second, we have a very first-rate Ambassador there. The best thing that has happened to our effort is our present Ambassador. What did he do? Remember when he said the first unity government wasn't legitimate because the Sunnis didn't participate? It was a legitimate point. How do we get the Sunnis to participate in the election? You had the acting Parliament pass a law defining what could kill the Constitution—changing the law. That is a disaster.

So what did our Ambassador do? He said: Change it—quietly; a brilliant diplomatic move. They changed the law going back to what it had been under the law that was written in the first instance. Second, what did he do? He said: This isn't the final document. They amended the Constitution at the last minute it was being voted on to say you can amend it later. Why? For a specific purpose. Everybody knows that unless you get the Sunnis to buy in, there is no possibility of success. So everyone has anticipated from the beginning, beginning with our Ambassador, that you have to amend the Constitution to give the Sunnis a piece of the action.

Up to now, our administration has been saying quietly that would be divisive absent the Parliament doing what is called for under the law, convening, as they should be now, and now with about 3 months left, reporting to the entire Parliament amendments to the

Constitution that will then be sent out to the people to vote on. Absent that, I do not know how this works.

The Sunnis need a piece of the action, to stay in the action.

My friend, the chairman, understands that there are three things going on. One, they are so-called insurgents. They are basically the old Saddamists. They are the Baathist Party, they are former military, and they are the Republican Guard.

As I said to the President, who asked the question after my first trip from Iraq—he said: We have taken care of—I don't want to put words in his mouth—he said it was a great victory. And it was a great victory. I said: But Mr. President, 400,000 people went home with their guns. I said: Count the bodybags. We had such a blitzkrieg success; what happened? They didn't resist. They took off their uniforms, kept their guns, and raided the 800,000 tons of ammunition dumps we didn't guard. That is the insurgency—not bunch of dead-enders, as the Secretary of Defense said some time ago, and they are getting increasingly organized.

There is a second group. The second group is the Zarqawi guys. They are the guys who are the jihadists—mostly from out of the country. As my friends, the chairman and ranking member, know, the military has never estimated them to make up more than 5 percent to 8 percent of the entire insurgency. They do bad things, but they are a separate group, coordinating with but separate, with separate agendas, from the insurgents.

There is a third group. The real problem is civil war. Insurgency is not the big problem. It is a problem. The problem is sectarian violence with Sunnis killing Kurds, Kurds executing Shiites, and Shiites mostly eliminating Sunnis. Unless you stop that, what is the deal? I hope I am wrong, but as I say, take a look at my record on this for the last 3 years and tell me. Am I wrong a lot of times? I haven't guessed this one very wrong very many times.

Ask the following question: By December of 2007, we are going to have a drastic withdrawal of American forces for one of two reasons: either because we actually have things going in Iraq, the Iraqis have not only stood but stood together, dealt with the Sunnis, dealt with the militia and kept the neighbors out, which means we will be able to draw forces home, or we are going to be in a full-blown civil war.

I will make a prediction. This is a dangerous thing to do on the floor, and I pray to God I am wrong about it. I think there is at least an even chance that you will hear the following debate among the foreign policy intellectuals on the left and on the right a year from now. You have to let them fight it out in a civil war. It has to be decided in a civil war; nothing we can do about it. Let the chips fall where they may, and we come back in and try to pick up the pieces. That may be the ultimate strategy we have to deal with.

But to my friends who say get out at a time certain, I say I understand your frustration, but what do you do afterward? What do you do if things go to hell in a hand basket quickly and there is civil war that turns into a regional war? What is your plan?

The Levin amendment lays out a plan. It says take care of the insurgency by giving the Sunnis a piece of the action so they turn on the insurgents. They have a reason to want to be a part of the deal.

I thank the Chair.

I have a more detailed plan as to how we should proceed. But don't confuse the Levin plan by ruling it out. The Levin plan lays out what must be done, how to do it, and it is done on the path by which we can leave and leave our interests intact.

I thank the Chair. I thank my colleagues for allowing me a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, let me say that I did want to get in there when the Senator from New Jersey was speaking.

They keep talking about 8 generals out there—8 generals out of 4,000 generals who are retired right now. Three of the eight generals who had their own political plans were using that. I have listened to that over and over again.

I have just returned from my 11th trip, I say that to my friend from Delaware, to the Iraqi AOR. The reason I have done this is so I can watch the progress that is being made—and I see the progress.

When the Senator from New Jersey stood up saying nothing has happened, consider the fact that we now have three successful elections behind us. Before each election, the Democrats on this floor said it is not going to work, they will not have a free election, it isn't going to be successful. We now have had three. I was over there. I went over the day the Ministers were ratified, and they are in there.

There are 164,000 trained and equipped troops. I think it is really bad, particularly when it is in error, for us to stand here on the floor of this Senate and say that those troops are really not trained and equipped, that they are really not serviceable for war. I have heard all kinds of things which are a great disservice to these people. I was up there in Fallujah during the last election when these Iraqi security forces were risking their lives going into town to vote.

Anyway, I went over there the other day, the day Zarqawi was killed, and I thank God that happened. It happened to be the same day that the 4 Ministers out of some 30 Ministers were confirmed. I can remember talking to them on a one-to-one basis.

Dr. al-Rubaie, the National Security Adviser for the Iraqis, is really a quality guy. I spent several hours talking to him. He projects that the number of troops in Iraq will drop below 100,000 by the end of this year. This is kind of interesting. Here we are trying to dictate terms as to when we are going to pull out when they already know when they are going to request and make a recommendation to us to pull out. The other side has it completely backward. He is saying that right now; he projects, the way we are going, that they are going to make a request by the end of this year to drop the U.S. forces and the coalition down to 100,000. That would be a reduction of 30,000. Then he says that by the end of the following year, they should be all the way out.

Dr. al-Rubaie has made it clear that a timetable has to be on Iraq's terms and that there is already a roadmap. For people who say we don't know, there is no roadmap, there is no criteria out there, there is.

Let me tell you. This is a quote from Dr. al-Rubaie. This isn't me talking, this is a quote from him. He said that Iraqi governorates must meet ''stringent minimum requirements as a condition of being granted control. Threat assessment of terrorist activities must be low or on a downward trend. Local police and the Iraqi army must be deemed capable of dealing with criminal gangs, armed groups and militia, and border control. There must be a clear and functioning command-and-control center overseen by the governor.'' He said, and this is his quote, that ''13 of the 18 provinces''—18 in Iraq, and 13—''have met'' or are close to meeting this criteria already.

One thing which has bothered me most recently is the inconsistency I have observed over time in the Democrats' position. They claim to disagree with the war in Iraq for the very same reasons that they used for supporting going into Bosnia and Kosovo. I remember them standing on this Senate floor saying that we have no reason to be going to Bosnia and Kosovo because we don't have any security interests at stake.

In 1995, President Clinton urged Congress to support involvement in Bosnia, and they agreed with his philosophy to ''stand up for peace and freedom because it's in our interest to do so.'' That sounded real good at the time. Now, when President Bush is doing exactly the same thing, they are saying: No. We have changed our position. We don't want to do that anymore.

Opponents of the war in Iraq contradict themselves.

Senator KERRY stated, on April 6 of this year, that ''the [Iraq] insurgency grew day by day to be an insurgency that is now a low-grade civil war . . . and our troops can't resolve a civil war.''

The Senator from Delaware characterized this as a civil war. This isn't a civil war. This is a war where others are going after the Iraqis. The insurgents aren't Iraqis. I don't know why people can't understand that.

Zarqawi was Jordanian, and Osama bin Laden is Saudi. There are outsiders

who caused them to coalesce into getting along better with each other. There were factions in Iraqi that you do not see today.

But Kerry endorsed involvement of U.S. troops in Bosnia and Kosovo, both of which were civil wars. Those were civil wars. This is not a civil war.

In 1995, President Clinton said that ''we must not turn our backs on Bosnia,'' which was echoed by Senator KERRY when he stated that, ''History has taught us that we can't sit idly by while people commit these incredible evil acts against humanity.'' He was talking about Bosnia and Kosovo. I would like to ask him: What evil acts are you talking about when compared to Saddam Hussein, who murdered and tortured to death hundreds of thousands of his own people; where they dropped people into vats of acid; where people were begging, before they were put into the shredders, to put their heads in first so they could die quickly; women being raped and buried alive? We have not seen atrocities such as this since Hitler in World War II. And here he was talking about things that were taking place in Kosovo and Bosnia. It wasn't happening.

Let me tell you what Dr. al-Rubaie said. He said:

> There is . . . an unofficial ''roadmap'' to foreign troop reductions that will eventually lead to total withdrawal of U.S. troops.

The roadmap is there. It is there, and it is one which they have put down in writing.

I am going to deliver to you what Minister of Defense Jasim asked me to deliver to you—to us—in this Chamber today. He said:

> Tell them their sacrifice is for a very noble cause, they have given freedom to 26 million people. I believe they are waging a just war for humanity. The terrorism must be stopped or it will spread all over the world, like a carbon copy of fascism and communism. . . . The American victims have borne the price of a freer world. . . . We are very grateful. . . . The war in Iraq is a just war and we have no option but victory. It is not a war that affects Iraq alone, but is truly a world war.
>
> The terrorists are a sickness that must be eliminated . . . There is great transformation taking place in Iraq but, the international media does not focus on positive things happening.

Here he talks about the only focus being on the negative things.

I will talk against the next amendment later.

I can tell you, after 11 trips to Iraq and the AOR, that every time I come back to this Chamber and talk about the quality of the Iraqi security forces and the successes they have had, I am very proud of them, and they are very proud of us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for wrapping up close to 20 Senators on this side who have spoken to this issue. I remind my colleague there will be further debate tonight. I am anxious to have as many as possible come over and join me. I commend the Senator on his statement and thank the Senator for his long, hard work on our bill throughout this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for managing this fine amendment.

In October of 2002, I delivered a speech opposing the war in Iraq.

I said that Saddam Hussein was a ruthless man, but that he posed no imminent and direct threat to the United States.

I said that a war in Iraq would take our focus away from our efforts to defeat al-Qaida.

And, with a volatile mix of ethnic groups and a complicated history, I said that the invasion and occupation of Iraq would require a U.S. occupation of undetermined length, at undetermined cost, with undetermined consequences.

In short, I felt the decision unfolding then to invade Iraq was being made without a clear rationale, based more on ideology and politics than fact and reason.

It is with no great pleasure that I recall this now. Too many young men and women have died. Too many have been maimed. Too many hearts have been broken. I fervently wish I had been wrong about this war; that my concerns had been unfounded.

America and the American people have paid a high price for the decision to invade Iraq and myriad mistakes that followed. I believe that history will not judge the authors of this war kindly.

For all these reasons, I would like nothing more than to support the Kerry amendment; to bring our brave troops home on a date certain, and spare the American people more pain, suffering and sorrow.

But having visited Iraq, I am also acutely aware that a precipitous withdrawal of our troops, driven by congressional edict rather than the realities on the ground, will not undo the mistakes made by this administration. It could compound them.

It could compound them by plunging Iraq into an even deeper and, perhaps, irreparable crisis.

We must exit Iraq, but not in a way that leaves behind a security vacuum filled with terrorism, chaos, ethnic cleansing and genocide that could engulf large swaths of the Middle East and endanger America. We have both moral and national security reasons to manage our exit in a responsible way.

I share many of the goals set forth in the Kerry amendment. We should send a clear message to the Iraqis that we won't be there forever, and that by next year our primary role should be to conduct counterinsurgency actions, train Iraqi security forces, and provide needed logistical support.

Moreover, I share the frustration with an administration whose policies with respect to Iraq seem to simply repeat the simple-minded refrains of ''we know best'' and ''stay the course.'' It's not acceptable to conduct a war where our goals and strategies drift aimlessly regardless of the cost in lives or dollars spent, and where we end up with arbitrary, poll-driven troop reductions by the administration—the worst of all possible outcomes.

As one who strongly opposed the decision to go to war and who has met with servicemen and women injured in this conflict and seen the pain of the parents and loved ones of those who have died in Iraq, I would like nothing more than for our military involvement to end.

But I do not believe that setting a date certain for the total withdrawal of U.S. troops is the best approach to achieving, in a methodical and responsible way, the three basic goals that should drive our Iraq policy: that is, (1) stabilizing Iraq and giving the factions within Iraq the space they need to forge a political settlement; (2) containing and ultimately defeating the insurgency in Iraq; and (3) bringing our troops safely home.

What is needed is a blueprint for an expeditious yet responsible exit from Iraq. A hard and fast, arbitrary deadline for withdrawal offers our commanders in the field, and our diplomats in the region, insufficient flexibility to implement that strategy.

For example, let's say that a phased withdrawal results in 50,000 troops in Iraq by July 19, 2007. If, at that point, our generals and the Iraqi Government tell us that having those troops in Iraq for an additional 3 or 6 months would enhance stability and security in the region, this amendment would potentially prevent us from pursuing the optimal policy.

It is for this reason that I cannot support the Kerry amendment. Instead, I am a cosponsor of the Levin amendment, which gives us the best opportunity to find this balance between our need to begin a phase-down and our need to help stabilize Iraq. It tells the Iraqis that we won't be there forever so that they need to move forward on uniting and securing their country. I agree with Senator WARNER that the message should be ''we really mean business, Iraqis, get on with it.'' At the same time, the amendment also provides the Iraqis the time and the opportunity to accomplish this critical goal.

Essential to a successful policy is the administration listening to its generals and diplomats and members of Congress especially those who disagree with their policies and believe it is time to start bringing our troops home.

The overwhelming majority of the Senate is already on record voting for an amendment stating that calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with Iraqi security forces

taking the lead for the security, creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq. The Levin amendment builds on this approach.

The White House should follow this principle as well. Visiting Iraq for a few hours cannot resuscitate or justify a failed policy. No amount of spin or photo opportunities can change the bottom line: this war has been poorly conceived and poorly managed by the White House, and that is why it has been so poorly received by the American people..

And it is troubling to already see Karl Rove in New Hampshire, treating this as a political attack opportunity instead of a major national challenge around which to rally the country.

There are no easy answers to this war. I understand that many Americans want to see our troops come home. The chaos, violence, and horrors in Iraq are gut-wrenching reminders of what our men and women in uniform, some just months out of high school, must confront on a daily basis. They are doing this heroically, they are doing this selflessly, and more than 2,500 of them have now made the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

Not one of us wants to see our servicemen and women in harm's way a day longer than they have to be. And that's why we must find the most responsible way to bring them home as quickly as possible, while still leaving the foundation of a secure Iraq that will not endanger the free world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized. The Senator has 14 minutes 47 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is time for American troops to come home. That was the judgment of the Senate last year. Last year, by a vote of 79 to 19, we adopted on a bipartisan basis an amendment written largely by the Senator from Michigan but amended and then cosponsored by the Senator from Virginia. It was a bipartisan amendment.

By 79 to 19, we said last year that this year would be different. This just would not be another year, it would be a year of significant transition, and we were specific about what that transition meant. It meant that the Iraqis would be moving toward control of their own nation. It meant that their forces would take the lead. Those were our words—''take the lead''—in defending their country. It meant that we would create the condition for phased redeployment—that is, withdrawal of U.S. forces. That is how we voted last year, 79 to 19.

Today, we are now debating again whether American forces can start to come home. I thought we already decided that last year, that this would be the year when they start to come home.

Senator LEVIN brings an amendment to the Senate and says again, as we did last year, we will start redeploying or withdrawing American forces this year. What do we hear from the other side of the aisle? The same Republicans, many of whom voted to start bringing troops home this year, now resist the idea.

Is that because Iraq is stronger today? Unfortunately, the statistics do not suggest it. The news reports from the New York Times tells us in May 2003, there were five recorded incidents of sectarian violence. In May of 2004, 10; in May of 2005, 20; in May of 2006, 250.

To suggest that Iraq is stronger this year, a year later, is at least subject to debate. But this much we do know: We know we are paying a price every single day. The heartbreaking newscasts we listen to are of our men and women, our brothers and sisters, our sons and daughters who continue to die in Iraq, as they simply drive their vehicles down the road or stand and guard a security installation, 2,508 of our best and bravest who have died.

The obvious question is, When will this end? The Bush administration, what plan do they have? No end in sight for the way they view it. I listened to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say the Iraqis will take control in the future. This is the fourth year we have been told that the Iraqis will stand up and defend their own country. We are told they have 260,000 soldiers and police prepared to defend their own country, ready to fight.

You know when I will believe that? When the first American soldier comes home, replaced by an Iraqi soldier. That has not happened yet. We are about to send 21,000 more American soldiers over to fight in rotation to keep 130,000 on the ground. If these Iraqi forces are so well trained and so well prepared, why are we sending another 21,000? I don't think we can explain that.

I think we know what this is about. We are facing a situation in Iraq today where the Iraqis have the wrong message from America. The Iraqis believe that they can wait, patiently wait, until the day comes when they defend their own country.

And why not? They have the best military in the world, the American military, in place defending their country. They have the American taxpayers paying for that defense. They understand we are prepared to invest those resources, and they think it will be indefinite. Nothing we are going to do on the floor of this U.S. Senate will change that point of view, unless we adopt the Levin amendment which says we will begin to withdraw the forces, redeploy the forces, this year.

There has been a lot of criticism on the floor that the party on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans, is all unified and the Democrats cannot seem to all agree on anything. I do not know what the vote will be on the Levin amendment. I think it will be a substantial vote within the Democratic caucus. But our critics are wrong.

Mr. President, 100 percent of the Democratic caucus believes it is time for change. And 100 percent of the Republican caucus believes it is time to stay the course, not change. They stand unified for the premise that we will not demand accountability. They stand unified for the premise that we will not have any change.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I think the American people understand, as we do, that it is time for us to say to the Iraqis: Stand and defend your own nation. Let American soldiers start coming home.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask, how many minutes remain?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nine minutes 14 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island, my cosponsor, Mr. REED.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. President.

There are two key elements in the Levin-Reed amendment. The first is to begin redeployment, this year, of American combat forces in Iraq. So many of my colleagues have mentioned Mr. Rubaie, who is the National Security Adviser for the Iraqi Government. On two occasions he has said it is not only feasible but desirable. He said it first on television, and then he said it just this week in a carefully crafted editorial. So this is something that I think can be done, and, according to a key leader in the Iraq Government, should be done.

The second element is that the President should submit to Congress a plan by the end of 2006, with estimated dates for the continued phased redeployments of U.S. forces from Iraq, with the understanding that unexpected contingencies may arise. The President should do this with the understanding that unexpected contingencies may arise.

This has been referred to as an arbitrary timetable. It is not arbitrary, and it is not a timetable. It is not a timetable of our creation, but it would be of the President. So do, I assume, those who object to this feel that the President could not produce such a timetable? Or if he did produce such a timetable, it would be arbitrary, that it would be made without consultation with our military leaders, that it would be made without reference to conditions on the ground? I do not think so. In fact, I think such a timetable would be appropriate and necessary.

Also, I should point out that our amendment recognizes the residual

presence of U.S. forces in Iraq, those that will be training Iraqi forces, those that will provide logistical support, and those that would conduct counterterrorism operations, our special operations troops.

But, essentially, what we would also like to do, which is so critical, is to begin this transition from a predominantly military response to a nonmilitary one. During and after the phased redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq, the United States will need a sustained nonmilitary effort to actively support reconstruction, governments, and a durable political solution.

One significant reason why our military is stuck in Iraq today is because we have not made an appropriate nonmilitary effort. The administration has bungled reconstruction. They have yet to deploy more than 4 provisional reconstruction teams in the almost 18 provinces in Iraq. They continue to lag behind in terms of political mentoring, in terms of reconstruction, in terms of economic activity. They have done nothing.

As a result, the only real viable tool we have is military forces. And the commanders will tell you on the ground that they are just buying time, that without this nonmilitary effort, all of our plans for Iraq will not succeed.

Any effort like this requires popular support. Popular support rests upon candor with the people. This administration has not been candid with the people. They have not been candid with respect to the costs of this war. And those costs will go up.

Indeed, to stay the course, we can predict billions and billions and billions of more dollars. They have not been candid with respect to the length of our operations. They have not been candid with respect to the impact of these operations on our troops. They have substituted slogans for candor.

This amendment gives the President an opportunity to present a plan not only to the Congress but to the American people, a plan that will be candid, a plan that will strive for victory, a plan of his making. Without such a plan, we will continue to drift, and the chances of success will continue to diminish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes 11 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, there is much we all agree upon in this body. We have an interest in the stability of Iraq. And we want to improve the chances of success in Iraq. The disagreement is over whether the present course, with its open-ended commitment to maintain our military presence in Iraq, as we now have it, contributes to that stability or whether or not we must prod the Iraqis to do what only they can do—come together to end the insurgency and to avoid an all-out civil war.

The President of Iraq, Mr. Talabani, a few months ago, said the following about what Iraqis believe. He said that Iraqis believe that U.S. forces are ready ''to stay as long as we ask them, no matter what the period is.''

That perception on the part of the President of Iraq, reflecting the view, presumably, of many Iraqis, that the United States is ''ready to stay'' as long as the Iraqis ask us, no matter what the period is, is a perception which must end. It is a perception that was based on our administration's commitment, which was open-ended, unlimited, unconditional.

Iraqis must make a choice. It is a choice that our blood and our treasure has given them. The Iraqis, and the Iraqis alone, can unite to avoid all-out civil war, by making the political power sharing that needs to be done. Only the Iraqis can decide that they are going to divide the resources equitably so that they can bring in all the groups and the insurgency and avoid an all-out civil war. Only the Iraqis can unite to remove the militia control of the police.

Their unity can do that. We cannot do that for them. We have given them an opportunity. Mr. President, 2,500 American lives, 7 times as many American wounded, have given them an opportunity. They must make a choice: Do they want a nation or do they want civil war?

To maintain this open-ended commitment, which we now have, is contributing to a dependency of the Iraqis on us rather than forcing them, prodding them, to do what only they can do to build a nation.

The Levin-Reed sense-of-the-Congress amendment proposes that a phased redeployment of U.S. troops be begun by the end of this year. Our amendment does not establish a fixed ending date for redeployment. It does not propose a fixed timetable once the phased redeployment has begun. But while it does not establish a timetable, it does establish a fixed time for the beginning of a phased redeployment by the end of this year. It is not precipitous. It is by the end of this year begin a phased redeployment of American troops.

Mr. President, the National Security Adviser of Iraq has been quoted a number of times on the floor.

Do I have a minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute 5 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The National Security Adviser of Iraq said the following in yesterday's Washington Post: We envisage the United States troop presence by year's end to be under 100,000. That is a reduction of 30,000. That is totally in keeping with what the Levin-Reed amendment proposes. That is the Iraqi envisioned timetable. We want to hold them to that vision for their sake and for ours.

Then Mr. Rubaie, the Iraqi National Security Adviser, said the following—and these are words which every one of us should soak in—that the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's Government in the eyes of its people.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Let us do that in a way which is thoughtful, orderly, and planned. And that is what the Levin-Reed amendment proposes.

I thank the Chair. And I thank my good friend from Virginia, our chairman, for the way in which this debate has been handled on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, with regard to the pending amendment, I would only say, in response to the extra 10 seconds you had, I would hope that security adviser was in consultation with our Government at the time he made those remarks to determine the authenticity of those remarks.

Now, my understanding is we now turn to an amendment by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Wisconsin, I believe. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement——

Mr. WARNER. Cosponsors of that amendment: the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, and the Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY.

I inquire of the manager, in consultation with the proponents of this amendment, first, if we could get some estimate of the time for the introduction of the amendment. And then I would hope we would continue the practice that we have had today by which Senators go back and forth on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would propose that the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Wisconsin control the time which has been allocated to them. And as to when they bring up their amendment, it would be up to them because, as I envision this, they and you or your designee would manage that time.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I intend to remain. I do not know that there is a time agreement on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is unaware of a time agreement at this time.

Mr. WARNER. In other words, we are in an unusual situation. Now, maybe the distinguished colleague from Massachusetts can help advise his leadership and me as to the time. It would be helpful because, like colleagues on this side, there are commitments on our side with regard to what Members wish to do this evening.

So I am just trying to strike a note of comity so that we can accommodate those Senators on both sides of the aisle who are anxious to participate in this debate.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator would yield, I totally concur that this next amendment should be brought up and debated in an orderly way, but that being agreed upon, I would hope, between the sponsors of that amendment and the chairman, the Republican manager.

So I do not think there is any need for me, frankly, to intervene in that process. Perhaps you could hear from the Senator from Massachusetts as to what his plans are and how he plans to proceed. I think that would be helpful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the managers of the bill. I see no reason why we cannot proceed as we normally do in the Senate. I am happy to live by the tradition, with the distinguished manager, of going back and forth. We do have a little bit of an issue with a couple of Senators who need to attend other events. They are not going to speak very long.

So what I would like to do is be able to have both of them speak. Then if I could open up, and then Senator FEINGOLD speak. And then we would go back and forth. We have a number of speakers. I can't tell you exactly how long it is going to take now. But we are not trying to prolong it. We, obviously, have waited a significant amount of time. We were going to bring this up last week, and then we ran into this little parliamentary game that was played, wanting to go through the caucus. And now we are finally here.

So I want to make sure we have an opportunity to adequately lay out and counter what has been about 6 days of both misinterpretation and misstatement about what this is and what it is not. So I am happy to manage it. I respect the willingness of the Senator from Michigan to let me do that. We will try to be as expeditious as we can.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. I don't wish to misinterpret his comments, but there was an amendment brought up by his senior colleague from Massachusetts that took an inordinate amount of time, which we had not anticipated. If there was some disjuncture of the process over here, I believe it was initiated on that side.

Let's return to the matter at hand. Would 30 minutes allow you to begin this debate and then we could have, say, 15 or so on this side and then—

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, we would need a little bit longer than that to sort of open it up if we can. Simply because I am trying to accommodate these two Senators, if we could let them speak, I think the Senator from Illinois would like 10 minutes and the Senator from Vermont would like about 10 minutes. Then I could open up. Senator FEINGOLD, I know, wants to speak. I think he wanted to speak for about 45 minutes or more.

Mr. WARNER. Do you think we could have some response from this side before Senator FEINGOLD begins?

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. LEAHY. The distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, like the Senator from Vermont, has been here a long time. He knows that sometimes on these things, we can spend more time working out the agreement before time than it would actually take. Since I am one of the ones who has to leave, I would ask at least on the original consent that right after Senator DURBIN, I be allowed to speak for 10 minutes. I suspect this is going to work itself out.

Mr. WARNER. I am not objecting to that. I recognize you Senators have commitments. There are colleagues on this side who have commitments. We are trying to balance that and recognize that the proponents of the amendment should have an opportunity to lay it down. It so happens that there are four cosponsors.

Mr. KERRY. So that we don't chew up all the time trying to figure out how to chew up the time, let me suggest that we agree that we have 20 minutes quickly divided between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Vermont. Then if Senator FEINGOLD and I could open for the time that we need, and then it would be up to the Senator from Virginia. He obviously would want to have an appropriate amount of time to respond.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, but can he give us some definition of the time desired by yourself and Senator FEINGOLD? Let's assume it is a half hour now between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Vermont; that is, 30 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Twenty minutes, 10 and 10.

Mr. KERRY. Just to make certain that we are covering the time—and I am not sure we will use it—I certainly would want to reserve an hour for each.

Mr. WARNER. That would be an hour and 20 minutes before anyone on this side—

Mr. KERRY. Two hours and 20 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Two hours and 20 minutes before anyone on this side gets an opportunity to seek recognition other than the manager for purposes of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the Senator asked me how much time we needed. Whether it is before someone answers or not is something that can be worked out. That is the time we need.

Mr. WARNER. That is a substantial departure from the manner in which we have managed this bill thus far. I really think that this is most unusual. We have no time agreement. We have an open-ended amendment. We have four sponsors. We have colleagues that have commitments tonight. I really believe at some point——

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, how about if we let the two Senators I mentioned proceed. Senator FEINGOLD and I could each take 30 minutes at this point. Then they have a response. Then we can come back and respond afterwards.

Mr. WARNER. Fine. That is quite agreeable to me, take 30 minutes to present the amendment. Then we will on this side have an equal amount of time.

Mr. KERRY. Instead of taking an hour each—I need to protect Senator FEINGOLD's request. He is not here, and I am already compromising myself on his behalf—we would both give up a half hour to begin with, so we would take an hour and 20 minutes, and then the Senator from Virginia would have an hour or whatever he wants to respond.

Mr. WARNER. So an hour and 20 minutes on this side to initiate the amendment. I will concede that we will do that. But it seems to me somewhat a departure from the way we normally manage things. Then it comes to this side for, let's say, an hour's debate.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. I thank the Chair. Senator LIEBERMAN has been here off and on during the day wanting to speak.

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. REID. If there is going to be any time agreement, Senator LIEBERMAN ought to be worked into this. We have Senator BYRD here who has been calling all day.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would be happy to say, when the time comes to this side, he can initiate on our time his remarks.

Mr. REID. Senators BYRD and LIEBERMAN or both.

Mr. WARNER. Senator LIEBERMAN. I didn't hear Senator BYRD mentioned. Let's hear from our senior colleague as to what his desires are.

Mr. REID. We will take you up on that, if you will give Senator LIEBERMAN 10 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. I would be happy to do that at the conclusion of 1 hour and 20 minutes, that our side be recognized for a period of, let's say, 30 minutes, of which the first 10 will be given to Senator LIEBERMAN.

Mr. REID. As usual, the Senator from Virginia is very kind.

Mr. WARNER. I do believe we ought to hear from our senior colleague as to what his desires might be.

Mr. LEAHY. Before the Senator speaks, does that mean that the original request that Senator DURBIN and I would each be heard first——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not heard a unanimous consent request from the floor.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, we agreed that since these two Senators are under a timeline difficulty, we would try to accommodate them. Could we have the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Illinois each speak for 10 minutes?

Mr. WARNER. I have no objection, if you wish to initiate with those two

Senators beginning with 10 minutes each. Then what is to follow thereafter?

Mr. KERRY. At that point I would hope that Senator FEINGOLD and I would have an opportunity to introduce the amendment itself.

Mr. WARNER. Therefore using what amount of time?

Mr. KERRY. As I said, we would like 30 minutes each, and then we will come back afterwards.

Mr. WARNER. So we are back to the hour and 20 minutes on that side before we receive any time on this side?

Mr. KERRY. We won't even introduce the amendment, if we don't do that.

Mr. WARNER. The amendment has been here for some time. I have had an opportunity to examine it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BYRD. Before the Senator does that, may I inject—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, out of respect for our distinguished colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair, and I thank my distinguished friend from Virginia, Senator WARNER.

I have an amendment. I would at least like to debate it or have some time to speak on it. I was hoping that I might be able to speak for not to exceed 30 minutes on my amendment. I would like to throw that in the mix.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: To inform both the senior Senator from West Virginia, myself, and others, what is the order before the Senate at this time? My understanding is the Kerry-Feingold amendment with an unlimited amount of time on it and there is no provision for other amendments at this time; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Massachusetts, under the previous agreement, was to be recognized for his amendment at this time.

Mr. WARNER. I say to my good friend, the order has been in for some 24 hours by which this is the amendment. The time allocation is under the control of the two managers. We will work that out momentarily, hopefully on an equitable basis. I do not at this point in time see the opportunity for the introduction of your amendment, I say with due respect, until such time as the debate on the Kerry-Feingold amendment is concluded.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have not heard all of the debate, but from what I have heard, I don't think that another Senator, this Senator, would be precluded from asking for time to explain his amendment. Now if the agreement may preclude other amendments—I don't know whether it does or not. If it does, then that is one thing. But I have an amendment, and I would like to speak on it. I wonder if Senators wouldn't allow me to speak. I have four to six pages. I can do those in 40 minutes or less.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would be more than happy to accommodate my distinguished friend and leader. I simply say that unless we amend the order at this point, I do not see that opportunity. I will be glad to put in a quorum in hopes that we can resolve not only the time allocation on this side but how we could accommodate our distinguished colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. LEVIN. I suggest that the two Senators who need 10 minutes each be recognized now and that we try to negotiate these various time needs during their presentation.

Mr. WARNER. That is a very reasonable request. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Illinois be——

Mr. KERRY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, could I please have the unanimous consent request stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous consent request is the following——

Mr. WARNER. That the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Illinois be recognized at this time seriatim for 10 minutes each, during which time we are going to try to negotiate the time allowance. Then at the end of that 20 minutes, we resume under the standing order of the Senate and the Kerry amendment goes back.

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

The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the Levin-Reed amendment on Iraq, and I will also vote for the Kerry amendment, of which I am a cosponsor.

Both amendments are a step in the right direction, as they finally begin the process of winding down what has been the most poorly conceived, costly, and tragic misuse of United States military power since Vietnam.

We got into this war for reasons that bear little if any resemblance to the reasons the White House gives for keeping our troops there today at a cost of more than a billion dollars every week.

First it was weapons of mass destruction. There were none. Anyone who urged continued monitoring by United Nations inspectors was ridiculed by the White House as being naive.

Then it was Saddam Hussein's supposed ties to al-Qaida, which was a blatant, calculated distortion.

There was none, yet the Vice President continues to say there was. Today, thanks to the policy of the President and the rubber stamping by the Congress, Iraq and Guantanamo are the rallying cry for terrorists around the world.

Then it was because Saddam Hussein—who posed no threat to the United States—was a brutal dictator, which he was. He was also supported by the Reagan administration.

That, however, is not a justification for a war that has cost the lives and limbs of thousands of young Americans and tens of thousands of Iraqi civilians.

Winning against terrorism, like stopping the proliferation of dangerous weapons, promoting peace between Arabs and Israelis, or solving any other regional or global problem, requires the trust, the respect, the cooperation and the support of our allies.

Unfortunately, these, too, are casualties of this war. Squandered away.

The damage that this reckless adventure has caused to our reputation, particularly among the world's Muslims in countries like Turkey, Jordan, Indonesia, Egypt and other traditional allies, is incalculable.

We have heard a lot of partisan rhetoric about cutting and running. How easy it is to ask others to fight and die from the safety and comfort of an office in Washington.

How easy it is to vote for tax cuts and to self-righteously wave the flag, while our troops are scavenging for scraps of metal to protect themselves from IEDs. They were sent to fight and die without armor, by top Pentagon officials back home who proudly, dismissively and resolutely insisted they were ready, when they were not.

How easy it is to mislead the country, with patriotic pronouncements by the President like ''mission accomplished,'' or that we are seeing the ''last throes'' of the insurgency.

Contrary to the blatantly partisan and false attacks of the President's political advisors, no one questions the threat that al-Qaida and other terrorist networks pose to the security of Americans and to the people of other nations.

No one questions that we need an effective strategy to combat it. The issue is how best to combat it.

This administration has shown the world how not to do it, creating a lengthening catalogue of squander.

You don't do it by starting a war with selective, faulty intelligence, by dismissing thoughtful criticism as unpatriotic, without enough troops, with no plan to win the peace, by cavalierly discounting the risks.

You don't do it by repeatedly misleading the American people.

You don't do it by creating and fueling a terrorism problem where there was none.

And you don't do it by shamelessly denigrating the Geneva Conventions and the rights and values that distinguish us from the terrorists.

Unlike the war to defeat the Taliban, which continues to this day and shows no signs of abating, the invasion of Iraq had nothing to do with Osama bin Laden or the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

It has degraded our military in ways that will cost us trillions—not billions—trillions of dollars to rebuild.

It has left a legacy of thousands of maimed and crippled young veterans with medical and other needs that they, their families, and their communities will cope with for the rest of their lives.

Our troops have fought bravely in the harshest of conditions. They are our constituents. They are the sons and daughters of our friends and neighbors. They have carried out extraordinarily difficult missions, including tracking down and capturing Saddam Hussein and killing Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.

They have sacrificed so much. We support them unequivocally, Democrats and Republicans. The question is how we can best support them.

This was to be the year of transition. That was what the Congress voted last year, and what the President signed into law. Yet, the Administration continues to simply stay the course. This course is not in America's best interest.

Iraq has a new constitution. It has had elections. It has a democratically elected government.

We have trained and equipped more than 100,000 Iraqi soldiers.

It has been more than three years since the overthrow of Saddam Hussein. More than 2,500 Americans have died. We have been there as long as we were in World War II.

The Iraqi people need to take responsibility for their own country. It will not happen immediately, but both the Levin amendment and the Kerry amendment move us toward that goal.

I have cast over 12,000 votes in this Senate. I am as proud of my vote against the open ended resolution that gave the President the authority to invade Iraq as any I have cast in 32 years. It is time for the Congress to change the course of a policy that has cost us hundreds of billions of dollars that would have been far better spent here at home, that has weakened our leadership, that is dividing our country, and that has not made us safer.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Illinois is to be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the course of a congressional career, you are asked to make many votes. Most of them are fairly routine and not long remembered. In the course of my career on Capitol Hill, those votes that have kept me up at night, those I remember years after they are cast relate to one issue—the issue of war. When you have cast that vote, if the decision to go forward has been made, people will die—not just the enemy but brave Americans and usually innocent civilians.

So I remember very well that night in October 2002, when we were called to this floor of the Senate to vote on the issue of authorizing the President to go to war in Iraq. I say to the Senator from West Virginia, I will never forget that moment. There were 23 of us—22 on this side of the aisle and 1 on the other side—who stood up and voted no. If the Senator recalls, that vote ended late at night, near midnight. I stayed on the floor because I knew I would not be able to sleep when I got home. There were two Senators who were here waiting with the same feelings of emotion. One of them was our late colleague, Senator Paul Wellstone. Senator Wellstone was going back home to Minnesota to face reelection. I remember saying to him, ''Paul, I hope this doesn't cost you the election.'' Do you know what he said to me? He said, ''It doesn't matter, this is what I believe. This is who I am.'' That was the last conversation I ever had with Paul Wellstone. He died in a plane crash a few days later. I have thought about him a lot ever since and I miss him. I miss his voice. I wish he were here today. If he were here, I know what he would be doing. He would be joining me in supporting the Kerry amendment. I believe that in the meantime he probably would have voted, as I have, to support the troops. I voted to give the President every penny he has asked for in this war. Once that decision to go forward was made, my yardstick was very basic. If it were your son or daughter in uniform in Iraq, would you not give them everything they needed to wage this war and to come home safely? It was an easy question to ask and answer, particularly if you lived through the debacle of Vietnam, when our poor soldiers became the victims of public contempt because of our displeasure with the decisions of politicians. That must never happen again.

So now in the fourth year of the struggle, I have given the President every resource he has asked for. I have stood behind him and this administration even when I disagreed with their policy because I felt it was best that we stay uniform.

Today, I join in a decision being made by several of my colleagues to say that we must make it clear to the Iraqi people that our commitment is not forever. What have we given the Iraqis? We have given them 2,508 American lives. We have given them 18,000 soldiers who have returned home with injuries of body and spirit—2,000 with head injuries that may be life-changing. We have given them $300 billion of our treasury. We have given them the focus of our attention and the focus of our resources at the expense of our own country. What have they received in return? Their dictator has been deposed. We dug him out of a hole in the ground, put him on trial in front of his own people. We have given the Iraqi people three elections and two governments. We said control your future and your fate; this is your country. We helped them train about 264,000 soldiers and policemen. We invested billions in their infrastructure for oil and water.

We have given that nation virtually more than any other nation has ever given. But now we must tell the Iraqis something very straight and simple: It is time for them to stand and defend their own country. If they truly believe in the future of Iraq, it is time for them to stand and risk their own lives and their own blood for their own nation. This amendment by Senators KERRY, FEINGOLD, and others, says to them that at the end of the year we will consider the withdrawal of all of our troops.

Now, I say that with some equivocation because if you read the amendment, Senators KERRY and FEINGOLD have been careful. They understand that we are not going to pull every troop out as of the last day regardless of the circumstances. They have carefully crafted the language, which says that if we face a threat of terrorism, if we are still needed to continue training troops, or if there is danger to Americans at our facilities, we can stay and defend, as we should. It is not an immediate withdrawal on the last day. But it says to the Iraqis: You must stand and fight on your own.

I have been told over and over again how well trained these Iraqi soldiers are. The proof of their fitness for battle is when the first Iraqi soldier replaces an American soldier, so that soldier can come home with his mission truly accomplished.

If we leave this open-ended, as those on the other side would suggest, I am afraid the Iraqis will understand that they have the best military in the world that will stay there indefinitely. How can we do that to our soldiers who have performed so well, who have been the model of bravery, the model of patriotism?

We have been misled into this war. We were given information by the administration that was not true. This war has not been well managed by this administration in terms of the number of troops sent into the field or the equipment being given to them. We know that. For years, we have been promised that these Iraqis would stand and fight and we could come home. That has not happened. Now I have reached that point that other colleagues have reached as well, where I believe the Iraqis must be told that now it is your nation, now it is your turn.

For those who say that one year is not enough time—one year is not enough time? What happened in the last 12 months in Iraq, in the last 12-month period of time? We have lost 762 American soldiers in the last 12 months. We have spent $90 billion in the last 12 months. We have seen thousands of soldiers return home with injuries. It is not just the passage of time, it is the passage of life and life's journey for so many of our soldiers. Twelve months is a reasonable time—12 months, and all that it means for us and all that we would give, is a reasonable time.

I say to the Senators from Massachusetts and Wisconsin, I thank you for bringing this measure before us. I think it is now time for the American people to stand up and say to this administration: You misled us into this war. You have no plan for it to end. Our brave soldiers deserve the leadership that brings us to the right conclusion. I think we can do that. I think this amendment is a step in the right direction. I will support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

Mr. LEVIN. 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. WARNER. 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. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank all for their cooperation. I think we have reached a reconciliation of the needs and requirements of all for a period of time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Senator KERRY be recognized now to offer his amendment and, provided further, that he then be allocated 30 minutes to speak; further, that there be debate only as follows; provided further, that that be followed by up to 30 minutes under the control of the chairman, Senator WARNER, to be followed by up to 30 minutes under the control of Senator BOXER, to be followed by 20 minutes under the control of Senator BYRD; provided further, that there now be a period of 10 minutes under the control of Senator LIEBERMAN; thereafter, provided further, that there be 30 minutes under the control of Chairman WARNER, to be followed by Senator FEINGOLD, to be followed by Senator WARNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am one of the main cosponsors of the amendment. I request to be the next Democratic speaker for 30 minutes after Senator KERRY.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my good friend, we have now spent 30 minutes working out this time arrangement.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I will cede my time to Senator FEINGOLD now, Senator BOXER can go, and I will go afterwards. I will just flip with Senator FEINGOLD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER. As amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As amended.

Mr. LEVIN. No objection.

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

Mr. WARNER. Has the Chair announced the acceptance of the unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, there is no objection to the request.

AMENDMENT NO. 4442

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 4442, and I yield 30 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 4442.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq in order to further a political solution in Iraq, encourage the people of Iraq to provide for their own security, and achieve victory in the war on terror)

On page 437, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 1084. UNITED STATES POLICY ON IRAQ.

(a) REDEPLOYMENT OF TROOPS FROM IRAQ.—

(1) SCHEDULE FOR REDEPLOYMENT.—For purposes of strengthening the national security of the United States, the President shall redeploy, commencing in 2006, United States forces from Iraq by July 1, 2007, in accordance with a schedule coordinated with the Government of Iraq, leaving only the minimal number of forces that are critical to completing the mission of standing up Iraqi security forces, conducting targeted and specialized counterterrorism operations, and protecting United States facilities and personnel.

(2) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS REQUIRED.—The President shall consult with Congress regarding the schedule for redeployment and shall submit such schedule to Congress as part of the report required under subsection (c).

(3) MAINTENANCE OF OVER-THE-HORIZON TROOP PRESENCE.—The President should maintain an over-the-horizon troop presence to prosecute the war on terror and protect regional security interests.

(b) IRAQ SUMMIT.—The President should work with the leaders of the Government of Iraq to convene a summit as soon as possible that includes those leaders, leaders of the governments of each country bordering Iraq, representatives of the Arab League, the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, representatives of the European Union, and leaders of the governments of each permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, for the purpose of reaching a comprehensive political agreement for Iraq that engenders the support of Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds by ensuring the equitable distribution of oil revenues, disbanding the militias, strengthening internal security, reviving reconstruction efforts and fulfilling related international economic aid commitments, securing Iraq's borders, and providing for a sustainable federalist structure in Iraq.

(c) REPORT ON REDEPLOYMENT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State, submit to Congress a report that sets forth the strategy for the redeployment of United States forces from Iraq by July 1, 2007.

(2) STRATEGY ELEMENTS.—The strategy required in the report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The schedule for redeploying United States forces from Iraq by July 1, 2007, developed pursuant to subsection (a)(1).

(B) A schedule for returning the majority of such redeployed forces home to the United States.

(C) The number, size, and character of United States military units needed in Iraq after July 1, 2007, for purposes of counterterrorism activities, training Iraqi security forces, and protecting United States infrastructure and personnel.

(D) A strategy for addressing the regional implications for diplomacy, politics, and development of redeploying United States forces from Iraq by July 1, 2007.

(E) A strategy for ensuring the safety and security of United States forces in Iraq during and after the July 1, 2007, redeployment, and a contingency plan for addressing dramatic changes in security conditions that may require a limited number of United States forces to remain in Iraq after that date.

(F) A strategy for redeploying United States forces to effectively engage and defeat global terrorist networks that threaten the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, first, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts. I am going to abbreviate my remarks so he and I can hopefully split this time and yield it back. It is regrettable that we are not able to present this amendment in the manner we normally would expect, which is the two lead sponsors would each offer their thoughts without that type of limitation.

Nonetheless, this amendment is something that I think represents not only the views of the Senator from Massachusetts and myself but the views of the majority of the American people which they have come to in a very painful way after this war has proceeded in the way it has.

In fact, I find it jarring that we spend so much time on the floor of the Senate and throughout the Congress talking almost incessantly about the situation in Iraq as if on 9/11 the situation involved Iraq, as if the attack had come from Iraq. Of course, it didn't. We were attacked by al-Qaida operating out of Afghanistan on 9/11. And yet here we are discussing day after day, week after week every tiny aspect of the situation in Iraq.

Of course, it is a terribly important situation, but I submit—and I think the Senator from Massachusetts agrees with me—that the overriding issue is what is in the best interest of the national security of the United States of America, what is in the best interest of protecting the American people when they are at home and when they are abroad.

All of us in this Chamber, every single one of us, supported the appropriate action to invade Afghanistan. It was a necessary war, a war that had to be fought in order to go after the Taliban and al-Qaida. None of us stood back and said, as the Senator from Texas wants to say, that somehow some of us who don't believe in war will never support a war and the rest support wars.

That is absurd. We understand when it is absolutely essential, and it was essential in the case of Afghanistan.

I voted against the Iraq war because it appeared obvious to me that was not the wise next strategic move in the fight against al-Qaida, those who attacked us. It was pretty clear to me, but it was even clear apparently to this administration when, on their own State Department Web site, where President Bush had his name, they listed the 45 countries where they believed al-Qaida was operating. This came out in November of 2001. It included, obviously, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Ireland, the United States. Guess what country wasn't even on their list. Iraq. And this has been confirmed publicly by the recognition now, despite the gross misrepresentations that al-Zarqawi was not even in the part of Iraq controlled by Saddam Hussein when we invaded Iraq.

It is pretty obvious on the face of this that this was not the place to go if we wanted to deal with al-Qaida. They were not there then, but because of the errors we have made, we created a beachhead for them to do far more in Iraq than they ever could in the past.

I understand former Secretary of State James Baker, Secretary of State under the first George Bush, said he used to go around the country and people would ask him every day: Why didn't you go on into Iraq at the time of the first gulf war? He says with a smile: I don't get asked that question anymore because it didn't make sense. It didn't make sense then, and it doesn't make sense now.

One of the theories we hear is that somehow staying in Iraq is necessary because what we are going to do is have all the terrorists come into Iraq, and we are going to get them all, and then they wouldn't be able to attack us anywhere else. Some call this the roach-motel theory, the idea that all these terrorists all over the world are simply focused on Iraq and by staying we are going to get them. This is what I would like to call an Iraq centrist policy, a policy that somehow believes Iraq is the be all and end all of our foreign policy when, of course, it is nothing of the kind.

The fact is, those against al-Qaida is a much broader fight. I have seen estimates of somewhere between 60 to 80 countries where al-Qaida is operating. Yet our focus, our troops, and our resources are only heavily focused on this Iraq situation. This is just plain tragic 5 years after 9/11.

One might say we are fighting the terrorists in other countries, too; we are doing whatever we can. But we are not. We have taken our eye off the ball. We are not dealing with the al-Qaida threat in other countries because we are so focused on Iraq.

One good example is Somalia. Remember Somalia? This is a place where we know there were al-Qaida operatives and affiliated groups. It is one of those failed states where it is almost an invitation to terrorist organizations to come in and organize and be away from any kind of control. Because we haven't been paying attention to Somalia, because we don't have a policy in Somalia, guess what just happened. A radical Islamist group has taken over Mogadishu and now threatens to take over the rest of the country.

I can't say for sure what they will do, but there are indications they may be very much like the type of Taliban government or organization that fostered al-Qaida in Afghanistan.

So we have taken our eye off the ball. In fact, I asked Ambassador Crumpton last week in a public hearing: How many people do we have in the Government devoted to Somalia full time? Mr. President, do you know what his answer was? One person. One person in a country that is clearly a threat in terms of al-Qaida.

It is not just there. What about Indonesia? Indonesia is the largest Islamic country in the entire world. It is the fourth largest country in the world. I heard Senators debating who had been to Iraq the most. One said he had been there 12 times. One said he had been there 11 times. Guess how many Senators have even been to Indonesia once in the last 2½ years. Just two of us, Senator BOND and myself, to a country that is being terrorized by a group called JI, Jemaah Islamiah, that is clearly affiliated with al-Qaida.

We are not paying attention to Indonesia. We are not putting our political and other resources there. We are only focused on Iraq where al-Qaida wasn't even operating as of the time of the invasion.

If that isn't enough, what about Afghanistan? I think we can all agree that Afghanistan is a place where we ought to win, where we shouldn't deplete our resources—well, we shouldn't, in the words of my colleagues on the other side, cut and run. But we are now feeling the consequences of what some have called the Iraq tax in Afghanistan, and that is the resurgence of Taliban fighters.

The recent death of more U.S. and Afghan soldiers there and the continued presence of terrorist networks in the region show how shortsighted this administration was by taking its eye off the ball.

We have not finished the job in Afghanistan, and we are now at risk of backsliding into instability. This is where the attack on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon was planned. This is where it was done. And because of this overemphasis and obsession with only staying in Iraq, we are allowing the Taliban and perhaps al-Qaida to get back in.

Let me give an example of what some said about this. A recent expert indicated with regard to the Afghanistan situation:

> It is now 5 years since George W. Bush declared victory in Afghanistan and said that the terrorists were smashed.

Since the Bonn meeting in late 2001, a smorgasbord of international military and development forces has been increasing in size. How is it then that Afghanistan is near collapse once again? To put it briefly, what has gone wrong has been the invasion of Iraq. What has gone wrong is the invasion of Iraq, Washington's refusal to take State-building in Afghanistan seriously, and instead waging a fruitless war in Iraq. That view is shared by many others. I assure you I could give you many other examples.

But the point is, despite the fact that we all know who attacked us on 9/11, we are not focused on them. It is the most absurd situation I have ever seen in my 25 years as a legislator. Everybody knows we went into Iraq on a mistaken basis. Everybody knows that al-Qaida is the one who attacked us. Yet somehow our colleagues on the other side are trying to pretend they are one and the same thing, when everybody knows it is nothing of the kind.

So we have to change course. We have to refocus our energies on those who attacked us. I have heard a number of statements on the floor today, and I have been out here on and off since noon listening to the debate. I heard the Senator from Kentucky make the assertion that if we don't, they will soon be back here—meaning in the United States—if we don't stop them in Iraq. Well, the fact is, they are being effective in attacking us and our colleagues and our allies in many other places: In Indonesia, in London, in Madrid, in Turkey, in Morocco. It is not as if there haven't been any attacks. It is not as if this al-Qaida organization isn't functioning. I mean, under their argument, apparently we should invade all those other countries on false pretenses as a way to somehow root out the terrorists. But we know that approach doesn't work.

If we continue to be stuck in Iraq, we are facilitating al-Qaida's future. We are facilitating their recruitment. We are facilitating the growth of their operations in places such as the Philippines, Malaysia, and Indonesia. We are facilitating al-Qaida if we continue to make this mistake in Iraq over and over again. That is what I care the most about.

One of my colleagues, the Senator from Texas, Senator HUTCHISON said: If we were to withdraw the troops or redeploy the troops in the coming year, we would be giving the enemy the playbook. Well, my point is, we need a new playbook. The playbook has nothing to do with 9/11. The playbook has nothing to do with al-Qaida. We need a new playbook that has something to do with what really threatens the American people. That is what the Kerry-Feingold amendment is all about. It is not about just taking off. What it is about is refocusing.

Of course, we have been faced all day with all of the horrible things that might happen if we bring the troops

out of Iraq, and that is a fair debate. What happens if the other side is wrong? What happens if a reasonable redeployment over the next year would work, and the Iraqi Government would be able to handle it? Think about the ''what if'' there.

We had a moment of silence on the floor, I believe on October 31, for the two thousandth American troop killed in the Iraq war. I believe last week we had a moment of silence for No. 2,500. What if they are wrong? What if we can get out of there now in a reasonable way and refocus on the fight against terrorism so we don't have to stand here and have that moment for No. 3,000, for No. 3,500, for No. 10,000. That is the direction we are heading, and the American people know it. Do we think it makes sense for our national security to have some 135,000 American troops on the ground in harm's way without any clear idea of how that is going to change the situation in Iraq?

Mr. President, it was bad strategy to go into Iraq in the first place, and it is a bad strategy to stay there because we are there and we don't want to admit that it was a bad idea in the first place. Some will say: Well, what you are saying then is those who have died have died in vain in Iraq. I disagree. I think anytime an American gives his or her life pursuant to a decision of our democracy, it is impossible for that person to die in vain. That is how our system works. I voted against this war. I didn't think it was a good idea. But we voted on it. That is how it works. As long as those troops fight in that spirit in support of a democratic decision, they do not die in vain, and we honor them for their sacrifice.

If the policy is wrong, if we made a mistake, we owe it to their families, we owe it to those who are injured, we owe it to those who are still there and who will still go and who will die in the future to correct that mistake, to change course. We owe it to them to do what makes the most sense.

What makes the most sense? We have, in my view, two choices—not this absurd notion that somebody wants all the troops to leave tomorrow. Choice No. 1 is a completely open-ended commitment, with no guarantee that this will end anytime in the near future or a commitment to finish the mission by a reasonable date and redeploy the troops where they can be better used to help us in the fight against those who attacked us on 9/11.

Mr. President, I heard the junior Senator from Virginia say: We don't need to embolden our enemy. It is his view that the idea of having a reasonable timetable to bring the troops out emboldens the enemy. Well, I will tell you what emboldens the enemy: Thinking they have us in a trap and we don't know how to get out. That emboldens and exhilarates them. They wanted us in Iraq. They are glad we are in Iraq. And they are using it as a way to fuel the hatred that generated 9/11. That is the bottom line.

To me, this is about national security. To me, this is about those who attacked us on 9/11. This administration and this Congress made a mistake by thinking that Iraq was the logical next step in this fight. It is time to reverse course. It is time to redeploy. It is time to focus on the real security of the American people.

Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fourteen minutes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I yield back the time to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am going to speak, obviously, a little bit in an abbreviated fashion at this point, and then I will reserve time and speak again later because of the way things have worked out.

I want to thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I want to thank him for his foresight and his leadership with respect to this issue, and I also want to thank him for his cooperation and efforts in the last days to put together what I think is a reasonable and sensible approach to how we deal with an obviously complicated situation.

Let me say that I have heard this debate over the course of the last days and I have listened carefully and I am saddened, in a sense—but I guess I have grown to expect it in the course of our politics—that there is an awful lot of characterization going around, an awful lot of stereotype sloganeering which tries to characterize something as other than what it is. It is what we have come to.

The fact is that this amendment is not what it is being characterized as. I have heard a number of people say it is a precipitous withdrawal. I have heard obviously the words ''cut and run'' and other words used many times.

Let me first point out the differences between this and the other amendment that has already been debated. First of all, this is binding. The other amendment is a sense of the Senate, and our troops and our country deserve more than a sense of the Senate. They deserve a policy.

Secondly, we have a date; the other is open-ended. It is almost like what President Bush is doing. We are going to stay the course and be open-ended.

Thirdly, this has an over-the-horizon force specifically to protect the security interests of the United States of America in the region and with respect to Iraq. But in addition to that, this amendment specifically strengthens the national security of the United States. It is not an abandonment of Iraq; it is, in fact, a way of empowering Iraq to stand up on its two feet and for the Iraqis to be able to do what they have expressed their desire to do, which is have their sovereignty.

It is interesting. In the last day we had a huge debate about the sovereignty of Iraq, and colleague after colleague came down and said how important it is to respect the sovereignty of Iraq. Well, this amendment respects the sovereignty of Iraq. In fact, it increases the sovereignty of Iraq. It provides specifically for three provisos under which the President has the ability to be able to lead troops. There is no abandonment of Iraq. It sets a date by which, over the course of the next year, the Iraqis themselves have said they have the ability to be able to take over their own security. Prime Minister Maliki said a few days ago that by the end of this year—December—in 16 out of 18 provinces, they will be able to take care of their own security. This amendment holds them accountable.

In addition to that, it provides for the ability of the President to maintain a minimal number of forces who are critical to the job of standing up Iraqi security forces, of conducting targeted and specialized counterterrorism operations like the kind that got Zarqawi and also protecting United States facilities and personnel.

So even when you reach the date of next year—ample enough time for the Iraqis to complete the task of standing up—it will be 4 years, Mr. President, next year, and I think the American people have a right to expect that after 4 years, soldiers who have been trained over the course of those years are prepared to stand up for their country. In the United States of America, when we send a marine recruit to Pendleton or to Quantico, we can tell you in a matter of months when that recruit is ready for deployment. When we send a pilot to Corpus Christi or Pensacola, we can tell you exactly when they are ready to deploy. Is this administration telling us that after 4 years, we don't have Iraqis who are trained enough to drive trucks and perhaps be blown up by an IED, rather than an American soldier? Are they telling us they are not going to be prepared enough to be able to stand up for the security of Iraq?

This amendment demands the same kind of accountability that the President was prepared to demand each step of the way of the Iraqis up until this point. We set a date for the transfer of the provisional Government. They said: Oh, we can't do it that fast. We said: You have to do it that fast, and we did it. We then set a date for the Constitution and the referendum. Some Senators, some of whom have spoken against this amendment, came out and said: Oh, I think it is too early. I don't think we ought to have that date. Many of us stood up and said: No, we have to hold the date and hold them to the date. Guess what. We did it. We held them to the date and we got the Constitution.

The same thing happened for both elections. A lot of people came up and said: Oh, we can't get this all together on time; we have to delay the election. We said: No, we are going to stick with the election date, and we did. General Casey himself has said that the large presence of American troops is lending to the occupation, the sense of occupation, and it is delaying the willingness

of Iraqis to stand up. It is human nature. Anybody who has to go out and take the risk of loss of life, if somebody else is there to do it for you, you stand back. The fact is, countless numbers of conservative voices, including people like Bill Buckley, have suggested that the time has come for American forces to leave. He happens to believe, as others do, that it is lost. I think there is nothing in this amendment at all that, as some colleagues have said, that some people have decided it is all lost. I do not believe that.

I believe this is the way you empower the Iraqi Government, with its own people. This is the way you have accountability for what they need to achieve in the next year. This is the way you require their forces to take on responsibilities they may be reluctant to do today. And it allows for the President to make a determination that the job is not quite done and we can address the troops that may be necessary to complete that task.

That is anything but abandonment. I have heard some people say there is no plan. There is more plan here than there is in any other approach to what is happening in Iraq. Why do I say that?

Again, listen to our own generals. General Casey and others have all said that the reality is that this war cannot be won militarily. Our own commanding general is saying to us: You can't win it militarily. Secretary Condoleezza Rice has said it can't be won militarily, it must be won politically.

Our soldiers have done their job. Our soldiers have won the part of the war they need to win. They have given the Iraqi people a government. They have given the Iraqi people several elections. They have given them a constitution. Now it is time for Iraqis to stand up and want democracy for themselves as much as we want it for them. The best way to guarantee that is going to happen is to set a date with a proviso that the three things that we still need to do can still be done: make sure they are trained, continue to fight al-Qaida, and protect American forces and American facilities. All of that is provided for in this amendment.

This has been quoted a couple of times out here today, but let me remind my colleagues what the National Security Adviser to the Prime Minister has said, himself, in ''The Way Out of Iraq, A Roadmap.''

> The eventual removal of coalition troops from Iraqi streets will help the Iraqis who now see foreign troops as occupiers rather than the liberators they were meant to be. It will remove psychological barriers and the reason that many Iraqis joined the so-called resistance in the first place. The removal of troops will also allow the Iraqi government to engage with some of our neighbors who have, to date, been at the very least sympathetic to the resistance to what they call the coalition occupation.

That is the National Security Adviser to the Prime Minister of Iraq, telling us that withdrawing American troops will, in fact, help them provide order in the streets of Iraq.

The Senator from Virginia and I were in Iraq together. Nobody works harder in the Senate at protecting our security than he does. I respect him, and he knows he is my friend. He knows as well as others know here that what General Casey said is true. There is no military solution to what is happening in Iraq. You either resolve the differences between Shia and Sunni and provide for an adequacy of the differences that are fueling the insurgency or the insurgency will continue.

There are five different components of that insurgency. There are outright criminals, and there is organized crime. There is al-Qaida. You have the Baathists, who have one attitude about regaining power. And, of course, you have the insurgents who are different from the Baathists, who are hardcore.

Those are different elements that are going to have to be resolved in different ways. I ask any of my colleagues, where is the diplomacy necessary to deal with this? What we do in this is require the kind of diplomatic effort that, in fact, is a plan to resolve all of the problems that are outstanding in Iraq: the problems with respect to governments bordering the country, the problems with respect to Shia and Sunni, the problems with the divisions of royalties of oil, how do you protect the rights of Sunnis in the minority, what is the degree of federalism that will exist in the government. These are the reasons for the insurgency.

At this moment, I don't see the kind of effort I have seen historically, whether it was from Henry Kissinger in the Middle East with shuttle diplomacy, in Vietnam, or Jim Baker in his efforts to put together a major coalition with respect to Desert Storm—that doesn't exist today. So a policy to say ''stay the course'' is a policy to say you are not going to resolve those issues. It is a policy to hope that somehow the Iraqis will pull their act together. It is a policy that is based on more wishful thinking than on real policy changes that address the question of shifting responsibility.

When the Prime Minister of Iraq can tell us that they can manage 16 out of 18 provinces within a year, when 87 percent of the Iraqis are polled and say they think we ought to set a date for withdrawal of American troops, when 94 percent of the Sunnis say we ought to withdraw, when 90 percent of the Shias say we ought to withdraw, we ought to listen to the Iraqis. After all the talk in the last days about sovereignty, where is that respect for sovereignty?

I have more to say about why it is important for us to take this effort here. The long list of mistakes that have been made do not inspire confidence in the judgments made by this administration. Congress helped to get us into this war. Congress needs to take on responsibility for helping to get us out of it.

I had a lot more to say, and I have a lot more to say, but because of the way this is working, this will be truncated. I know I only have about a minute left so I reserve the remainder of the time, and we will go through the process and come back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts. We all try to work within the framework of the unanimous consent.

At this point in time, the Senator from Virginia, myself, has the time between 6:35 and 7:05, a period of 30 minutes. I would like to now offer the first 15 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut and retrieve a period of time he had from 7:55 to 8:05 to be added to my time which commences at 8:05.

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

Mr. WARNER. Then, following the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from Pennsylvania would be recognized for the remainder of my time in this time slot, Mr. SANTORUM.

That would be followed, I inform other Senators, by Senator BOXER, from roughly 7:05 to 7:35, and then the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, 7:35 to 7:55.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, first let me thank the Senator from Virginia for previously responding graciously to the request from the Democratic leader, Senator REID, that I be granted time to speak on both of these amendments, and an extra thank-you for his allowing me to do so a bit earlier than the initial order.

Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendments introduced by the Senator from Michigan and others, and the other amendment introduced by the Senators from Massachusetts and Wisconsin and others because they both would direct, in different ways, the withdrawal of American forces from Iraq without regard to the real conditions on the ground.

Let me begin with a harsh and familiar lesson history has taught us and that we are experiencing again in Iraq: War is hell. Precious lives are lost, blood is spilled, treasure is spent. Countries, communities, and families are deeply pained and disrupted. But history also teaches us that there are times when wars must be waged and won to prevent even more awful hell: to overthrow an evil leader or protect the noble causes of human freedom, opportunity, and peace.

At the outset of the war in Iraq, coalition forces, led by our own American men and women in uniform, brave and brilliant, succeeded with remarkable speed to achieve a most worthy goal, the overthrow of an evil leader, Saddam Hussein, and the opening of the opportunity for freedom, the opportunity for the people of Iraq and broader peace in the region.

After that, I would say, and I think all who support that war must admit, that mistakes were made on our side—some of them big—and the difficulties in Iraq increased. As others have said before me, the war in Iraq to overthrow Saddam Hussein may have been a war of choice. It is now a war of necessity. We must win it.

Why? Because the consequences of an American retreat and defeat there would be terrible for the safety and security of the American people at home whom we have a constitutional responsibility to protect.

I must say I also approach these two amendments with a sense of legislative history. They evoke debates that have occurred many times in the Senate. We had one just a decade ago on this floor, about how long our Armed Forces should stay in Bosnia. Some wanted to set a deadline for withdrawal, a date. Others, including myself, argued successfully that setting a day for automatic withdrawal was dangerous and wrong because it would discourage our allies and encourage our enemies. Our withdrawal should be consistent with the achievement of the goals we have set for the mission.

I remember in that debate quoting Biblical wisdom and warning, ''If the sound of the trumpet is uncertain, who will follow into battle?''

I suppose in our time we might amend that to say, ''If the sound of the trumpet is uncertain, who will stay in battle?''

I also remember arguing in that debate that a nation, I thought, should only set an unconditional date, a deadline for withdrawing troops from battle, if all hope of victory was lost, which it was not then in Bosnia and is not now in Iraq, unless the consequences of a too early American withdrawal by calendar instead of condition were acceptable to our country, which it was not. They were not then in Bosnia and are not now in Iraq.

The Kerry-Feingold amendment directs that all American troops be withdrawn from Iraq by the middle of next year, regardless of the intervening events. The Levin amendment is more complicated. I have spent some time studying it since it was made public on Monday. The Levin amendment directs that a withdrawal of American troops from Iraq begin by the end of this year, 2006, without regard to the conditions on the ground.

So, for that reason, consistent with what I have just said about legislative history and my own previously stated strong position, I cannot support either of these amendments.

I personally hope, as I am sure all Members of the Senate do, and I believe, that we will be able to withdraw a significant number of Americans in uniform from Iraq by the end of this year and even more by next year. I express that optimism based on the election and formulation of the new Iraqi unity Government, the increasing capacity of the Iraqi security forces to protect their own people, and the commitment of the new Government to disarm the sectarian militias.

General Abizaid and General Casey have said that it is their hope to begin withdrawing more troops by the end of 2006 and even more next year. But I want them to decide based on the realities on the ground in Iraq, not on their hopes or my hopes or the shared hopes of the American people that we will soon be able to bring our Armed Forces home from Iraq. I do not want those distinguished American generals and the brave and steadfast American men and women serving under them to be directed by this Congress to exit before they conclude and recommend to us and the President that withdrawal is justified.

My own opinion is that the sooner the Iraqis take control of their own defense and destiny, the better it will be for them and for us. But if we leave too soon, it will be disastrous for them and for us.

Sponsors of the Kerry-Feingold amendment have stated a very clear and direct purpose. I disagree with it. The sponsors of the Levin amendment have argued on behalf of their amendment that they believe we must direct the beginning of a withdrawal of American troops without condition by December 31 of this year to make clear to the Iraqis that our commitment to them is not open-ended. I believe the Iraqis know very well that our commitment is not open-ended and is not a blank check. I will tell you that I personally have said that to their leaders directly, every time I have met them here or there. I know many of my Senate colleagues of both parties and leaders of the administration have said the same, openly and directly to the Iraqi leaders and the Iraqi people. And the Iraqis themselves have said over and over again that they know our commitment is not unconditional.

Just yesterday, in an op-ed piece in the Washington Post by the National Security Adviser of Iraq, he made clear that his Government wants the American military out of Iraq as much as we want our men and women to come home to America.

He and the rest of the Iraqi leadership doesn't need a congressional directive to convince them of the desirability of American forces leaving Iraq.

What will be lost by it? I will answer that in a moment.

I will say that in the interest of Iraq's security and ours, it should only happen—that is, our withdrawal—as the Iraqis step by step are more and more ready to stand on their own.

The amendment introduced by Senator LEVIN itself states that the Iraqis are making good progress in exactly that direction. The amendment itself reports more than two-thirds of the operational Iraqi Army combat battalions ''are now either in the lead or operating independently.''

That is significant progress.

A national unity government has been formed. It took too long, but that also is an enormous achievement. But, of course, there is much more work yet to be done—as the Levin amendment itself states, to amend the Iraqi constitution to get more help from international donors and to ''promptly and decisively disarm the militias and remove those members of the Iraqi security forces whose loyalty to the Iraq government is in doubt.''

But then the amendment goes on to direct the beginning of withdrawal of American forces by the end of this year regardless of whether that work is done or those militias are disarmed.

That is where I respectfully believe it errs.

In doing so, I feel that this amendment would just underline the message the Iraqi leadership has clearly already received, accepted, and shares; that America's military commitment to Iraq is not open-ended and unconditional. I fear that it would also send another message to our terrorist enemies and to the sectarian militias in Iraq that America is not prepared to see this fight through until the Iraqis themselves can take over. That will actually encourage the terrorists to accelerate their cruel and inhumane attacks, and it will unsettle the sectarian groups to hunker down and rearm their militias to strengthen themselves for the civil war that they feel will follow a premature American retreat. And that might well create conditions that none of us want, which is to say chaos and civil war in Iraq, regional war in the Middle East, and the terrorists who attacked us on 9/11 being able to claim victory in Iraq and going on, emboldened, to attack us again here at home and to bring their terrorism to more Arab countries in the Middle East.

That is why I said the war in Iraq, however one thinks we got there, is now a war of necessity, a war we must help the people of Iraq to win or the security of we, the people of America, our children and grandchildren will be gravely endangered.

Section 2 on page 4 of the amendment which the Senator from Michigan introduced says:

> The current open-ended commitment of United States forces in Iraq is unsustainable.

As I have said, our commitment is not and should not be open-ended. It is conditional on the Iraqis working hard to move themselves forward together on the path to self-government and self-defense and, in fact, as the amendment states, they are doing. And this conditional commitment of ours to them is surely militarily sustainable and must be honored.

The failure to do so I believe would have terrible consequences for our credibility in the world and our success in the long conflict ahead against the radical Islamist terrorists who declared war against us and much of the rest of the world during the 1990s and carried out a brutal act of war against our people on September 11, 2001.

We cannot and must not concede any battlefield to our enemies in this most unconventional but deadly serious war.

I do not think it is an overstatement to say that our freedom and security and that of most of the rest of the world, Muslim and non-Muslim, depends now, as it has at critical moments in the past, on American persistence and fortitude in this painful, awful, essential worldwide war.

For these reasons, I will respectfully oppose the Levin amendment and the amendment introduced by Senators KERRY and FEINGOLD.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will say to my good friend and colleague—and my remarks are not predicated on the fact in all likelihood that he will cast a vote which will be supportive of the views that this Senator and others on this side of the aisle have stated, but I say out of the long time that we have worked together to those Senators who may not remember it that I was tasked to draw up the first resolution in the Gulf War when George Bush, Sr., was President. The Senator from Connecticut stepped up and joined me. It was known as the Warner-Lieberman amendment at that time.

Subsequently, when the second resolution was to be drawn up, I again was joined by Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator MCCAIN, and Senator BAYH. The four of us drew that one up.

He has been on the Senate Armed Services Committee these many years that he has served in the Senate, and he has shown tremendous leadership. And each day he grows in stature as a statesman and his stature as a knowledgeable person regarding the security interests of this country.

As they exist today and in the future—when I say ''in the future,'' for our children and grandchildren—they acknowledge their appreciation to the Senator from Connecticut for his wisdom.

The remainder of time under my control I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, first, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Virginia. If I could, I would like to also associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Connecticut. I agree with him wholeheartedly. They were incredibly articulately made and hits on all of the relevant points as to why these two amendments should be defeated.

I actually want to talk about a different debate which has been brewing on the floor of the Senate for over 3 years. That is the debate as to the reasons why we entered into a war in Iraq in the first place. There was some information released today that I think sheds some light as to the facts relating to what the conditions were in Iraq prior to our commencing the Iraq war.

The essential nature of the decision that we made at the time when we had to decide whether to go to war with Iraq was based on many factors. Colin Powell laid them out at the United Nations. One was that Saddam had possessed and had used biological and chemical weapons on his people and that he had biological. That is indisputable.

The second was that he had an active WMD program. And we have the Iraqi Survey Group which published the Delta Report. It was very clear in the Delta Report that, in fact, there was ongoing research at the time of the Iraq war, and if that research of those sanctions were lifted it could have quickly turned into a full-fledged biological and chemical warfare capability.

In fact, the Delta Report mentioned that they could, postsanctions, reconstitute anthrax and an anthrax program in 4 weeks.

So he already used chemical weapons and had chemical weapons research that could quickly be transitioned into programs.

The one aspect that has been in question or which most Americans find—and certainly many have spoken on the floor of the Senate—was whether at the time of the Iraq war back in 2003 Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. That was always the claim—that he had not gotten rid of his weapons of mass destruction and potentially produced additional weapons of mass destruction.

Up until today, the general perception of the American public—and certainly Members in this Chamber—was that there were no such weapons of mass destruction.

In fact, today on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Rhode Island said, ''We have heard the initial defense of the approach to Iraq as we are going after weapons of mass destruction. They were not there.''

The senior Senator from Connecticut said, ''If I had known then what I now know, namely that Saddam Hussein possessed no weapons of mass destruction, I would not have given the President my vote.''

The senior Senator from Washington said, ''We have looked for weapons of mass destruction and found none.''

Let me follow up these quotes with quotes from an unclassified version of a document released 3 hours ago coming from the National Ground Intelligence Center, a part of the Department of Defense. It is a summary of a classified document which I have had the opportunity to take a look at.

The document's key points in the unclassified version are as follows:

> Since 2003, coalition forces have recovered approximately 500 weapons, munitions which contain degraded mustard or sarin nerve agents. Despite many efforts to locate and destroy Iraq's pregulf war chemical munitions, filled and unfilled pregulf war chemical munitions are assessed and still exist.

That means that in addition to the 500 that we have recovered, there are additional munitions.

The report goes into great detail as to what those munitions are. There are additional munitions that we have not categorized and identified specifically in number or in character.

Back to the document:

> Pre-gulf war Iraq chemical weapons could be sold on the black market. Use of these weapons by terrorists or insurgent groups would have implications for coalition forces in Iraq. The possibility of use outside of Iraq cannot be ruled out. The most likely munitions remaining are sarin- and mustard-filled projectiles. The purity of the agents inside the munitions depend on many factors, including the manufacturing process, potential additives, and environmental storage conditions. While agents degrade over time, chemical warfare agents remain hazardous and potentially lethal. It has been reported in the open press that insurgents in Iraqi groups desire to acquire and use chemical weapons.

This is an incredibly significant document.

We now have a lot from our intelligence agencies that said we have recovered 500 chemical weapons and that there are a number of others.

It is hopeful that we can, in fact, get that number and that information out.

But the bottom line is, irrespective of whether there were any others, the fact that we recovered 500 and the fact that there are a likelihood of others to recover, maybe from Iraq, maybe from other places around the Middle East, suggests that Saddam Hussein did have weapons of mass destruction.

One of the principal concerns that we had in going into this war against terror, or terrorists as it has been defined, was that Saddam would not necessarily use chemical weapons or biological weapons against his neighbors again or against us, but, more importantly, that he would have these stockpiles of weapons to give to terrorists to use against us or to use against others. Now we have information that confirms that some 500, and likely more, weapons were, in fact, in Iraq at the time of the Iraq war.

The quotes that there were no chemical weapons, that the President lied, that all of this was a fabrication of neocons who wanted to go to war, is now—if it was not, in my mind, discredited from the other information we have gotten—is now, in my mind, completely discredited. He had chemical weapons before the gulf war. He used them after the gulf war. He used them during the Iran-Iraq war. They had weapons programmed in place at the time of the second gulf war, the Iraq conflict. And we now have found stockpiles.

The Duelfer report said there were no stockpiles. We have now found 500. You want to call that a stockpile? Five hundred is a lot of chemical weapons. We handed out a video upstairs, Congressman HOEKSTRA and I—who has been tremendously helpful in gathering this information and having this report, first finding the report and declassifying portions of it—he handed out information that showed an attack of the Iraqis using 15 sarin chemical

weapon shells like the ones recovered here that killed 5,000 people.

This is a serious and important document. This is a serious and important step in understanding what Iraq was all about when we, in fact, commenced military activities against them. It is an important finding to determine what our actions need to be going forward in making sure we rid this country of the chemical weapons that still may be available, as was mentioned, potentially on the black market.

I thank Congressman HOEKSTRA. I asked for this document from the National Ground Intelligence Center 2½ months ago. It took 2 months of going nowhere before I contacted Congressman HOEKSTRA. He, by the way, was not aware of this document, either. He was able to get this document and we were able to look at it. Several Members in the Senate and the House have reviewed the document. It is up in the Intelligence rooms. I encourage Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle to go up and view the document. It is a classification that all Members can review the entire document. Please go up, take a look at it. If you do not believe the statements or you do not think the statements are compelling enough, I encourage you to go up and read the entire classified report. It is very compelling. It is a very serious situation.

The bottom line is, the statements that Saddam Hussein at the time of the second gulf war, the Iraq war, had no weapons of mass destruction is now categorically untrue. This report puts that to rest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEMINT). The Senator from California.

The Senator from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WARNER. I yield back the remaining 2 minutes I have under my control. The order provides for 30 minutes for the distinguished Senator from California, to be followed by 20 minutes from the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia.

I come to the Senate tonight with a tremendous sense of loss for the victims of the tragic war in Iraq. Yesterday, the military informed two California families that their sons were murdered in cold blood by the very same Iraqi troops they had been training.

Let me repeat that: The military informed two California families whose sons were in the National Guard that their sons were murdered in cold blood by the very same Iraqi troops they were training.

Sgt. Patrick McCaffrey and 1LT Andre Tyson were killed near Balad 2 years ago. After 2 long years, the Army is now telling the families that Iraqi troops who their sons had been training turned on them and intentionally killed them.

This morning, the mother of Sergeant McCaffrey appeared on CNN and said:

> Patrick was never at ease and he constantly said, ''Mom, we're risking our life every day, all the time, permanently.''

She told the press that Patrick told his commanding officer twice that he was fired upon by Iraqi troops. He told his dad the same thing and his dad told the press that his commanding officer said, and I quote his dad: ''That he should keep his mouth shut.''

Mrs. McCaffrey said she wants the story to come out because she believes there are other instances of Iraqi troops turning on our soldiers. This is a story that is all over the news. It is emblematic of what this war is turning into.

This week, we all were devastated to hear of the cruel and savage killing of two United States soldiers who were reportedly tortured in a barbaric fashion. These soldiers were manning a traffic check point when they were captured by insurgents. A third soldier also died in the attack.

Every day we hear of a new tragedy from Iraq. Why? Because more than 3 years ago, our President launched a war that was based on false premises. The administration told the American people that Saddam posed an imminent threat to the United States because of his close ties to al-Qaida and because he had an active nuclear weapons program. The administration's case has unraveled in light of the facts. We have a chance tomorrow to stand up and say no to the status quo. We can do it with two Democratic amendments. We know there was no working relationship between al-Qaida and Saddam, and Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program was dormant.

Just look at the State Department's own document which Senator FEINGOLD talked about. It says clearly when we were attacked by al-Qaida on that fateful day of September 11, there was not one al-Qaida cell in Iraq. Yet those who asked questions about these false premises were dismissed, ridiculed, called unpatriotic, and, in one case, the case of Ambassador Joe Wilson, he actually faced retaliation. The wife of Ambassador Wilson had her identity as a CIA agent exposed. Why? Because Joe Wilson blew the whistle on President Bush's claim that Iraq had sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa.

Why do I recount Valerie Plame's story? Because it shows just how far the Bush administration and their Republican friends in Congress will go to tarnish and hurt those who see the war differently from them. That is frightening no matter what side of the fence you are on. Imagine going after someone's family because you felt you did not like what the man said. In fact, he told the truth, that there was no truth to the claim that Saddam was seeking yellow cake uranium.

In this debate right now, those same voices are saying that anyone who disagrees with the status quo in Iraq and speaks about an exit strategy for the war is advocating a policy of cut-and-run. Let me be clear, calling for redeployment of our troops out of Iraq is not cut-and-run. It is smart and strategic.

Why is it smart? Because it will give the signal to the Iraqis that they have to stand up and protect their own country.

Why is it strategic? Because it will allow us to use our resources to go after al-Qaida, Osama bin Laden.

Let's take a look at the status quo. The status quo in Iraq is an endless venture with ever-changing missions that has resulted in more than 2,500 United States deaths and 18,000 wounded. It is a blank check and a blind eye.

I have a chart that shows the costs. This is showing what this President calls ''progress'' and his Republican friends in Congress call progress. Let's look at the facts. The monthly cost of the Iraq war in 2003 was $4.4 billion a month. It is now $8 billion a month. It is causing our debt to soar. It is not being paid for in the usual way: It is put right on Uncle Sam's credit card and our grandchildren will pay the bill, maybe even their children.

The estimated number of insurgents in 2003, 3,000; estimated in 2006, 20,000. Is that progress in Iraq? I don't think so.

Insurgent attacks in 2003, 5 a day; now, 90 a day. Is that progress? I don't think so.

Incidents of sectarian violence, 5 per month; now it is 250 per month.

If that is progress, then we are in serious, serious trouble—more trouble than I think we are in.

How about Iraqis. Are they optimistic about the future? In 2003, 75 percent were optimistic. Do you know what the number is today? Thirty percent. These figures come from the Brookings Institution.

There are claims that the status quo is ''progress,'' when actually the status quo is a disaster. The war is taking a heavy toll on our fighting men and women, many of whom are serving their third tour of duty. Suicides are up.

In 2005, 83 United States Army soldiers committed suicide, an increase of 16 suicides over the 67 reported the year before, and the highest number since 90 were recorded in 1993. Of those 83 soldiers, 25 had been deployed to either Afghanistan or Iraq.

Divorces are up. Where are the family values around this place? Between 2001 and 2004, divorces among Active-Duty Army personnel have doubled. Divorces have doubled. That is the weight of this war. And post-traumatic stress disorder is rampant. A study published in the July 2004 New England Journal of Medicine revealed that 15 percent of marines and 17 percent of soldiers surveyed after deployment in Iraq ''met the screening criteria for major depression, generalized anxiety, or post traumatic stress disorder.''

Our military men and women have done every single thing we have asked of them—even without a plan to anticipate the insurgency. Even without adequate body armor, even without enough up-armored humvees, here is what this administration has asked our fighting men and women to do: find the weapons of mass destruction, find Saddam Hussein and bring him to justice, find Saddam's family and bring them to justice, secure Iraq for elections—there have been three elections, successful, there—train Iraqi troops—there are now 260,000 of those Iraqi troops trained.

In light of all that our military has done—and they have paid the price in blood, in lost limbs, in pain and suffering and death—what are the Iraqi leaders saying? They have proposed amnesty for those who have killed American soldiers. The amnesty plan would include insurgents who have staged attacks against Americans—even as those attacks continue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a front-page story from the L.A. Times that ran this past weekend.

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

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 18, 2006]

AMNESTY FOR IRAQ REBELS IS PLANNED

(By Borzou Daragahi)

The Iraqi government has crafted a far-reaching amnesty plan for insurgents, officials close to Prime Minister Nouri Maliki said Saturday, even as guerrillas killed at least 34 Iraqis in a barrage of bombs and rockets in the capital and the U.S. military hunted for two missing soldiers.

The Americans may have been captured after an attack Friday evening on a checkpoint south of Baghdad that left at least one soldier dead, the military said.

U.S. forces dispatched helicopters and surveillance planes over the area as well as teams of divers to scour the river and nearby canals for the missing soldiers.

The amnesty plan, which apparently would include insurgents alleged to have staged attacks against Americans and Iraqis, calls for the creation of a national committee and local subcommittees to woo rebels and begin a ''truthful national dialogue in dealing with contradicting visions and stances,'' according to a version of the plan published Saturday in an Iraqi newspaper.

The reconciliation plan, which is expected to be formally announced soon, would be among the Iraqi government's most comprehensive attempts to engage with insurgent groups.

''The main thing,'' said Haidar Abadi, a leader of Maliki's Islamic Dawa Party, is that the plan doesn't rule out participation of ''the bloody-handed people in the political process.''

The plan, mysteriously released and rescinded by the prime minister's office last week, calls for the pardon and release of prisoners ''not proven guilty in crimes and clear terrorist activities'' and a review of the process by which former members of Saddam Hussein's Baath Party are excluded from public life.

U.S. and some Iraqi officials have long urged Sunni insurgent groups that don't have strong ties to the former regime's security apparatus or to foreign militants—and without the blood of innocent Iraqis on their hands—to lay down their weapons and join the political process.

The new proposal, said an official close to Maliki, merely recognizes the difficulty of verifying insurgents' past actions.

''Theoretically, we can say we cannot give any amnesty to those in the [former] security agencies and those in Saddam's regime and those who have killed and bombed Iraqis after the invasion,'' said Salah Abdul Razzaq, a spokesman for several prominent Shiite religious organizations.

''In practice, anyone who comes to negotiations and says, 'I have no problem with Iraqis or Iraqi government, just with U.S. forces,' how can we check that?''

Some Kurdish and Shiite members of parliament, which is scheduled to convene today, voiced doubts about Maliki's reconciliation proposal.

''We think that any reconciliation talks should take place within parliament,'' said Baha Araji, a Shiite lawmaker close to radical cleric Muqtada Sadr's movement. ''We don't need groups from outside—I mean the Saddamists, Baathists and killers.''

But officials close to Maliki said the plan was days away from being formally announced.

A version of the amnesty plan—titled the ''Reconciliation and National Dialogue Project''—was published in Saturday's edition of Al Mada newspaper. Copies were distributed to journalists and then quickly taken back at an abruptly canceled news conference Thursday at Maliki's office.

Abadi said the incident was a minor mix-up caused by inexperienced members of the prime minister's media office.

''It doesn't mean that the project of reconciliation was withdrawn, but that it was given more time for a consensus to be reached,'' said Abbas Bayati, a leading Shiite lawmaker. ''We are ready to sit around a table with all the Iraqis, even those who participated in the resistance and now repent that.''

It was unclear whether any amnesty plan would require legislative approval or be adopted by executive decision.

Sunni Arabs lead the Iraqi insurgency, which is fueled by the minority sect's perception that it was unjustly robbed of political power and prestige by the 2003 U.S.-led invasion and the Shiite-dominated governments that followed. Incessant insurgent attacks have sparked reprisals by Shiites and brought the country to the precipice of civil war.

Sunni Arabs said they were far more encouraged by the Maliki government's olive branches than those of his predecessor, fellow Islamic Dawa Party member Ibrahim Jafari, viewed by many as too sectarian in his outlook.

The death this month of terrorist leader Abu Musab Zarqawi opened a new opportunity to draw in Iraqi insurgent groups, Sunni officials said.

''The general direction and general understanding among politicians is that now is the time to differentiate between the extremists and foreign fighters on one side and the native Iraqi people in the resistance,'' said Alaa Makki, a leading member of the Iraqi Islamic Party, the main Sunni Arab political group.

''We think now there might be a reevaluation from A to Z among the Iraqi population,'' he said. ''I think Maliki is going along with these ideas.''

But the violence showed no signs of abating Saturday. Dozens of Iraqis were killed in a series of insurgent attacks targeting Iraqi security forces in Baghdad despite a highly publicized crackdown meant to bolster public confidence in the government.

At least seven large explosions rocked the capital. In the day's most deadly incident, a car bomb explosion at 8 p.m. in a busy market in southwest Baghdad killed 12 people and injured 381 police said.

An earlier car bomb targeting a police patrol killed seven people and injured 11, hospital officials said.

A roadside bombing in downtown Baghdad killed six people and wounded 15.

In central Baghdad a car bomb targeting an Iraqi army patrol killed three civilians and a soldier and injured eight soldiers and four police officers.

A bomb placed inside a passenger bus killed at least two civilians and injured 151 police said.

In the northern suburb of Kadhimiya mortar rounds landed on a busy market, killing at least two people and injuring 14.

An explosion killed a man in west Baghdad hospital officials said.

The search for the missing U.S. soldiers was underway near the Euphrates River town of Yousifiya south of Baghdad. U.S. forces launched raids on four sites, questioned local leaders and set up roadblocks around the area, presumably to prevent assailants from taking the soldiers elsewhere.

''We are using all available assets, coalition and Iraqi, ground, air and water, to locate and determine the duty status of our soldiers, Maj. Gen. William B. Caldwell IV said in a news release.

The attack Friday evening took place in a religiously mixed area south of the capital known as a stronghold of militants loyal to extremist religious groups, including Zarqawi's AI Qaeda in Iraq.

U.S.-led forces at a nearby checkpoint began radioing their colleagues after they heard an explosion and small-arms fire but could not make contact.

Backup forces sent to the checkpoint discovered the dead U.S. soldier and learned that two were missing, the military said.

Mrs. BOXER. It says: The premier is crafting a reconciliation program that ''doesn't rule out participation of 'the bloody-handed people in the political process.'''

What happened when we brought up a resolution on this side of the aisle to say, no, no, we will not allow that to happen? What happened? The Republicans stalled us for 2, 3 days, figuring out a way they could get us to back down. But we did not back down.

I cannot believe it. They are still killing our soldiers, and the Republicans in the Senate are saying: Oh, give the Iraqi Government a chance. In their wisdom, they will do the right thing. Well, they are not doing the right thing when they are considering giving amnesty to those who are hurting, killing, brutalizing our troops. I cannot believe it.

And in light of all that I have laid out, what does our President say? He says: I will not allow us to leave until everything is absolutely perfect in Iraq. He does not know when that is. He is not even willing to talk about conditions that would be enough to bring our troops home. It is kind of like: Well, we will know it when we see it. Well, that is not enough for the American people. When the President said, ''mission accomplished,'' it was not true. And when he says now, we can make this work, we can have a country at peace, we can do all this, and we just have to stay there as long as it takes—blank check. Open checkbook, America. Open checkbook for

you. Debts on your children, debts on your grandchildren, and a blind eye to what is happening and what the Iraqi people want.

What kind of leadership is that? You think I like standing up here and getting into this kind of debate? No, I do not. But I have never seen anything like this since the Vietnam war, folks. I lived through those years. That was the reason I got into politics, so we would not make this mistake again.

Senate Democrats are providing real leadership. Do we all agree every inch of the way? No. But I predict to you, at the end of this vote, tomorrow, Republicans will be firm for the status quo, and Democrats will be for changing the mission, changing the dynamic. And that is going to be important for the American people to know.

As I said, redeploying our troops is smart and strategic, and here is why. Again, it is smart and strategic because the Iraqis must stand up to the job of providing security for their own people. My goodness, that is what countries do, folks. That is what countries do. We did it. Yes, we had people help us in the Revolution. By the way, France was one of those countries. But when the fighting was over, we had the boots on the ground. The Iraqi people have to stand up. They have to want democracy as much as we want it for them.

And I will tell you, we should start concentrating on the war against terror. My friends on the other side blend it all together. They blend it all together. But I have already proven to you there was not one al-Qaida cell in Iraq on 9/11. The State Department's own documents show it. There were more al-Qaida cells in America than there were in Iraq. But our presence there is fueling the insurgency completely.

Let me tell you what Peter Bergen has stated. He is an expert. He is an expert on terrorism. He has written books about it. He says this:

> What we have done in Iraq is what bin Laden could not have hoped for in his wildest dreams: We invaded an oil rich Muslim nation in the heart of the Middle East, the very type of imperial adventure that bin Laden has long predicted was the United States' long term goal in the region. We deposed the secular socialist Saddam, whom bin Laden has long despised, ignited Sunni and Shia fundamentalist fervor in Iraq, and have now provoked a defensive jihad that has galvanized jihad minded Muslims around the world. It's hard to imagine a set of policies better designed to sabotage the war on terrorism.

Now, I have spoken with many generals and military experts who agree that our long-term presence in Iraq is counterproductive. They tell us that our continued presence will continue to breed terrorists not only in Iraq but throughout the world.

Now, I want to show you, as I wind down this speech, how the Iraqi people now feel about our presence. The Brookings Institution revealed this poll. It was just printed in the press a few days ago. If this does not tell the story, nothing does.

Eighty-seven percent of the Iraqis support a timeline for U.S. redeployment. Eighty-seven percent of the Iraqi people want us out of there and want a timeline specifically. By the way, this is one thing that unites all the groups there. Sixty-four percent of the Kurds want a timeline for U.S. redeployment. Ninety percent of the Shias want a timeline for U.S. redeployment. Ninety-four percent of the Sunnis want a timeline for U.S. redeployment.

So you tell me how it makes sense, at a time when we are learning that the Iraqis, whom we are training, have, in at least two cases we know about, turned against our soldiers, who are risking their lives—shot them in cold blood. For what? They are there to help the Iraqi people, and they are being killed.

I have to say that the status quo is leading us deeper and deeper into a place we don't want to be as a country. The American people want an exit strategy. An exit strategy is not cut-and-run; it is smart and strategic. The status quo is more of the same. How many more times will we come down here and talk about beheadings? How many more times will we come down? How many more deaths will it take until finally we say enough is enough?

That time, I hope, is coming. I think we are going to see votes on these two Democratic amendments that, when taken together, will indicate a real difference here between the parties.

Listen to what the Iraqi people are saying. Listen to what the American people are saying. Listen to what the world is saying. The views of the United States by people all over the world are going down. In the last year alone, favorable views of the United States dropped in Spain, from 41 percent to 23 percent approval; in Indonesia, from 38 percent down to 30 percent; in Turkey, from 23 percent to 12 percent; and in India—India is considered one of our best friends—it has gone from 71 percent down to 56 percent. This does not make us stronger in the world; it makes us weaker. This does not make us safer in the world; it makes us more vulnerable.

I believe in democracy. So let us look at what the Iraqi people are telling us they want. They want a timeline and want us out. Let's listen to the generals who have told us that our long-term presence is fueling the insurgency and we need to get out. Let's listen to the American people who are wise and love our troops and say it is time for an exit strategy.

Folks, we are paralyzed. We are paralyzed here. It is like we are in a hole and we can't get out. Well, I say today is the day to start climbing out of that hole. Senate Democrats have proposed two ways to change the dynamics here in this war.

I plan to vote aye for the Kerry-Feingold-Boxer amendment. It speaks to me as something that will work for us. It is strategic. It is wise. It is smart. I will also vote for the Levin amendment because it moves us in the right direction. It shakes up the mission into something that makes sense. It changes the mission. It starts bringing our troops home and starts to redeploy them.

So my feeling is, the status quo is a disaster. It is a disaster. Let us open our eyes to the truth. Can you imagine how I felt when I got a call in my office by a woman who couldn't find out the truth about who killed her son? And the military had completed its investigation, and they knew her son was killed by the very same Iraqi soldiers whom he was training. And they kept it a secret? They kept it a secret until today from that woman. I have to say, why? Is it because they are fearful that when the American people learn of this, the support for this war will plummet even further? I don't know the answer to that question. But so far, I have no good answers. It worried me with Mr. Tillman, Patrick Tillman, in Afghanistan, when they said he was killed by the enemy, and the parents pressed on and pressed on, and it turned out to be friendly fire.

I am telling you, my colleagues, this is a turning point for us as individual Senators. I hope we have the courage to say no to the status quo, support the Kerry-Feingold-Boxer alternative, and also support the Levin alternative because they both shake it up and say, once and for all, we need to talk about an exit strategy. In the end, that is going to be the road for success.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, today the Senate is debating two amendments on Iraq. The first amendment has been offered by Senator LEVIN. It is a nonbinding sense of the Congress that clearly illustrates that there must be a change in our policy toward Iraq. It states that it is neither in the American nor the Iraqi interest to maintain an open-ended commitment of large numbers of our troops.

Some may challenge this idea and stubbornly maintain that we must stay the course, no matter the cost or the consequences. I would point these critics to the op-ed which appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, June 20, 2006, written by Iraq's National Security Adviser. Here is what he said: ''The eventual removal of coalition troops from Iraqi streets will help the Iraqis, who now see foreign troops as occupiers rather than the liberators they were meant to be'' and that ''the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people.''

The distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, has crafted a good amendment which I will support. We need a change in our Iraq policy.

Senator LEVIN has put his finger directly on the key issues facing our continued military occupation of Iraq.

The second amendment which is being debated is an amendment by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY. His amendment proposes that American troops be redeployed from Iraq no later than July 1, 2007. Senator KERRY should be commended for offering his amendment. It is an important amendment, and it deserves a full debate. It directly addresses the most pressing issue facing the American people today.

Last week the very distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, offered an amendment similar to that of Senator KERRY's. It was offered up as a sacrificial lamb, and a procedural motion was made to either kill the amendment or to continue debating it. I was one of six Senators who voted to continue debate on that amendment.

Some may seek to ascribe my vote as a vote for the substance of Senator MCCONNELL's amendment. But I shall speak for myself. As I have told Senator KERRY, my vote was not for the substance of Senator MCCONNELL's amendment. My vote was to continue debate on the most important issue in our country today. My vote was in favor of the institution of the U.S. Senate, a temple of debate and free speech.

Some may seek to hide from the controversial issue of Iraq, but I will not seek to hide from it. We Senators are sent by the people of our States to debate the critical issues facing our country, not to hide from them. My vote was in the minority on that procedural motion, but I stand by my vote which was in favor of debate on the momentous subject of Iraq.

The amendment the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY, offers will likely be voted on tomorrow, and I have spoken to Senator KERRY about the substance of his amendment. I know he is seeking a change in the administration's policy toward Iraq, which is acknowledged by most Americans to be a disaster. And he should be saluted for his courage in insisting on offering his amendment, even though he will be criticized—and perhaps even called unpatriotic by some—for speaking his mind. However, I cannot support the substance of his amendment.

I do not support setting a drop-dead withdrawal date for our troops from Iraq. I do not believe that this is a wise policy. I have called time and time again for the President to begin bringing our troops home. Our troops cannot be brought home overnight.

I also have concerns that this amendment is not strongly tied to the constitutional powers of Congress relating to the conduct of war.

So for these reasons, for as much as I support his efforts to make a change in an ill-defined, open-ended, stay-the-course policy in Iraq, I will not support the amendment by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY.

But there are other ways to effect a change in direction. So I rise today to ask that I may be given time to offer another amendment on Iraq.

There is an urgent need for the U.S. Senate to consider as many options as we can to find an exit strategy with honor for our troops. Our country is polarized. The Senate is polarized. And I fear that we have let the usual partisan warfare put blinders, such as we put on horses, on ourselves and on our purpose.

Every Member in this body, I am sure, would like to see a successful end to the war in Iraq. Every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle would like to do something that would speed the return of our troops home to the loving arms of their families.

All of us, regardless of party affiliation, want to do the best thing for our country. And we would all do well to remember that both the President, the Chief Executive, and the Congress have important roles to play when it comes to the most critical decisions that can be made by any government; namely, the decision to go to war and the decision to come home from war.

The American people are dismayed, as they should be, by this conflict in Iraq. I voted against our entry into that war. I voted against the invasion of that country without any provocation toward our country.

Most assuredly, dozens of mistakes have been made and billions of dollars have been spent. Without a doubt, our international reputation has been damaged, and we are losing the support of our own people for a drawn-out commitment in Iraq and more and more loss of precious blood, precious life.

Can we not try one more approach? Can we not? Can we not spend just a little more time on the consideration of a way out of Iraq? Can we not? Can we not? Can we not attempt to speak with one voice on the matter? Is that asking too much?

I have a third way. This is a fresh approach, I believe. It returns Congress's rightful voice to the warmaking power, yet it avoids the pitfalls of usurping the executive branch's role in an ongoing war. It is respectful of the separation of powers, but it does outline a viable exit strategy for Iraq.

The amendment I would like to offer, the amendment I would like to see debated on the Senate floor, is an effort to move the debate over the war in Iraq away from the realm of political mudslinging to the realm of constitutional responsibility.

My amendment is a simple, straightforward approach to laying out a roadmap to bring our troops home from Iraq with honor and dignity, the honor and the dignity which they deserve.

My amendment establishes the policy that the democratically elected Government of Iraq should assume responsibility for its own security. My amendment sets forth the conditions under which the congressional authority to maintain U.S. troops in Iraq would expire.

This amendment is a genuinely fresh approach to unraveling the conundrum of how to disengage the U.S. military from Iraq. My approach does not attempt to micromanage the war. It is not an attempt to set artificial deadlines. It is not based on politically motivated rhetoric. It does not preempt the authority of either the President or the Congress. What it does do is it returns the focus of the debate to the role of Congress in the authorization of war. What my amendment does do is to reassert—yes, reassert—the role of Congress to authorize—or to terminate the authorization of—the use of force.

The conditions under which the Iraq use of force authorization would expire are based on circumstances, not on timetables, and they include the following: When the Government of Iraq assumes responsibility for its own security; or if a multinational peacekeeping force were to assume responsibility for security in Iraq; or if the President certifies that the United States has achieved its objectives in Iraq; or if Congress were to enact a joint resolution to terminate the use of force authority.

Mr. President, the situation in Iraq has undergone seismic changes since the original use-of-force authorization was granted by Congress in October of 2002. Since that time, our troops have completed the mission of removing Saddam Hussein from power and paving the way for the establishment of a democratically elected government in Iraq. The authorization under which the United States sent its military forces into Iraq—which I voted against—is now painfully outdated. So it is time to update that authorization to provide a statutory framework for returning our troops home, and to acknowledge that the war in Iraq does have an end point and is not an open-ended commitment.

Mr. President, it is most important to understand that the amendment I am proposing speaks only to the intent and authority of Congress. So it does not—hear me now—it does not infringe upon, or in any way usurp, the authority of the President. No Senator has to set aside his or her support or opposition to the war in order to support my approach.

But this amendment would send a powerful message to the people of the United States and to the people of Iraq, and especially to the democratically elected Government of Iraq. It would send the powerful message that the United States supports the security of Iraq but does not intend to become a permanent occupying force in Iraq. This is a message that the people of Iraq need to hear. It is a message that the people of the United States need to hear. It is a message that the people of the United States are clamoring to hear. My amendment is a realistic roadmap for the United States to remove its forces from Iraq in an orderly

manner—a manner consistent with our national security interests. It is a legally enforceable formulation that should be embraced by all who are truly concerned with finding a solution to the problems in Iraq, not just using the debate over the war in Iraq as a political football.

Surely, we owe the over 2,500 patriotic souls who have died fighting for our country in Iraq a little more time on this debate. Surely, we can consider the matter of the conflict in Iraq for a few more hours for the sake of the over 18,000 U.S. troops who have been wounded in that country, and the unknown numbers of Iraqi innocents who have been killed or maimed. Surely, we can discuss this matter on a level that is deeper than sloganeering like ''cut and run'' or ''stay the course.''

Mr. President, I hope our two leaders will work together to find a way for the Senate to debate my amendment and allow a vote on its merits.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, what is the time agreement this evening?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is allocated 40 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia, I yield myself as much time as I might consume. We have speakers coming down here and, as they arrive, we will recognize them.

I do want to express my appreciation to Members on both sides who have participated in this debate. We have already had a very spirited debate. There will be others speaking throughout the course of the evening and again tomorrow before we ultimately vote on both of these amendments.

As you know, we have in front of us two amendments. One is a sense of the Senate, a nonbinding resolution, the Levin amendment, and we also have the Kerry amendment, which has a force of law and which would require a withdrawal from Iraq by next summer.

As we consider and contemplate both of those amendments, I know there are strong emotions that Members on both sides feel with respect to this issue, and clearly for good reason. I know in my own particular circumstance, as I travel South Dakota, I hear from people all across my State. I have participated, as many Senators have, in way too many funerals and have heard the playing of taps way too many times in the last year. It is that sentiment I think that makes people in this country very weary regarding the conflict in Iraq and the cost it has brought this country in terms of both blood and treasure. So as we see Members get up and express their thoughts on the Senate floor during the course of this debate, I think they are in many cases reflecting the sentiments of their constituents in their States, as well.

Generally speaking, I think a sense that people have across the country is one of weariness with this conflict in Iraq. At the same time, I think we have to recognize what the stakes are in this debate and what the risks are as well. Clearly, as we have, I think, articulated—Members on our side—throughout the course of this debate, the stakes are high and the consequences of failure are disastrous for our country if we fail in this campaign in Iraq.

I have to say that, like many Members here, I have traveled to Iraq on a couple of different occasions. I was there as recently as a couple of months ago with Senator MCCAIN, as well as with the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD, and a number of our Governors and House Members, representing different regions of the country. I had been there a year earlier and, of course, in the course of that year much had changed. In fact, I would have to say there had been, at that time, some mixed results. We had seen the outbreak of sectarian violence after the bombing of the shrine at Samara. But at the same time, we had seen vast improvements in the ability of the Iraqi security forces to provide for their own security. That, in my mind, was very encouraging because at that time about 75 percent of the battle areas were being policed either by Iraqi armed services or the police force, which was a marked improvement from the time I had been there a year before.

Mr. President, I think it is fair to say that, by any measure, if you look at any significant metric in the past year or so, we have seen some improvements and progress made in Iraq and I think, in a substantial way, in the broader war on terror. If you look particularly at Iraq, Prime Minister al-Mailiki, just in the last couple of weeks, completed the formation of a new Iraqi Government, filling many Cabinet positions. If you look at the success our troops have had in taking out the terrorist leader, Musab al-Zarqawi and many of his allies in just the last few weeks, that is a huge blow to al-Qaida and a huge victory for our side in the war on terror.

As I said earlier, the Iraqi security forces are growing in number every single day. Only a year and a half ago, Iraqi security forces had just begun to form. Today, there are 264,400 trained and equipped Iraqi security forces, which is more than double the number of U.S. troops who are serving in the region.

The beginning of this year, 2006, the Iraqi security forces had 10 brigades and 43 battalions that controlled areas of responsibility. Here, only a few months later, those numbers are nearly doubled to 18 brigades and 71 battalions. Large- and small-scale water treatment facilities have been rehabilitated or constructed for an estimated 3 million people at a standard level of service, with plans underway to deliver clean, safe drinking water to 5 million more. May oil production was over 2.1 million barrels per day.

The U.S. Treasury Department is sending professionals to Iraq to provide technical support for the creation of a public finance system that is accountable and transparent. The State Department is coordinating a broad effort to support an economic policy framework that enhances investments, job creation, and growth.

I have to say that that progress has occurred—and many of my colleagues have spoken in favor of these amendments in spite of the presence of Americans and our troops' efforts—due to and because of the efforts of our troops and their presence there. Contrary to what I have heard some of my colleagues on the other side say throughout the course of this debate, when I was in Iraq, which was as recently as a couple months ago, as I said, the Iraqi political leaders I talked to made it very clear that they thought it was important that we have a presence in Iraq.

I have heard Members get up on the floor and say they have talked to people there and they say they want us out, and they don't want the door to hit us on the way out. But that is certainly not the message that was delivered to me and the delegation I was with when we were there. I also have to say that part of our mission in going there was to impress upon the Iraqi leadership, the political leaders in that country, the importance of forming a national unity government, and to end the sectarianism and the sectarian violence that ravaged that area during the time that we were there. They have made that progress in the last couple of months since our departure from Iraq. They have formed this national unity government, and they continue to make progress toward what I believe is a democracy inclusive of the Shiites, the Sunnis, the Kurds, and the various groups over there that are all struggling to come together behind a government and to be able to assume responsibility for their own governance and also for their own security.

It seems to me at least that right now it would not be a good signal to send either to them or to our men and women who are fighting the good fight in Iraq that we intend to pull out at any particular time certain. It seems, just as a matter of policy, what we are simply doing when we do that is telegraphing to the terrorists our intentions, and they will just wait us out, that we are going to leave at some point and they will be able to assume control in that region. If there is a vacuum at some point, they will be able to step in and fill it.

I think we are at a strategic turning point, and I think we are at that point due to the good work of the men and women wearing the uniform. We have to listen to what they are saying and what our commanders on the ground are saying. I don't think it is in the best interest of our troops or the overall campaign in Iraq for us to be here in Washington, DC, in a political body such as the Senate—although clearly we have responsibilities with respect to

funding the troops and supporting them, giving them direction, but I don't think we ought to be passing judgment about when is the best time to pull our troops back.

We are moving in a direction that will enable us to do that, and I believe that our commanders have made it clear that as they see the Iraqi military stand up, as the government stands up, it is only a matter of time before our troops will be able to stand down, and we will begin to draw down some of our troop strengths in the region.

I make that point because, as I mentioned earlier, popular support is waning for the conflict and people are weary and they are frustrated as they see lives lost and they see the cost of the war, but at the same time I think they realize we have a mission to complete there. We listen to the people across the country, but it is also important to listen to what the troops are saying.

Whenever I travel, when I go to Iraq, when I listen to troops who have returned from Iraq, when I talk with National Guard units in South Dakota that have been deployed there, and, frankly, even when I discuss with families who have lost loved ones in Iraq their thoughts about the work we are doing there and whether we are making a difference, I consistently ask the questions: Do you believe we are making a difference? Do you believe progress is being made? Do you believe we are doing the right thing?

I try to ask those questions separate from—and especially when I am traveling into Iraq—the structured settings in which I would get a response—I wouldn't say a canned response but a response that might be less than completely forthright. I ask troops in different situations.

I remember when I was in Iraq in Baghdad the last time, I got up early in the morning and went to the fitness center and worked out in the weight room with a lot of our troops and visited, interacted with them, and asked their opinions on issues. Clearly, there is a belief, I think, that the work there is hard, that the work there has been costly, that people would like to be back home with their families but at the same time who understand the stakes of what they are doing and believe profoundly in the mission and the work we are doing at winning the war on terror.

As I said before, I think we have to, as we listen to this debate, keep in mind that the stakes are very high because it is not just about freedom and democracy in Iraq, as good as that objective may be, it is also about, in a broader sense, the national security of future generations of Americans.

I happen to believe that the war on terror is sort of our, as they used to say, rendezvous with destiny, that many generations that have come before have had to battle evil. We had World War II and Nazism and all the characters of that time who wanted to kill and destroy and maim people. And since that time we have fought the Cold War. It has taken a certain amount of resolve in every one of those circumstances to prevail. But in either of those circumstances had we not had that resolve, had there not been freedom-loving people and leadership committed to finishing that mission, we could be living in a very different world.

They met, in their generation's time, the challenge that was put before them to make the world a safer and more secure place for future generations. That was true in World War II, that was true in the Cold War, and that is true today in the war on terror. I believe it is our time and our generation's, if you want to call it struggle between good and evil, and we have a responsibility to the people of this country and to freedom-loving people everywhere to make sure we do not fail in succeeding, in winning the war against terror, to ensure that future generations do not have to live in constant fear, in constant threat, and perhaps dealing with thugs such as al-Zarqawi and others who want to do evil and want to kill, want to destroy, and have nothing but the worst of intentions for the people of this country and people elsewhere around the world.

Mr. President, this amendment will be voted on tomorrow. I know the Senator from Massachusetts has time to talk about his amendment later. And the Levin amendment will also be voted on. I appreciate and believe it is appropriate for us to have this debate, especially in the context of the Defense authorization bill, where we are debating national security. This is a debate we have every year. I think it is very appropriate to have this discussion.

I don't question the motivations or intentions of people who bring these amendments; I think just in terms of their judgment, it is wrong. I don't think we can telegraph to our enemies what our strategies are. I believe it is important we complete the mission, that we listen to those commanders, those generals, those troops on the ground day in and day out, fighting the good fight, trying to protect our citizens in this country and around the world and future generations from what I believe is a very real, very serious threat to our security as we go forward.

Mr. President, I see that the Senator from Kansas is on the floor. I will be happy, if he is prepared at this time to make his remarks, to yield such time to him as he may consume. We have others who will be joining us in the Chamber. I, at this time, yield to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from South Dakota for yielding time to me on this very important topic that we are dealing with today, and I also thank my colleagues from Massachusetts and from Michigan for raising these issues.

As Senator THUNE was stating, this is an important debate. It is time we had this debate. It is the right vehicle for us to have this debate, and I think it is helpful for us to have this debate for the United States as we move forward.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, can I inquire how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 25½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, it is time we had this debate and time we had this debate in front of the people of the United States and in front of the world. Rest assured that the terrorists are watching this debate. Those who seek harm for us in Iraq and in many regions of the world are watching this debate, and they are testing and sensing our sense of resolve or lack of resolve in this war on terrorism.

They are very much playing off us and saying the weakness of the United States is its willingness to stay the course or its lack of resolve or the shifting of public opinion, and that is what they drive at more than anything else, seeing that the weakest part of the U.S. military is public opinion, U.S. public opinion, so that our forces are not defeated on the battlefield. We have lost valiant soldiers, but we win the battles. What they are targeting is weakening U.S. public opinion and U.S. resolve. That is what they are targeting with the attacks, with the IEDs, with the roadside bombs. It is not going force on force and saying: OK, we are going to drive Americans out of this portion of Iraq; we are going to keep them out of this particular area. Much of it is saying: Look, we know the United States. We know they are a democracy. They respond to public opinion. What we have to do is have this be costly enough to the United States in American blood that public opinion shifts and they pull away. And once they leave, we take over. So their actual target is U.S. public opinion.

We need to disappoint the terrorists on that particular issue, that U.S. public opinion and U.S. resolve remains in place to see this through.

We are in a decades-long struggle with terrorism. It had been going on since before we had the attack on 9/11. It had been going on for a decade prior to that. We had the attack on Khobar Towers. We had the USS *Cole* attack. We had two embassies in Africa attacked. Hit, hit, hit, and ineffective, feckless responses on our part I think further emboldened the terrorists to take this even further. Hit, no response; hit, ineffective response; hit, ineffective response; and then 9/11, and after that, there was no way you were going to stop the United States from responding. We said: Look, that is it, we are going and we are going to deal with this. We went into Afghanistan, the headquarters. And after that we said: Where else are terrorists working out of? And the war effort moved to Iraq.

Let's look at it from the point of view of the terrorists. I think they misjudged us in thinking we wouldn't respond. We did respond, and we responded aggressively and we responded effectively. We sent a very strong message. But now if we pull out or if we set a timeframe for pulling out that says just wait a definite period of time, 1 year, wait that period of time and the United States starts pulling back, how do the terrorist groups read that?

My colleague from Massachusetts would have a certain point of view on that; maybe others would, my colleague from Michigan. I respect the motivation. I am delighted we are having this debate. It is important we have this debate with our Nation and with the world now.

The conclusions I draw from this are different. If we set timeframes, it says to them that they have us where they want, and they can start declaring victory in their own words saying: Look, we have them down; in a year's period of time, they are gone; all we have to do is wait that period of time.

We have to see this through to a successful conclusion. That does not mean, in any respect whatsoever, that I oppose us repositioning troops, pulling down the number of troops in Iraq or taking our troops away from the Sunni Triangle and handing more of that over to the Iraqis. It seems to me that our timeframes, as set by our military leaders—as set by the military leaders—that they would be the ones to recommend saying it is time we can pull troop levels down.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Not now. I have limited time, and I want to make this statement, if I may. That we can, at the appointment of our military leaders, start pulling our troops away from the Sunni Triangle so we can have the Iraqis taking over more and more of the security in more dangerous areas. I think that is an important thing for us to say here in this debate as well, that in opposing setting a timeframe for pulling out, we are not opposing changing tactics, or if our military leaders say it is time, we can start pulling troops down, let's do it. I want that to take place. But it should be the military leaders doing this, without the dictates of us saying here that we are just going to set an arbitrary timeframe for us to pull on out of this region. I think it sends the exact wrong signal, particularly at this point in time when we have momentum that we have gained and we have an Iraqi government in place.

Frankly, through the help of this debate, we are sending a message to the Iraqi people and their government that the United States is not in this for an unlimited period of time. We do expect the Iraqis to step up. You have to step up in taking more of this on and moving more of this forward. I think this should be done on our working with and listening to the military leaders of what they would say would be the right route for us to go on this and not us setting an arbitrary date.

This has been, in my estimation, a very good debate to have. But I think it is important at the end of the debate that we have a very strong and clear vote on this that we are staying, and we are going to see this through to the end. We are not dictating to the military leadership an arbitrary time period, and we are going to win this war on terrorism, period, and that we have the resolve to win this war on terrorism. I think that is important for us to do.

I want to thank my colleague from South Dakota for chairing this debate at this point in time. I do hope that my colleagues join me again tomorrow in voting against this resolution with this timeframe.

Mr. KERRY. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROWNBACK. If we have time on our side, but I don't know if we have other colleagues wishing to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. The Senator from Kansas, if he wants to yield for a question, I guess that is your prerogative. We have other speakers coming. I am hesitant to allow too much time to burn off the clock.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I would rather reserve the balance of our time for other speakers.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the comments of my colleague from Kansas, because I think he too has laid out very clearly what the stakes are in this debate.

As I said earlier, we will have an opportunity to vote tomorrow on both of these amendments, the Levin amendment, the sense of Congress amendment, and then the Kerry amendment, both of which are directed at some sort of a timeline with respect to the conflict in Iraq. As I mentioned earlier, I think as we have undertaken to allow a very open debate on this, which, as I said before, I think is a good thing to do, particularly in the context of debating the Defense authorization bill, we are hearing from both sides some of the emotion that is felt on this and also some very strong opinions and views but, oftentimes, a different interpretation of the facts.

I think what we need to do in this debate is try and focus on the facts as they exist on the ground and not sometimes as we understand them here from what we read in the press, but we need to rely, in my judgment, on those people who are day in and day out fighting the good fight in the theater. Our commanders, our generals, our troops who are conducting this operation over there are doing the Lord's work, in my opinion, in protecting us from terrorist threats that exist. I dare say, as we look at the type of threat we will face in the future, it seems to me, at least, that the success or failure of the operation in Iraq is going to bear heavily on whether we are ultimately going to succeed in the war on terror.

People have argued about whether we ought to be in Iraq in the first place, and that is a debate where Members on the other side have said we shouldn't have been there, we shouldn't have gone in the first place. Most who are making that argument are people who supported the resolution to go there, and I think many of those people also realize as well—and I think the vote will reflect this tomorrow—that they have strong misgivings about us pulling out prematurely and putting in jeopardy the good work that has been done by the troops in that region already.

So I expect tomorrow when we have this vote we will see a very strong vote against the Kerry amendment. I think it will reflect, hopefully, the will of this body at this point in time as we are making good progress, I think, at a very important turning point in the war in Iraq, the progress that has been made on the ground both with respect to the Iraqi security forces as well as with the Government of Iraq as it stands up. We want to make sure we are not telegraphing to our enemies that at this very point where we literally have them on their backs, that we are going to let them up and begin to assume many of the things that they were doing in the past: the killings, the planning, the launching of attacks against people not only in that region but elsewhere around the world and, in many cases, people from freedom-loving countries and American citizens. We want to make sure that never happens again.

My colleague from Alabama is here on the floor. Would the Senator from Alabama like to speak on this subject? We are waiting for the Senator from Georgia to arrive. He is not here yet, so if the Senator from Alabama would like to claim some time, I am certainly willing to yield to him. I think we have about 10 minutes left on our side if the Senator from Alabama would like to make some remarks.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I do have some remarks, and I would deliver those after the others have finished their time tonight if it is not too late, and I would just share a few thoughts at this time.

We have been given a great heritage in our country. We have been given a Nation that is the greatest Nation in the world at this time. We have the finest military the world has ever known. We have a great democracy where we have full and vigorous debate.

I was here when we debated the question of whether or not to issue that ultimatum to Saddam Hussein, and we knew then if he didn't accept it, if he didn't allow the inspectors in and if he didn't renounce weapons of mass destruction, we would be going to war, and that was the vote and we knew it and everybody discussed it. It went on for months. People say it was quick. It went on for months.

I will tell you what I said about why we went. I looked back at my remarks. It was not based on primarily weapons of mass destruction. We were dealing with Iraq for years. We had a war with them in 1991, and we defeated them and sent their Army going back to Baghdad. In effect, Saddam Hussein sued for peace and he made a series of promises to keep us from following and destroying his Army completely and invading his country and removing him from power, and he made those commitments, and he did not follow them.

There were a number of U.N. resolutions that he was in violation of. He rejected the international community, and an embargo had been placed on Iraq. The United States was attempting to enforce that embargo. Saddam Hussein was consistently working to get around that embargo. We were flying in no-fly zones and enforcing no-fly zones over Iraq. He was shooting at our airplanes on a daily basis, almost. We were dropping bombs on Saddam Hussein on a regular basis, dropping bombs from our aircraft.

So the question was, as The Economist magazine said, are we going to quit our efforts, are we going to issue an ultimatum and be prepared to go to war if they do not? Their editorial said, the London-based Economist magazine said, our vote is for war. That was that London journal's opinion.

That is the way I felt about it. Iraq was a rogue nation that had tremendous amounts of oil, it had a dictator prepared to use weapons of mass destruction, use weapons of mass destruction against his own people, and he was determined to break the embargo, determined to be able to sell his oil on the world market, not for his own people's good but to build up his military power, just like he did when he invaded Kuwait, and be the preeminent Nebakanezer of the Middle East. That was his goal. It remained his goal. It probably still is as long as he takes a breath.

So we gave him that ultimatum, and with the support of large numbers of nations in the world—I believe some 60 supported us, including nations like the United Kingdom and Australia and others—he refused to comply and we commenced our military action. This Nation made a decision to remove him from power and we voted on it as a Senate, and we sent our soldiers in harm's way. We did not do that lightly. No great Nation which expects to be respected will send its soldiers into harm's way with a half-hearted commitment to them.

When I talk to those soldiers, as I did recently at the 231st birthday of the United States Army over at the Jefferson Memorial, and I talked to those soldiers and we were discussing these kinds of deadlines and policies and directives to set forth plans as to how the war should be conducted, one of them said to me, Senator, let me tell you what we want. We want to win. And I have talked to families who lost loved ones in Iraq, and they tell me every time—it is amazing—my son was doing what he believed in, what he wanted to do.

I submit we owe them the responsibility to be faithful to them and not to dishonor their sacrifice by cutting and running when it is not time to do so. I believe that very, very sincerely.

So I would just say to my colleagues, I can see how we have differences of opinion, and I understand that. I remember the debate and I remember the vote I cast and I knew it was very serious. No Nation that desires its own self-respect or the respect of other nations can be flippant about those kinds of matters. When you make a commitment, you stay the course.

Iraq has formed a new government completely now. They have a parliament. They have elected all their ministers. They have their interior and defense ministers in place. They are determined to continue to grow and strengthen their Army and their security forces.

I believe they still need American help to get over that hump and be successful. We should not disregard the advice of our military leaders and set an artificial date, not connected to military and political reality in Iraq, for leaving Iraq. I think that would be the very wrong thing to do. And nothing could be more corrosive to our self-confidence as a Nation or to our own military than to prematurely give up on the opportunity we have to create a good and stable government in Iraq.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, could I inquire how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise tonight in opposition to this amendment. As I have thought about this over the last several days, I believe it is critically important that we bring this issue up for debate. The Senator from Massachusetts, frankly, is to be commended for doing so. We could have eased through this bill without having this debate and the American people would not have had the opportunity to hear where we are, what is going on, and in particular why those of us who think it is important that we move ahead continue to do so.

First of all, when the President spoke to a joint session of Congress following September 11, he said we were going to be engaging in an entirely different form of military conflict than we had ever been engaged in before, and it was going to be a war on terror which was going to be a long and enduring war. He has been exactly right. We ultimately moved into Afghanistan, and liberated the people of Afghanistan. We took out hundreds if not thousands of terrorists in that country, and ultimately the decision was made to liberate the people of Iraq, and we have done that. It is about this conflict that, in the minds of a lot of Americans, the question is still being asked, How much longer is this going to go on?

I remind the folks of America that the President did say it is going to be a long and enduring war. That is the case. The reason it is going to be a long and enduring war is because this is an unconventional war in every sense of the word. It would be nice if we had tanks on the battlefield or artillery being fired at an enemy over the hill. But we are never going to see that in this war on terrorism. It is being fought in the back alleys of Baghdad and Mosul and Tikrit, in towns that were foreign to anybody in America before we moved into Iraq and made the march to Baghdad. That is the kind of war which is going to continue to be fought.

The people of Iraq know that well. They have suffered as much if not more than any country in that region that has had a conflict like this. I say that because we all remember Desert Storm and what happened in Kuwait. We all remember what has been happening daily in that part of the world, whether it is Jordan or whether it is Israel or Egypt or some other part of that region of the world. The people of Iraq have truly suffered. They understand that America has made a sacrifice, and they understand that, were it not for the American soldier coming in to liberate them, they would not be in the condition they are today, which frankly is a pretty positive condition—both economically as well as otherwise.

Are there bad things happening? Sure. There are going to continue to be bad things happening. The one thing about war is there is nothing pleasant about it. There is nothing good about war. But at the end of the day, America has always stood tall in military conflicts. America has carried the day. America has always achieved victory, and victory means a democratic form of government in Iraq being formed. It means a unified government, which we have seen taking place in Iraq recently. It means taking out the bad guys, from a leadership standpoint all the way down. That is happening in Iraq every single day.

Recently, we saw the takeout of their leader, Zarqawi. That happened in a short period of time. But were it not for the first American soldier to set foot in Iraq and start the motion in process, that would not have happened the way it did 2 weeks ago. It will happen again. Whoever is next in line will ultimately be brought to justice or have justice physically brought to them at the hands of the American soldier.

We are in a situation today where we are discussing whether we ought to pull our troops out of there—whether we talk about next week, next month, or next year. In my opinion, that sends the wrong message to the Iraqi people. It sends the wrong message to the terrorists. And it sends the wrong message to the world. It is a different message from what the American military

and America itself has ever sent to any enemy with which we have been engaged in combat.

We are having successes today, successes that are brought about because of sacrifices—in a lot of cases the ultimate sacrifice. That has always been the American way. While we grieve for those families who have made that ultimate sacrifice, they are going to be satisfied only when their ultimate sacrifice is rewarded with full and complete victory in the war on terror.

I believe it is important that we have this debate. It is important that the American people understand we truly are winning this war and that the wins are not measured by victories on the battlefield every day, but the victory is being measured by winning the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people. The victory is being measured by the folks who are achieving success inside Iraq, from a military standpoint, from a governmental standpoint, and from an economic standpoint.

I urge my colleagues to look at these motions very carefully, both of them, and that we defeat both motions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the majority has expired. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Georgia. He is a very valued member of the Armed Services Committee, as is Senator THUNE, who spoke earlier, as was Senator SESSIONS.

I think we have had a good debate. We are prepared to continue that debate as long as it is desired. We are here to stay. We feel very strongly about these issues, you know. I do not want to invade the time of my good friend.

I yield the floor at this time, and I will follow him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I wonder if it will be possible to let the Senator from New Jersey speak for about 15 minutes and then I resume the floor?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if that is with no objection, the next 30 minutes is under the Senator's control.

Mr. KERRY. I understand I have unlimited time at this time, Mr. President? There is no time limit on me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time limit.

Mr. WARNER. That is correct.

Mr. KERRY. I just yield him 15 minutes. I don't intend to talk all night, but I hope to have the chance to speak.

Mr. WARNER. I hope we have a rotation.

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

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, to decide our future in Iraq, we must first understand our past in Iraq.

Frankly, I never believed this administration's false arguments about why we should go to war in Iraq. And I believe this administration has never had a strategy for success in Iraq.

That's why I voted against the war in Iraq.

The Bush administration led us into this war based on false premises and false promises.

The Bush administration invaded Iraq without the troop numbers needed to complete the job.

The Bush administration failed to provide the troops with the equipment they needed letting them go into Iraq without proper body armor or properly armored vehicles

The Bush administration failed to create a real international coalition so that the United States wouldn't have to bear the highest cost in blood and national treasure.

And President Bush went into the war without a plan to win the peace.

This was a war of choice, not a war of necessity.

The Bush administration's record in Iraq represents a massive failure of leadership—a massive failure of Presidential leadership.

Let me be clear. While I did not support the war, I have always supported the troops on the battlefield. Our troops have succeeded in the tasks they were given. They have fought for freedom and security in the most difficult of situations. They have risked their lives to protect ours. And the Nation is indebted to them for their service.

In New Jersey, over 3,169 New Jerseyans are serving in Iraq or Afghanistan and 71 service members with ties to New Jersey have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country in Iraq or Afghanistan and our thoughts and prayers are with them and their families. Obviously, our troops are committed to this call to duty. They have not questioned the why, or the wherefore, they have simply, honorably, and valiantly answered the call of their country.

But we are all living with the consequences of this failure in Presidential leadership today:

Iraq continues to explode with sectarian violence.

Reconstruction efforts have not restored Iraq to prewar levels of oil production, security concerns continue to impede progress, while accusations of contractor corruption continue.

We have not been able to internationalize the effort of training and security in Iraq because of the administration's closed-minded decision to keep countries from helping with reconstruction unless they supported the administration's decision to go to war.

On top of the other failures, the administration refused to engage in real diplomacy to create regional security with Iraq's neighbors.

The United States has spent nearly $319 billion in Iraq. Our monthly burn rate is over $8 billion. Over 2,500 American lives have been lost, over 18,500 soldiers have been wounded—many of them severely.

And we were all horrified to hear the news just yesterday that two U.S. soldiers, PFC Kristian Menchaca from Houston, TX and PFC Thomas Lowell Tucker, from Madras, OR, were kidnapped and slaughtered by the insurgents.

My heart goes out to the families of these soldiers and to all who have lost loved ones in Iraq.

I believe we have paid a heavy price for the war in Iraq—in blood and in national treasure.

But we must account for not only the literal cost of the war but also what we have not done because of the war—the opportunity cost of the war in Iraq.

We also cannot forget that our fight against terrorism started where it should have in Afghanistan. But because of the President's war in Iraq, this administration then took our eye off the ball in Afghanistan.

The administration never finished the job in Afghanistan, the birthplace of the Taliban, the home to al-Qaida, the land of Osama bin Laden, and the place where the attacks of 9/11 were planned.

This was the right place to pursue the national security of the United States. It was in Afghanistan that the murderers of September 11 were located. We had Osama bin Laden pinned down in the mountains of Tora Bora. But instead of having a large contingent of the best trained, best equipped, most technologically advanced military in the world go after him, we outsourced the job to Afghanistan warlords. The result? Osama bin Laden got away.

Many of us have been horrified as we have watched the resurgence of the Taliban and strong anti-American sentiment in Afghanistan.

During just the past few weeks, over 250 people have been killed in the upsurge in violence and we see techniques borrowed from Iraq, like the use of improvised explosive devices, now being used in Afghanistan.

According to the New York Times, Pentagon officials say that 32 suicide bombs have been exploded in 2006, which is already 6 more than exploded in all of 2005. Roadside bombings are up 30 percent over last year and the Taliban are fighting in groups triple the size of last year. Just this Monday, we heard reports that the Taliban used women and children as human shields during a fierce firefight with British troops. And after a deadly traffic accident involving the U.S. military, an anti-American riot exploded in Kabul last month. Meanwhile, Bin Laden makes his tapes and remains free.

President Bush's war has also hurt us here at home. The fact is that because of the cost of President Bush's war at almost $319 billion, we cannot afford to take care of some of the basic needs of our citizens here at home. This administration is cutting funds for firefighters, for education, for our seniors, for healthcare, and for homeland security funding in New Jersey and New York to protect our ports and our transit systems. They are underfunding the very veterans who are securing our

country and who come back from war wounded or traumatized. The Bush administration is cutting funding to all of these people—our nurses, teachers, and seniors—while spending billions in Iraq every month.

As we start a new hurricane season, I look back on Hurricane Katrina and I see the terrible price the people of the Gulf Coast paid when their National Guard troops were away in Iraq and unable to protect them here at home. Our homeland is simply less secure when our National Guard and Reserves are being kept in permanent rotation away in Iraq.

Clearly, it is time to change the course; we need a new direction in Iraq.

That's why I am supporting the Levin and Kerry amendments today.

The Senate has already spoken saying that 2006 must be a year of transition. That is why the Levin amendment says that we must begin transitioning out troops now while still protecting our people and helping with security. With the Levin amendment, we make it clear that the time has come to change the course, rather than stay the course.

I am also supporting Senator KERRY's amendment which takes the first and most important step by setting a date of July 1, 2007 to have all U.S. troops transition except those critical to training Iraqi security forces, working on specialized counterterrorism operations, and protecting our U.S. personnel and facilities, like our embassy.

Let us be clear. This amendment does not say we should remove all of our troops from Iraq right now.

With this amendment, we are saying that it is time for Iraqis to take responsibility for their own destiny.

With this amendment, we are sending a message that over the course of the next year, the Iraqis must take full control of their own country, their own security, and their own future.

With this amendment, we are saying that we respect the message of the Iraqis' own elected, sovereign government. At a time when the Iraqis have put in place the entire cabinet of the elected government of Prime Minister Maliki; at a time when the United States and coalition forces have trained and equipped more than 116,000 Iraqi soldiers and more than 148,000 Iraqi police and other security forces; at a time when sectarian violence has taken over terrorism as the most serious security threat in Iraq; at a time when 69 out of the 102 army combat battalions, are either soon able to take the lead or able to operate independently, isn't it time for the Iraqis to start taking responsibility for their own destiny?

In fact, the Iraqis have made this point themselves. The Iraqi National Security Adviser Mowaffak al-Rubaie said in a Washington Post article this week:

> Iraq has to grow out of the shadow of the United States and the coalition, take responsibility for its own decisions, learn from its own mistakes, and find Iraqi solutions to Iraqi problems, with the knowledge that our friends and allies are standing by with support and help should we need it.

He also said that the eventual removal of coalition troops ''will help the Iraqis, who now see foreign troops as occupiers rather than the liberators they were meant to be'' and that ''the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people.'' Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki supports a transfer of responsibility for 16 out of 18 provinces by the end of 2006 and his security adviser believes that we can reduce coalition forces to less than 100,000 by the end of this year with most of the multinational force gone. The Iraqis are clearly saying that they are ready for this transition to happen.

A few days ago, Republican Senators made a great deal of Iraqi sovereignty when I, and Senator NELSON, proposed a Sense of the Senate amendment that urged the government of Iraq not to grant amnesty for those who had killed U.S. soldiers.

We heard a lot about sovereignty.

If the Iraqis are to be respected as a sovereign government, as many argued on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, shouldn't we respect their knowledge and wishes as it relates to the very issue of troop redeployment and their ability to sustain their own security?

It is only when the Iraqis and the rest of the world know there is a certain timeframe for a real transition that they will make the hard choices, negotiations, and compromises to maintain a stable government of national unity. It is time for the U.S. to cap the open-ended commitment of U.S. forces in Iraq and to ''remove the training wheels'' on the Iraqi security forces. The sooner the Iraqi security forces believe they are fighting for their country, the sooner they help stop the sectarian violence. Until that happens, the fledgling Iraqi Government will continue to rely on U.S. forces to keep them from making the difficult decisions and taking tough actions. It is time for the Iraqis to step up to the plate.

Clearly, it is essential to set a date certain for transition so that Iraqis will take responsibility for their country.

It is also essential to set this date certain for transition so that the international community will start to take responsibility for reconstruction and security in Iraq, as well.

The United States cannot go it alone; we must internationalize reconstruction, security, and create an international process to end sectarian violence. It is in everyone's interest to create a stable and secure Iraq. That is why I support the proposed Summit in Senator KERRY's amendment which brings together all of the players—the EU, NATO, the UN, and Iraq's neighbors—to come up with a plan to solve the political problems, to deal with the militias, and to revive reconstruction efforts.

And this Summit will also deal with a key issue to Iraq's stability—oil. Ultimately, all parties need to be brought in to the process and share the oil profits whether through a national fund or some form of revenue sharing. We cannot forget that Iraq has the fourth largest oil reserves in the world. The goal is to reduce insurgent attacks, improve security along the pipeline and create strong oversight over current pipeline reconstruction. The Iraqis need a stable income stream to restore economic stability and help pay for reconstruction and security so we must get oil production back above prewar levels.

I also believe that our worldwide troop deployment must reflect our priorities in the fight against terrorism. Senator KERRY's amendment creates an over-the-horizon troop presence in case we need to deal with other terrorist issues or regional security issues. With the reduction of troops in Iraq we will be able to redeploy certain troops to other key areas, such as Afghanistan. And we will also be able to bring our National Guard and Reserves home to prevent another terrorist attack on our soil and to help during natural disasters.

Let me conclude by saying that there are those who want to politicize the war to present the American people with a false choice—either stay the course by keeping our troops in Iraq or empower the terrorists by cutting and running. I would ask all of you not to fall into the trap of this false choice or simplistic solutions.

Let me be clear, this amendment is not a simplistic choice to leave Iraq today and to let it fall into the hands of the terrorists.

With this amendment, we will begin to fulfill the transition the Senate voted for and the Iraqis have said they intend to pursue.

With this amendment, we are voting to leave sufficient troops in Iraq at the end of that year to fight counterterrorism, to finish training Iraqi forces, and to protect our people and our embassy.

With this amendment, we are voting to put troops over-the horizon in case of other terrorist activity or regional conflict.

With this amendment, we are voting to create regional stability and get the international community to the table.

With this amendment, we are voting to get our National Guard home to keep us safe and secure in our cities and towns.

With this amendment, we are voting to finish the job in Afghanistan.

With this amendment, we are changing the course of events in Iraq—a change of course that will still meet our objectives, save American lives, and ensure our ability to both protect our people at home and meet the other challenges we have as a nation.

Let us remember that this was a war of choice, not a war of necessity.

Let us remember what this administration has told us about this war.

Let us remember the unfound weapons of mass destruction; remember the missing mobile weapons labs; remember the yellow-cake uranium in Africa; remember Saddam's nonexistent vast stockpiles of chemical weapons; remember when Secretary Rumsfeld told us that, ''We know where the WMDs are;'' remember the non-existent link between al-Qaida and Saddam; remember the claims that Iraqi oil and other countries, not the U.S. taxpayer, would pay for the cost of reconstruction; remember when the administration told us that the war would cost somewhere between $50 and $60 billion; remember when Paul Wolfowitz said that ''it seems outlandish'' to think that we would need several hundred thousand troops in Iraq; and let us remember when President Bush told us on May 1, 2003 that ''Major combat operations in Iraq have ended'' while he stood in front of a sign that said ''mission accomplished.''

Let us remember the lies.

So I ask: Are we willing to continue to sacrifice the lives of young Americans so that this same administration can stay the course, a course without direction, for a cause that President Bush has already said that he will abandon to the next president? I hope not.

I will say again, do not fall into the political trap and rhetoric from those who will try to mischaracterize this amendment.

I voted against the Iraq war when many on the other side tried to falsely characterize those of us who didn't believe the evidence that the administration presented, who thought we should work through the international process, who didn't believe the administration had done any postwar planning. For standing up for what we believed in, they tried to mischaracterize us as anti-American and unpatriotic. I was willing to take a difficult stand, and stand up for what I believed was right for the country and for the people of New Jersey. That is why I voted against the war.

Today, with over 2,500 lives lost, almost $320 billion spent in national treasure, with $8 billion used each month, I know I made the right decision.

The Senate has an opportunity to act now, to enact a policy worthy of the sacrifice of our soldiers.

And that is why I am voting for the Kerry and Levin amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey for a really excellent summary and a terrific statement about what this is about and what is at stake. I thank him also for in the short time he has been here he has really proven to be indispensable for a number of different debates we have had and for his work in the last few days on no amnesty for those who have killed Americans. It had a major impact on our policy. We thank him so much for that contribution.

Mr. President, I think one of the important things that the Senator from New Jersey just said is let us remember what this amendment is really about.

I have sat here and listened to this nondebate for a little while. When Senators used to be able to question each other, we used to be able to have a dialog on the floor. It seems to me that is the best way to test each other's thinking.

What is interesting to me is that a number of Senators came to the floor to make these grand pronouncements about our country, about war on terror, about our troops. And none of us in the U.S. Senate would disagree that our troops are the best troops in the world and that they have made an extraordinary sacrifice. None of us would disagree. We are a great country and a great democracy. None of us disagree that we don't need to fight against terrorists to win the war on terror. That is not the issue.

A lot of other people are getting tired of that sort of game, of trying to characterize things as they aren't.

The Senator from South Dakota said that we shouldn't telegraph to the enemy and to the terrorists. Of course, we shouldn't telegraph to the enemy and terrorists. What are we telegraphing? We are there. They know it. They are killing our soldiers to some degree but lesser than the insurgency today.

The point that people need to really focus on is the fact that what has happened in Iraq is not what was originally billed. This is the third war. It is a different war from the war we went into.

The war that the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, described was the war against Saddam Hussein as an enforcement mechanism of weapons of mass destruction. And they weren't there. There is a whole history of that being about a war of choice as opposed to a war of necessity.

That then transitioned because Zarqawi and company and a bunch of foreigners were attracted by the fact that we were there. We made a great target. So they started to use that target. And, indeed, it became a haven for some terrorists.

But every single analyst who I have talked to—and I know the chairman knows this—says that there are about 1,000 or less of the foreign terrorists in Iraq. Ninety-eight percent of what is happening in Iraq today is Iraqi on Iraqi.

When they come to the floor and say to us we are going to telegraph something to the terrorists, who are we telegraphing something to? The Shias who hate Sunnis, the Sunnis who hate Shias who are killing each other?

What are our troops supposed to be about? Drive down the street and find an IED and get blown up? Wait for a suicide bomber to come into an outpost and kill them?

The bottom line is that either the Iraqis are going to resolve the differences between Iraqis or we are going to see people dying for a long, long time.

When we talk about the war on terror, let's talk about the real war on terror which never was in Iraq. Yes, it is now part of the war on terror. It has been made part of the war on terror because foreign terrorists have been attracted there because the American target is there and because they know they can feed into the sectarian violence and use it against us.

What is smart if you are going to try to deal with that? How do you win? Do you think I want to win any less than the Senator from Alabama or the Senator from Georgia? I believe in winning. I believe in winning for America and I believe in winning for our troops, and I don't think this is a winning strategy. It is not a winning strategy in Iraq, and it is not a winning strategy in the war on terror.

All you have to do is look at al-Qaida and what they are doing in 60 to 80 countries around the world. Look at what happened in Somalia the other day? Are we dealing with that? Are we dealing with Darfur? Are we dealing with North Korea? It took us until this year to sit down with our own allies, Great Britain, Germany and France, and actually try to do the diplomatic work of dealing with Iran.

For 3⅕ years we sat on the sidelines and allowed Iran to become more of a problem.

Is that winning the war on terror?

What about the 60 percent of the kids in Saudi Arabia and Egypt and Jordan and other countries that are under the age of 25, 50 percent under the age of 18, 40 percent under the age of 14, and the unemployed and uneducated and unemployable? They are going to go down to madrasas and learn how to hate people while the United States remains a big, fat target in the Middle East.

Ask our foreign policy experts. I don't know whether it was Foreign Affairs or another magazine, but one of them did that just the other day.

Eighty-seven percent of the people, when asked, said we are less safe today in the war on terror than we were; 87 percent of the experts of the United States, including people like General Brent Scowcroft and others who I know the chairman has great respect for.

This is not a question of whether we want to beat terrorists. This is a question of whether we are doing it the right way and whether we know how to do this right.

Show me in this resolution, in this amendment, where it says all troops out in 1 year. It doesn't. A lot of people are upset at that. They think it ought to, but it doesn't. Show me where it says we are finished altogether, and we are walking away from Iraq. It does not say it.

It says we are going to leave sufficient people there to finish the training, to go after al-Qaida, over the horizon to have the capacity to be able to protect our interests in the region, and it says we will protect American facilities.

This is not cut and run. This is a smart way to win the war on terror. Our own generals—and I know the chairman has heard it; I know others have heard it—know that they believe our presence is contributing to the problems. It contributes to the sense of occupation. It contributes to the—whether it is Abu Ghraib or Guantanamo Bay or Haditha, those all contribute to the recruitment of terrorists against the United States.

Our intelligence people will tell every Member of the Senate that currently there are al-Qaida-trained operatives leaving Iraq, trained in munitions, trained in IEDs, going to Europe and elsewhere in order to wreak the havoc of the future.

We are not doing the job. We are not doing the job correctly. Let's have a real debate, not a false debate, about something this resolution is not.

Moreover, in listening to my colleagues, one of them talked about what his vote meant and the vote he casts to hold Saddam Hussein accountable. I remember what my vote was. I remember what I said in the Senate when I voted. I voted reluctantly based on what Colin Powell, Secretary of State, and others said they were going to do: Exhaust the remedies of inspections at the United Nations, not cut them short; go to war as a last resort, not as a rush; do the adequate planning, not ignore the State Department plan for what you do to win the peace.

I hear colleagues come to the Senate and say: We shouldn't tell this administration what to do. Their record demands that we tell them what to do. Congress helped get us into this mess, and Congress ought to help get us out of it. We are partly responsible.

I have heard my colleagues talk about troops they talk to. We all talk to troops. We have all talked to families. I will be honest about it, I hear both things. I hear troops whose families have said to me: Make sure my son or daughter did not die in vain. I agree with what the Senator from Wisconsin said earlier about that. I think anyone who serves their country at the call of the Nation never dies in vain.

I have heard troops who have come back and said to me: We are making progress. We ought to be doing more of this, more of that, more of the PRTs, more of a number of different other projects. But I have also met a lot of troops who are coming back who believe they do not know what the mission is; they think the war is wrong and they think a lot of the troops just want to come home. That is where they are. It is a mixture.

Our question, our judgment, is to try to see through that, try to be intelligent and genuine in trying to work out what is the best policy. I have come to the conclusion that the reason for setting a date—I was not there 2 years ago. Why wasn't I there 2 years ago? Because 2 years ago we didn't have all the elections, we did not have a referendum, we did not have the Constitution, we did not have an elected government, we had not made some of the progress, and we had not transitioned to a civil sectarian struggle. We then still saw things as fundamentally foreign jihadists. Because of all the mistakes that have been made, that transition is now a matter of history.

I believe deeply, based on what I am hearing from military personnel, based on what I see personally, and based on my own experience where I fought with foreigners in another country, where we were trying to stand them up and get them to go out and do the job, that as long as we are there and prepared to do the job for them, they won't do it adequately. You have to push people out into that kind of situation.

The bottom line, can we do it the way we are muddling along? Possibly. I heard a couple of colleagues come to the Senate and say there were some who have decided that this is lost and we just have to go. I haven't. I believe there are ways, hopefully, to pull something together that has a sufficiently stable government that we can go forward to the other issues of the Middle East.

I will tell you this, and this I know for certain: If we make this successful muddling along, as we are doing now, it is going to cost us more lives, more limbs, and more dollars than if we did what is in this plan. That I know to a certainty. I also know to a certainty that unless we are prepared to do the diplomacy necessary, we cannot resolve the fundamental underpinnings of this insurgency.

I talked to General Zinni the other day to ask his advice. He doesn't agree with me setting a date, so I will be upfront about that, but he certainly cited unbelievable dismay at the lack of adequacy of consultation in the region, at the lack of effort to put together a regional security arrangement, at the lack of diplomacy that is trying to resolve the fundamental differences and work bilaterally in an intensive way to pull people to the table to try to deal with this.

One thing I know, when you have a 20-percent minority Sunni population who for 200 years has run the country and now suddenly they are not, but some of them are still committed to doing it, if you do not give them a sufficient stake, you are not going to resolve this problem. And, at the same time, you have the Shias who are 60 percent of the population who for 200 years have been oppressed by this 20 percent minority, and they won at the ballot box because we gave them at the ballot box the opportunity to have power, and they want to hold on to it. That is natural.

But if they want to go the full distance of what they want to do, we have a serious long-term problem. That is what we are supposed to resolve in the next few months.

The Senator from Delaware is absolutely correct in his description of the tensions that have to be resolved. I disagree with the Senator with respect to the question of whether there is a plan. This amendment is a plan. It is a plan for standing up the Iraqis. It is a plan for creating accountability. It is a plan for shifting responsibility to the Iraqi Government to bolster their sovereignty and empower the Government in the eyes of the Iraqi people. It is a plan for how to begin to redeploy troops to protect our interests in the region at the same time as you stand up their military. And, most importantly, it is a plan for what you do with the Arab League, with the Secretary General of the United Nations, with the neighbors and with the factions in Iraq in order to resolve the fundamental differences. It specifically requires reaching a comprehensive political agreement for Iraq that engenders the support of Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds and ensures equitable distribution of oil, strengthens the internal security, disbans militias, revives reconstruction efforts, fulfills related international economic aid commitments, secures Iraq's borders, and provides for a sustainable Federalist structure in Iraq.

That is a plan. And the only way to arrive at any plan, whether it is the Senator from Delaware or anyone else, is to pull the parties together and do the diplomacy necessary. Never in the 21 years I have been here have I seen as significant an issue of war and peace, life and death, as significant an absence of fundamental diplomacy as there is here. Never. It does not come close to the efforts of other generations.

There is 200 years of American history being turned topsy-turvy. It is hurting us on the war on terror. When September 11 happened, the whole world was with us—the whole world. Newspaper headlines said: We are all Americans now. That was the atmosphere after September 11. And the whole world understood why we had to go to Afghanistan. And every single one of us voted for that, understood it, and supported it.

But Iraq is different. Iraq had nothing to do with Afghanistan at the time, nothing to do with September 11, and everyone knows it.

So why are we here talking about requiring this administration to do something? Why don't you think about the history. When they could have demanded and relied on accurate information instead of manipulated intelligence, they made a willful choice not to do that. They were wrong. Instead, they sacrificed American credibility at home and abroad. The result of that is the ''We are all Americans now'' was squandered. It disappeared.

Ask any American citizen who travels abroad now how comfortable they feel as they travel. Ask any American businessman what happens to them when they travel in other parts of the world.

When this administration could have given the inspectors additional time to discover whether Saddam Hussein actually had weapons of mass destruction, when they could have taken time to exhaust the patience of our own allies and hold them accountable to the U.N. resolutions, instead they just broke off and said, OK, you go your way, we will go ours, and they exposed America to greater cost and greater sacrifice.

When they could have paid attention to Ambassador Wilson's report, they chose not to. And they were wrong. Instead, they attacked him and they attacked his wife to justify attacking Iraq.

But the mistakes were not limited to that decision to invade. They mounted, one upon the other. When they could have listened to General Shinseki and put in enough troops to maintain order, they chose not to. When they could have listened to Larry Lindsey and others who said it is going to cost $200 billion, they not only chose not to listen, they fired him. They were wrong.

When they could have learned from George Herbert Walker Bush, Jim Baker and General Scowcroft and built a genuine world coalition, they chose not to. And they were wrong.

When they could have implemented a detailed State Department plan for reconstructing post-Saddam Iraq, they chose not to. And they were wrong.

When they could have protected American forces by guarding Saddam Hussein's ammo dumps where there were weapons of individual destruction, they exposed our young men and women to the ammo that now maims and kills them because they chose not to act. And they were wrong.

When they could have imposed immediate order and structure in Baghdad after the fall of Saddam Hussein, Secretary Rumsfeld shrugged his shoulders and said, ''Baghdad was safer than Washington, DC,'' and he chose not to act, he was wrong.

When the administration could have kept an Iraqi Army selectively intact, they chose not to. And they were wrong.

When they could have kept an entire civil structure functioning to deliver basic services to Iraqi citizens, guess what. They chose not to. And they were wrong, and we are paying the price today.

They could have accepted the offers of the United Nations and individual countries to provide on-the-ground peacekeepers and reconstruction. Guess what. In their arrogance about doing it alone, they chose not to, and so we are alone. They were wrong.

When they should have leveled with the American people that the insurgency had grown, they chose not to. Vice President CHENEY even absurdly claimed that the insurgency was in its last throes, and he repeated that again just a few days ago. He was wrong.

Now, after all these mistakes, the administration likes to accuse anyone who proposes a better course of wanting to cut and run. Well, Mr. President, we are in trouble today because of the policy of cut-and-run—cutting and running from common sense, cutting and running from history, cutting and running from cultural realities, cutting and running from the truth, cutting and running from the best advice of our military. And we are paying a huge price for that today.

Mr. President, every single one of us is determined to win the war on terror. But we have to ask ourselves some tough questions about where we find ourselves today. I wonder, as we are told by a lot of people that—I think the President, just yesterday or the day before, said it was important to have Members of the U.S. Congress who will not wave the white flag of surrender in the war on terror.

I think the President of the United States ought to stop acting as ''Campaigner in Chief'' and start being Commander in Chief and start bringing the Congress together and the Nation together around a real policy.

I don't know anybody waving a white flag. We are debating whether or not there is a better way to win the war on terror.

I respectfully say to my colleagues, if we don't begin to pay attention, instead of over $2 billion every couple of days—every 2 days, I think; it is about $8 billion a week; 8 billion bucks a week—instead of $8 billion a week going to Iraq, we could be investing and working on a greater Middle Eastern initiative, working on economic development, working on schools, working on children's issues, working on a future with respect to future terrorists.

The fact is, we are not going to succeed at this if all we do is go out there and alienate people. I have heard from soldiers over the last weekend. I was with three medics who have came back, and they are all against the war, those three medics. They are out there in America right now talking to people about why they are against the war. They said: When you go into a house at night, and you are holding guns, and you are scaring people in that house, and you leave that house, they don't like you. You are not winning their hearts and minds.

I cannot tell you how familiar that is to the same experience we saw and went through years ago in hamlets throughout Southeast Asia. It just does not work the way they are doing it.

We could ask the question, legitimately: How many lives have been lost because of the ineptitude of this strategy? How many lives have been lost? And how many people have been maimed and wounded because we did not provide the body armor to our troops? You want to talk about patriotism? How many troops were killed or wounded by the shells and the weapons that came from the ammo dumps that we were not smart enough to protect? How many lives have been lost and how many limbs have been amputated because there were not enough troops in the beginning in order to provide people with the support and safety and the control of the country? How much bigger and more dangerous is al-Qaida today because we outsourced the job of capturing him at Tora Bora to Afghans instead of using the First Marines or the 10th Mountain Division or even the SEALs who were there?

We are where we are today in this war on terror because of misjudgments. And I believe those misjudgments continue.

How many times have we heard that we are turning the corner or that this is a moment of turning the corner, and yet momentum was lost? Momentum was lost after the elections. Momentum was lost after the passage of the Constitution. Momentum was lost in the last months while we waited and waited and waited for Iraqi politicians to stop playing around and form a government.

I do not think our soldiers deserve that interim period, personally. And the question now is, how do you best protect our troops? How do you best secure our objectives? How do you best deal with the problem of an Iraq where Iraqis need to defend their own rights and interests?

Americans cannot do it for them. Yes, we can provide backup. Yes, we can provide insurance against a total implosion. Yes, we can provide security with respect to the efforts to go after al-Qaida. And our amendment contemplates all of that. But it also contemplates a transition based on experience.

The Iraqis needed a deadline for the transfer of authority to the Provisional Government. The Iraqis needed a deadline for the Constitution. They needed a deadline for their elections. They needed a deadline for their own formation of a government. They even have a self-imposed deadline for the transition of the Constitution in these next months.

Why then, when the Iraqis themselves are saying they can take over their security, when the Iraqi Government itself says withdrawing American troops would be helpful, would we not coordinate with the Iraqi Government a drawdown that makes it clear that we are standing them up?

Now, speaking of the stand-up, I thought the policy of our Government—how many times have we heard it from the President: ''As they stand up, we will stand down.'' He announced that in a speech to the American people. He has announced it in press conferences.

Well, here we are. In the trips I made to Iraq, General Petraeus, and his now successor, showed us charts that indicated 272,000 was the goal to train and equip. We are now at 264,600. That is as of June 14, 2006. The goal was 272,000.

Now, I think they moved the goal out to 325,000. But notwithstanding, how many have stood down? If the goal is to stand down as they stand up, and we have stood up 264,000—incidentally, in addition to the 264,000, there are 144,000 facilities protection service personnel working in 27 ministries. So you have a total of almost 400,000 Iraqis trained and equipped. And where is the stand-down?

I believe it is essential to accelerate this transition. That is the only way to reduce the targeting of our troops. It is the only way to invest other countries in the reality that the United States will not always be there, and they need to take a stake in their own region.

Right now, because of the way they feel about this administration, and because we are simply there ''staying the course,'' they have no compulsion whatsoever to come to the table. The only way you are going to bring them to the table, in my judgment, is to change that equation.

So we have a very significant, broad-based plan for an international diplomatic effort, beginning with bilateral, and working up, ultimately, through the bilateral to a summit that we know can be successful. That is the way in which we will invest in a new security arrangement for the region and protect the United States of America's long-term interests more effectively.

Mr. President, I see that another colleague has come and would like to speak now. I just close by saying that——

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, before the Senator closes, I would like to say a word or two with him.

Mr. KERRY. I would be delighted to do that.

Mr. WARNER. You finish your closing and I will wait.

Mr. KERRY. I would be happy to do so. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. President, I heard the Senator from South Dakota say that there are occasions when a generation faces a struggle between good and evil. I agree with that. There is good and there is evil in this world. And what radical fascist extremists are doing in the name of religion is evil. I know as well as anybody here in the Senate that we have to stand up to that. But we have to stand up to it in the best traditions and values of our country. We have to stand up to it in a way that brings people to our side and does not alienate them.

It is incomprehensible to me that after these several years, where we started with ''we are all Americans'' post-9/11, and the world was at our side, that we have now seen radical, extreme terrorists isolate the United States of America in that particular part of the world. That is a failure of policy. And it is a failure that makes the United States of America less secure, not more.

Some people have said: Well, if you tell the terrorists that we are leaving in a few days—whatever period of time—I remind them, we are not leaving altogether. We are going to leave our special forces personnel who are capable of taking out the terrorists.

But the bottom line is that they are not waiting for anything today. We just lost two troops in the most brutal, horrible manner. They are not waiting now. And the fact is that unless we get Iraqis to resolve those issues I talked about, this will continue or even get worse.

So ignoring all the warnings of history itself, in a moment of total ideological excess, this administration has managed to make the ancient cradle of civilization look a lot like Vietnam.

I think there is a path forward. I think there is a better way to secure our interests. There is a better way to fight the war on terror. There is a better way to stand up to Iraq. There is a better way to respect their sovereignty. There is a better way to protect our troops.

I hope the U.S. Senate will look carefully at that.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, first, I would say this has been a good debate. Say what you want. I listened very carefully to what you said, and there are certain elements with which I agree with you. You and I have known each other a long time. I have great respect for your military career, the accomplishments you have had. I think you often shared that with regard to my modest career.

But I must say, I kind of bit my tongue here a few minutes ago when you said in our old days we used to have a colloquy and talked. I arrived on the floor of this Senate at around 9:30, when I first got here. It is exactly 12 hours now that I have been on this floor. And the first thing I said—and I don't want to personalize this—to the other side of the aisle was: Now, let's try to engage in a colloquy and exchange some views. I did say that since we were under a time constraint my questions would be charged to me, the replies from the other side charged to your side. It seemed to me fair enough. We had 5 hours before us at that time. But I have to tell you, I was flatly turned down.

So now, after 12 hours and your invitation to enter into a colloquy, I say to my good friend, you can ask me any question you wish. And I might start off with a question or two for you.

Mr. KERRY. I would be delighted.

Mr. President, let me just say to the distinguished chairman, I don't have a question for him because he has not said anything outrageous.

Mr. WARNER. Beg your pardon?

Mr. KERRY. I said, the Senator from Virginia has not said anything outrageous that begs a question at this point.

But I will say this: I do understand the difficulties that the manager was under.

Mr. WARNER. Well, that is history. We are here now. Why don't we make the best of it?

Mr. KERRY. I know. But he had wanted more than 5 hours, as you know. We are where we are.

Mr. WARNER. We are here now.

Mr. KERRY. And I think he had more speakers than he was able to fit in.

Mr. WARNER. Well, I must say, I shared that on this side, but I was willing to take the heat.

Mr. KERRY. But I would be delighted to answer any questions.

Mr. WARNER. All right. We have the opportunity, Senator. Is there anything you wish to ask of me? And I will ask a few of you.

Mr. KERRY. Would the Senator not agree with me that the fundamental crisis of Iraq today is not particularly with Zarqawi having been killed and the treasure-trove of information we found—which, incidentally, happened because Iraqis gave Iraqis information and F–16s from outside came in and took him out. So there was an Iraqi component of that, which can still function with the setup that we are setting forward. But wouldn't the Senator agree, Mr. President, that the fundamental problem today is that 98 percent of the insurgency is Shia-Sunni, Sunni-Shia sectarian violence, militias within the military?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I don't know what that fraction is. But in discussions with senior military, clearly, they have said the insurgents, the foreign invaders, the others who have come in have dropped in terms of—somewhat—numbers of incidents. And, indeed, the sectarian violence—Sunni versus Shia, Kurds to some extent—has grown enormously. So I cannot qualify it. But the Senator is correct.

And that leads me to my first question, because——

Mr. KERRY. Can I just finish the question?

Would the Senator then not agree that there are serious limits on what our troops can do to resolve sectarian violence?

Mr. WARNER. Well, that remains to be seen. They are, right now, for example, in Baghdad, fighting side by side. A very significant number of Iraqi troops, together with the components of our troops, are trying to bring about a greater measure of stability and security in the very capital of this country.

I think we should make known to those following the debate and those who listened to the debate with Senator LEVIN, Senator LEVIN's amendment was a sense of the Congress. The amendment of our colleague from Massachusetts very explicitly becomes law,

if it were adopted and eventually went into the bill and the bill survived the conference.

The point I wish to make is, you are directing the President. For example, it says: The President shall redeploy, commencing in 2006, this year, United States forces from Iraq by July 1, 2007. So this is law. As we used to say in the old days, we are shooting real bullets with this one, not just a sense of the Congress.

Throughout the debate, not only this one in the past day or two on this bill, but we have always, certainly, on this side, resisted timetables. You talk about putting together a summit. That is on page 2, section (b), Iraq Summit: The President should work with the leaders of the Government of Iraq to convene a summit as soon as possible that includes those leaders, leaders of the governments of each of the countries bordering Iraq, representatives of the Arab League, the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—I think that is important to have NATO in there—representatives of the European Union, and leaders of the governments of each permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, for the purpose of reaching a comprehensive political agreement for Iraq that engenders the support of the Sunnis, the Shias, and the Kurds by ensuring the equitable distribution of oil revenues—that is a very important point you make, disbanding the militias—another very important point, strengthening internal security, reviving reconstruction efforts and fulfilling related international economic aid commitments, securing Iraq's borders, and providing for a sustainable federalist structure in Iraq.

Those are all important subjects, commendable goals. But first let's go back. It has taken the Iraqis 18 months since the first election in early 2005, through three elections, through the formation of the first permanent government. And the first permanent government is just, as you and I as old sailors would say, getting its sea legs. You start a conference like this—and I think it is a good idea—but the first question that is going to be asked is, can we proceed to achieve any of these goals if we have overhanging this the redeployment of our forces by July 1, 2007?

Senator, that is a timetable. That is a concept which I and I think the majority in this Chamber have continuously rejected. How could you ask the other nations of the world to come in and begin to put their credit on the line, their dollars on the line, if you have this timetable to pull out the very foundation that is supporting such progress as has been achieved in the 18 months of getting the first government up and testing their sea legs?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, that is a wonderful question and a very appropriate one. I really appreciate it. It gives me a chance to talk about the viability of this. First of all, may I remind the distinguished chairman what I just said a moment ago. We are at 264,000. We have 144,000 more. That is 400,000 people prepared to go. They are in the streets now. We have 1 year to continue to work with them. Prime Minister Maliki has said himself that by the end of this year, in 16 out of 18 provinces they will be able to take over security. This is contemplated within the framework that the Prime Minister himself has adopted. This respects their sovereignty. It respects their capacity.

Secondly, in my conversations with leaders in the region, as recently as this year, ranging from the President of Egypt to the King of Jordan and others, what I gleaned from those conversations is, they are waiting for a series of kind of diplomatic and business conference efforts that do get them invested and invest the whole region in an understanding that the United States is going to be leaving, and they need to begin to accept that reality.

The longer we stay, the longer we delay their readiness and their need—let alone willingness—to come to the table. I respectfully suggest that it is within the framework of a year.

We did the Dayton Accords in less time. Milosevic did not want to come to the table. President Clinton persuaded Yeltsin to create a pressure point that brought people there. In effect, we made things happen against people's will by creating the pressure. This is the same kind of situation.

I say respectfully to the Senator, we have a far better chance of spending less money, losing less lives and being more effective in the war on terror if we pursue this than if we simply do what we are doing today.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, it might be the case, but I would be willing to make a modest wager with you that if you got this conference under way, the first thing that they would ask would be to suspend this timetable of July 1, 2007.

Mr. KERRY. And if that were the case, and they were prepared to come to the table to resolve these issues and be part of this process, then the President could come back to us and we would respond accordingly. We are not stupid. We want to act in the best interest of our country. The question is, how do you begin to push people to a place where they realize they have to confront these realities?

Secondly, the Senator's question makes a presumption that I just fundamentally disagree with and don't see in this amendment. That is if we pull out the foundation, I think the Senator said, we specifically say we arrive at a schedule coordinated with the Government of Iraq, leaving only the minimal number of forces that are critical to completing the mission of standing up Iraqi forces.

I have asked the Senator from Virginia, what are we there for? What are we there to do? We are there to fight al-Qaida. We allow for that. We are there to stand up Iraqis for themselves. We allow that. And we are certainly there to protect American facilities. So what is it that is absent from here that would somehow pull out the foundation from anything?

Mr. WARNER. I say to the Senator, I cannot see, for example, the governments of each country bordering Iraq suddenly beginning to rush in if they feel that a civil war could start. The pulling out of the troops, the setting of a timetable will be a signal to all of the various factions. I will concede it is the Shia against the Sunnis that is the major faction. Wait them out. Let's let the troops flow out and then we will topple this government with a civil war.

It seems to me, I say to my colleague, you cannot expect these nations that border Iraq, the Arab League, I can't see that they would step up and say, we are willing to do everything. But wait a minute, coalition forces——

Mr. KERRY. Let me say to the Senator, I know he doesn't want American troops in the middle of a civil war. I know he doesn't think that that is why we sent our troops there.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I share that concern, but——

Mr. KERRY. That is where they are.

Mr. WARNER. It is the presence of our troops today that is probably holding it back from becoming a civil war.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, may I say respectfully, we will continue to be able to do that. Over the course of the next year, with over-the-horizon capacity and with our ability to move in an emergency, we are not going away. We have plenty of troops in Kuwait. We could have plenty of troops over the horizon. That is not going to fall apart. The problem is that the tasks that the Senator is referring to, each of them are civilian tasks. They are political tasks. You don't need 138,000 American troops as targets to complete those tasks when you have 400,000 Iraqis allegedly trained and equipped and prepared to defend their country.

Let me ask the Senator: Did Iraq or did it not fight Iran for 10 years within the last 25 years?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I remember well that conflict because I was then on the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. KERRY. And they lost a million people fighting for almost 10 years for their country. These are the same people. Four years later we are still driving trucks down the street and our guys are taking IEDs. Are you telling me that they don't have people who can drive a truck? They don't have people to go out on patrol? Why aren't our people garrisoned and being held in reserve in case there is an implosion? What are we doing with our troops being the ones that have to go out? I don't get it. I believe there is a better way to wage this effort. That is what this amendment contemplates.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we just disagree. I feel this government hasn't

been given a chance. It has only been 6 weeks. It took 18 months to get to where they are today. If we were to enact this into law, presumably the authorization bill would be signed by the President—there is a question whether if this is in there, he would sign it—this would go into law in a matter of a few months. And then suddenly to try and call on the rest of the world—and by the way, I certainly did not see the European Union trying to help form the coalition forces. Of each permanent member of the Security Council, the only one, Great Britain, stepped forward. I don't see those countries suddenly coming in and making the types of commitments that this paragraph requires, if we are going to pull out the very stability that is holding together this fragile government and preventing a civil war today.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, that is a legitimate question and it deserves, obviously, an answer.

Those countries, many of them, are reluctant to become engaged with the United States as long as they see us on the status quo path, because they see the same series of mistakes that I have just cited. If you talk to them, they will tell you, they don't have confidence that this administration is going to get it right or move in the right direction. That is why I believe you have to come in and lay out a path.

In my judgment, historically, most Presidents would not want the Congress telling them to do this. If I were President, I wouldn't want them telling me to do this. But at the same time, I would hope that I had consulted with Congress and not been as stubborn and not made the series of mistakes they have so that you wind up having alienated the very people you need to solve the problem. If you don't have some kind of regional security arrangement, the situation with Iran will grow more serious.

Iran loves the fact that we are bogged down in Iraq. This just plays perfect for Iran. And Iran has a much stronger lever over us with respect to its current nuclear path because they know they could wreak havoc with what is happening on the ground in Iraq, and that restricts our choices and options.

We will be stronger in counterproliferation efforts, we will be stronger in our efforts against terrorism in the region, and we will be able to create the credibility to bring these other countries to the table, which they are not willing to do today, if we make this kind of transition. If they understand that we are acknowledging that our presence is a problem, they have to step up because they don't want regional chaos. I believe that is exactly what helps us get it done. That is what changes the dynamics.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I think we have covered this point. We will just have to agree to disagree.

I would draw your attention to the clause where you say consultation with the Congress is required. Here we are, basically on the eve of the August recess which starts the first week in August. We come back here as a Congress for maybe 30 days or 5 weeks in September. Then leave again for elections. You say:

> The President shall consult with the Congress regarding the schedule for redeployment and shall submit such schedule to Congress as part of the report required . . .

You know, we know how this institution works. We have been here for two decades apiece. I say, if the President were to devise a redeployment schedule to meet 2007, when do you think the Congress might swing into action and take such responsibility, as implied here, through the consultation process? I presume Congress could take an action to stop it. You are talking about July 1, and I don't see the Congress acting on such a proposal in a timely manner.

Mr. KERRY. Well, if that is all that gets in the way of this, Mr. President, I am confident we can find expediting language or other language that would resolve it.

But I will tell you, Congress is going to be dealing with this issue next year at this time if we don't change this policy. Like it or not, we are going to be here debating it one way or the other.

Mr. WARNER. That may be true, but I will ask another question. Drop down to paragraph 3, ''maintenance of over-the-horizon troop presence.'' ''The President should maintain an over-the-horizon troop presence to prosecute the war on terror and protect regional security interests.''

Where would those troops, in all likelihood, be put?

Mr. KERRY. Most likely in Kuwait, Qatar, the Gulf States, if you work out a security arrangement.

Mr. WARNER. That would require a substantial amount of installations to be constructed.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, we already have—as the Senator knows, we have been there and there are a number of pretty substantial facilities already in Kuwait, and there are others regionally, in my judgment; and that is the purpose of this arrangement, to prepare to work on an accommodation, providing it was in the context of a larger security arrangement. What I have learned—and again, we all talk to people and try to learn as much as we can.

General Zinni was saying to me the other day that he believes the Gulf States are particularly interested in some kind of a regional security arrangement because they are threatened by the instability and by the questions about Iran and the challenge to the oilfields and so forth. That is precisely the kind of issue that has to be arrived at, initially bilaterally and ultimately through this international conference.

I know the Senator was willing to bet something a little while ago. I am not sure we should do that in the Senate, but I would certainly bet my reputation that, one way or the other, we are going to be ultimately having to engage in this kind of multilateral diplomacy to resolve these issues. The sooner we get about it, the better we will be in fighting this war on terror.

Mr. WARNER. I caution my colleague because that is saying to this new Iraqi Government that you are going to fail.

Mr. KERRY. No, sir. About the regional security, I said we will need ultimately to deal with the question of Iran, the oilfields, the instability in the region. I think the greater Middle East is going to require this kind of focus and attention one way or the other.

As I said during the debate a moment ago, I am not somebody who suggests that we cannot make this still work out somehow. I am not in that school. But I do know that on the current path, it is going to cost more lives, more money, and it is going to cost us prolonged loss of relationship and reputation within the region and is going to set us back in terms of other interests we have. This can be done more effectively, and that is what I am here to argue for. How do we protect our security interests more effectively? How do we advance our safety and security in the world? How do we win the war on terror more effectively and stand Iraq up more effectively? I believe setting the date accomplishes all of those things.

Mr. WARNER. You have to admit that July 1, 2007, is a timetable; am I not correct?

Mr. KERRY. Yes, for the beginning of the transition. But as it makes very clear, if you get to 2 months before the end, or 3 months, and you can see the progress being made, and there is another month or so that a certain number of troops need to be stood up, or whatever, we allow that—the ability of the President to make that determination. If it is done in the best traditions of the Congress, it will be done with the consultation of the various committees and the Congress itself. And then you would have the kind of unity in the pursuit of this policy that is absent today or we would not have had this debate for the last several days. I know the chairman believes this——

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator is operating on a premise that if this became law and the President issued a timetable, suddenly the level of violence would begin to be lowered considerably.

Mr. KERRY. No, sir, I am not making that presumption, Mr. President. I am saying that unless you resolve the fundamental political tension—the Shia don't have oil revenues. They want a strong Iraq with a central government. The Shia are well taken care of. The Kurds are happy in the north; they want to be left alone. They have oil revenues. So you have Kirkut as a major issue you have to resolve ultimately. But you have this fundamental tension between whether you are going

to have this federal loose-knit structure which the Shia want, with certain individuals with strong designs on future political power in that region, or whether you are going to have a manageable entity. That is why the former counsel for Foreign Relations and Senator BIDEN and others have joined in this idea of partition. The only way you are going to get there—and I don't think it is a particularly viable option—is through this kind of international conference. If you don't ultimately have a resolution by the parties politically, you are going to have a civil war. They have a few months under their own Constitution to try to resolve these things. That is going to be unavoidable.

I am not suggesting that the violence is going to suddenly vanish. The question is, How are you ultimately going to take away the rationale for the folks who are engaging in it? As I said, there are five different groups, and we are not dealing very effectively with it. You have criminal activity, you have Baathists, you have insurgents, Iraqi insurgents, and you have al-Qaida, and you have each of them that requires a different approach. Our military is not the answer to any of them, except al-Qaida. Al-Qaida, we can continue to prosecute with unit 145 operations and other things, and we can make that happen.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if you say the violence is not going to stop if this became law, if this becomes law, we have to make a movement in reduction in 2006. That is in there. There has to be a commencement. You would not wait and send out a platoon on Christmas Eve. You mean a significant drawdown, leaving only 6 months in the following year to get the bulk of the forces out. And if we start moving those troops, I tell you that will engender a higher level of violence and lead possibly to a civil war.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I respectfully disagree. We have a civil war today, to begin with. We have a civil war today. People are being killed in the dead of night, shackled in handcuffs, beheaded, found in basements; kids are being hauled out of buses every day. The number of sectarian incidents is many times what it was just months ago, a year ago, 2 years ago. Now, how are you going to resolve it?

I don't think there is any Member of the Senate who voted to send our troops to be in the middle of a civil war. Our troops are there to bolster the Government. We are there to support that Government's ability to make it on its own. How are they going to do that? By standing up these 400,000 security people. The faster they understand they have to go out and do it, the faster the violence is going to subside. Either they make it or it ''ain't'' makeable because we cannot make it for them. That is the bottom line that people have to understand.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my colleague that I agree fundamentally with the premise that the Iraqi people, in the final analysis, are the ones who are going to be able to bring about their own measure of democracy and enable this Government to exercise sovereignty.

Other Senators want to participate, so I will soon yield. I know both of us have had the opportunity to serve in the military. There is nothing more painful than the loss of a brother member of the service. I don't know about you, but it has been difficult for me today to contain my absolute outrage about what happened, Mr. President, to these two young soldiers who raised their right arms and volunteered for this service in Iraq, to have been captured and brutally mauled and executed.

You know, I would say a rough calculation is that we probably have had about a million and a quarter Americans—that is, our brave men and women in uniform and many civilians from the departments and agencies of our Government, including a number of American contractors—who have contributed to where we are today in this new Government standing up and beginning to exercise the powers of sovereignty.

I say to my good friend, given that heavy investment, the risks taken by over a million and a quarter of our citizens, to send out a signal now—and it is a timetable, Senator—that July 1, 2007, barely 12 months from now that we would probably have under your formula—I ran a calculation—you are going to leave some behind for training and some for logistics, but basically I would say the fighting forces are out. Some may be pre-positioned in other countries nearby. There is a clause in here requiring a report as to how soon they can come back to the continental limits of the United States. That is going to send a signal, and that worries me, that all these people who made these risks and contributions are going to sit back and say, right at the threshold of really the first rays of hope to get this problem solved, we send this type of signal.

What did you feel when we lost these two individuals? I know you felt it probably as badly as I did. I cannot understand why they could be saying over there that, see what we did, we beheaded two, and what did the Congress do? It passed this law that said our troops would be redeployed by July 1, 12 months from today.

Senator, timing in life is everything. The timing for this concept you have has not arrived, I say to my good friend.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, there are few people in the Senate for whom I have more respect and affection than the Senator from Virginia. We have known each other a long time, and we have traveled together. I am grateful to him for the respect and consideration he has shown for this debate this evening.

When I heard those two guys were captured, my heart sank because I immediately envisioned the worst. The worst happened. I thought about them throughout that time period, until they were found. I was not surprised that they were brutalized in the most horrific, disgraceful way, and may I add—and I know the Senator knows this—in ways that contravene every law of warfare. But I believe we have a better chance of honoring what they went there for and what all of our soldiers have died for, given something for, if we adopt a policy of reality.

Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I went to serve in Vietnam in 1968. There was turmoil in this country. Remember the Chicago convention, remember McCarthy, and Bobby Kennedy had been killed in June. In fact, I arrived back in Long Beach, CA, at the dock after the first deployment in the Gulf of Tonkin the night he was killed. It was the first radio words we heard. I remember that turmoil over the war. I remember Richard Nixon running for President with a secret plan for peace. I remember how people invested in the concept of peace. Years later, we read in Robert McNamara's book how he knew, as Secretary of Defense, while he was sending troops over there, that we weren't going to be successful. Now, from 1968 until 1975, when we left in that dramatic helicopter moment off the embassy, almost half of the people who died were lost in that period of time—for a policy that our leaders knew wasn't working.

I am not going to be a Member of the Senate in good standing and in good conscience and support a policy in Iraq that I believe is going to add people to whatever Iraqi memorial will be created, at a time where I am convinced this isn't going to work for them and it is not going to work for the Iraqis. I believe we have a moral responsibility to those soldiers who died to do our best to get it right, and I just don't believe staying the course, more of the same, is getting it right.

If you don't resolve the differences between Shia and Sunni where 98 percent of this fight is taking place, we are stuck. And I believe it is only by pushing the process, by demanding something of everybody in the region, by demanding something of the Iraqis who are in uniform that we are going to properly defend the honor of those who served. We defend it by getting it right.

And may I add, we also defend it by honoring those who come back. There is a $6 billion shortfall in current services in our VA budget. That is just unacceptable.

We have a big job to do. I look forward to working with the Senator to do it.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will conclude. The Senator from Massachusetts and I have had this conversation about that period of history before. We will have it again and again. I recall, I went to the Pentagon in February 1969 and was there for 5 years in the Navy Secretariat. As the Secretary of the

Navy, the Senator always said I was his boss. He has been very respectful about that.

I remember when his Silver Star came through our Secretariat at that time. I went back and checked for accuracy, and it was accurate, I say to the Senator. He knows that, and I know that.

I thought many times about that period, and I recall that the then-Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, came to the conclusion that we had to begin a program of Vietnamization and begin to look toward bringing our troops home. I remember that, and the rest is history.

I share those concerns. I, like the Senator from Massachusetts, every day, particularly in my responsibility as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, worry about these men and women in uniform. Like the Senator, I visit the hospitals, go to the funerals when it is appropriate for me to do so. I share that burden. I think most of our colleagues do. I happen to know that our President shares those burdens.

Mr. President, I say to the Senator, my friend, there is a time for everything, and I feel ever so strongly that we have to give this new government more time to try and exercise that sovereignty before we take the very dramatic steps that the Senator from Massachusetts has set forth in this amendment, which I say not as a buzzword, but there is that timetable.

I do not think the other nations will come in. I do not think we could bring to bear the resources elsewhere in the world in the timetable that is laid down here.

There is one other point that we should consider, and that is we are there with a coalition of forces. I see no mention—maybe I didn't read it carefully—but no mention of what would Great Britain think if we were to take this somewhat unilateral action as the Senator proposes? What would Poland, what would the other nations think? They don't have the measure of the troops of quantity and so forth, but they are there in spirit.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, they are drawn down. There is a huge debate in Great Britain. They are prepared to draw down. They are ready.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I admire the courage of the Prime Minister of Great Britain. The Senator from Massachusetts has seen it, and I have seen it. We are political figures, he and I. We understand when we see another leader. He has stood with our President and our President has stood with him, unlike any two leaders of the United States and Great Britain since really Roosevelt and Churchill. It is remarkable what those two men have done.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, if I can just say, again, I repeat, this plan is a plan to be successful. It is a plan to strengthen all of our efforts in the war on terror. I have been to Great Britain. I have met with the leaders there. I know there are people there who believe we can do a better job in the war on terror, and I know they know the price they are paying for standing by us at this moment.

I believe this is a better way to actually fight the war on terror than we are doing today. If you accept that premise, you approach this differently. I think a lot of other countries believe it, too. All you have to do is look at the record of what is happening with respect to countries in the region, the number of incidents, the number of terrorists, the increase of al-Qaida. You can run down the list. Al-Qaida is in 60 to 80 countries. Osama bin Laden is still running around the mountains of northwest Pakistan or Afghanistan.

The fact is, one of the reasons we saw happen what happened probably is that it is a quick statement by the folks out there that: You may have got Zarqawi, but we are still around.

The fundamental problem remains the same. The Iraqis will not tolerate foreign jihadists—jihadists, actually I have been told, is not a great way to refer to them because it actually confers more of a God-given effort to them, and they don't deserve it. They are terrorists, they are just foreign terrorists, and we ought to quit giving them jihadists. But the fact is, they are not going to survive in Iraq if these security forces take hold and the Government stands up.

I believe, as the Senator does, that we want that Government to stand up. I think the best way to stand it up is shift the responsibility to it. And from all indications, they believe that, too. National Security Adviser al-Rubaie wrote in the Washington Post that we ought to withdraw the American troops; it will help us in the streets of Iraq. Prime Minister Maliki says they are prepared to take over.

He said: You could probably have well under 100,000 troops by the end of this year, and we are talking about a year from now.

This is reasonable beyond compare, and besides, it allows the President to make the decision of what we need to finish standing them up. A lot of people object to that, but I think it is smart. And it allows us to continue to use special forces against al-Qaida. That is exactly how we got Zarqawi.

I think this is, as I said many times—incidentally, Secretary Melvin Laird broke a 30-year silence and wrote in ''Foreign Affairs'' that we have to get our forces out of there and reduce the numbers because they are contributing to the occupation and to the insurgency. All you have to do is talk to any leader in the region and they will tell you we are working as our own worst partner by this large presence of American troops which is acting as a poster recruitment for terrorism.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we will conclude. I just say if we had more time, I would want to enter into another chapter of debate with the Senator on what would be the consequences if we saw failure; if this program of his, no matter how well conceived and how conscientious, were to trigger that failure, what would be the consequence.

The fact that this country could revert to a haven for further training of al-Qaida and terrorists from all over the world——

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, that is why we maintain over-the-horizon capacity. That is why we allow the finishing of the training of the Iraqis to stand up.

Look, whether it is the plan of the President or this plan, both of them are operating on some element of faith that hopefully the Government is going to stand up. If it doesn't, we all got a problem. What we have here is one resolution—I keep hearing people come to the floor and saying they are definitely against an indefinite presence in Iraq, but they are indefinitely against being definite about it. You can't have it both ways. Either you are going to push this process or we are locked in the current paradigm.

Does my colleague think the current paradigm is going to do it? It may, but I am saying this for the last time: If it does, it will be at a greater cost in American life; it will be at a greater cost in dollars; it will be at a greater cost to the war on terror; it will be at a greater cost to our reputation in the region; and I believe there is a better way to get this done.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my colleague, I think this has been a very worthwhile colloquy between us. I must say on this side, there are 55 who are going to stand tall and unify with no dissension on tomorrow at the time of the vote.

At this time, can I inquire as manager of the bill if there are other Senators desiring to speak?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, there are. Senator HARKIN wants to speak for a few minutes. I know Senator FEINGOLD wants to speak.

Mr. WARNER. I am prepared to remain here as long as is necessary.

Mr. KERRY. Senator FEINGOLD, I understand, will not, but Senator HARKIN wishes to speak.

Mr. WARNER. On this side, I see my colleague from Alabama, although he has had some opportunity, but very limited opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. WARNER. I am trying to accommodate Senators. I ask my friend, if he desires to speak, can he advise the manager of the bill how much time he would like?

Mr. HARKIN. I am not certain how much time I want. Who is next in line? Are we going back and forth?

Mr. WARNER. We are going back and forth, and I am about to relinquish the management of the bill to my good friend from Alabama.

The parliamentary situation is we remain on the bill, and debate can continue on the bill. We are not going to try and have time constraints. We are trying for the benefit of this infrastructure that has to remain in place and such Senators who may be listening to determine who would like to speak and for what period of time. That is all I am trying to ascertain.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I think the only speaker remaining on our side now is the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. WARNER. Can the Senator from Iowa advise the chairman as to how much time?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I looked over my remarks, and I say to the chairman, probably 20 minutes, I suppose. It depends if I go off.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Alabama desire some time also?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I say to the chairman, 20 to 30 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Good. I relinquish the management of this bill to the Senator from Alabama and such time that Senator SESSIONS and Senator HARKIN may require. I thank all for their participation.

Mr. KERRY. Can we enter into a unanimous consent agreement so we know what is happening?

Mr. WARNER. I think that will be advisable.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the final, concluding comments this evening be made by the Senator from Alabama, followed by the Senator from Iowa, at which time I believe the Senate will adjourn; is that accurate?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I think that is a reasonable request.

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

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, before the chairman leaves, I want to tell him how much I appreciated his analysis and summary of where we are. He noted that we may have had as many as a million or more people at one time or another investing their very lives in a successful operation of this country, and we have just gotten a government up and they have just elected a Defense Minister a few weeks ago and an Interior Minister.

Based on the long chairmanship and leadership of the Senator from Virginia in the Senate and as former Secretary of the Navy, let me ask the Senator again: Does he think that we would be creating grave risks that are not necessary by a precipitous withdrawal at this time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I think this chairman has resonated with debates for months on this issue of timetables. I say to my good friend from Massachusetts, as I stated in our colloquy here, clearly by setting forth a terminal date there is a timetable, and that, in my judgment, is a very destabilizing thing. It sends a signal that perhaps the United States has less than the will and the commitment, as clearly expressed by our President many times, most recently upon his return from his trip to Iraq just days ago, that we are there to help the Iraqi people achieve their goals.

Now we expect from them a level of cooperation to move, hopefully, most swiftly to establish a full range of sovereignty and the responsibility that goes along with that. All I have asked repeatedly is give them a chance to do that. We have 18 months in the making of this permanent unified Government. Give them a chance. I think that is the President's desire—I know it is.

Mr. SESSIONS. I remember when we were there just a few months ago.

Mr. WARNER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. SESSIONS. Before this permanent government was in place, and I remember you and Senator LEVIN, along with Senator SALAZAR and others——

Mr. WARNER. The Senator from Wyoming, and Senator BINGAMAN was with us.

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes. And I remember you telling the leader of Iraq at that time that they were being challenged and they had to step up and assume responsibility.

Mr. WARNER. That is right.

Mr. SESSIONS. It is not as if they haven't been told that. And they assured us at that time that they understood that, and they felt that responsibility deeply. Is that the impression you got?

Mr. WARNER. That is absolutely correct. I will even go a step further. I said: The American people have a strong voice in this, and the elected representatives in Congress listen to those voices. You need only look at the expressions being put forth today.

But leadership requires reassuring our people, reassuring the Iraqis, reassuring the consortium of nations of the coalition, reassuring all others that this fight in Iraq portends the next half century of the history of that region. If it fails, who knows where the end of the strife will come in that region—the possible destabilization of one of the largest concentrations of energy in the world, which suddenly begins to impact in many ways on the quality of life here at home and throughout the world. That whole infrastructure could be challenged if this Nation devolves into a vicious civil war and anarchy follows and a haven for terrorism follows. We cannot let that happen.

I just said to my good friend, timing is everything. The time for this amendment has certainly, in my judgment, not come, and a timetable is not a good signal to send out. I yield the floor, and I thank my colleague.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I have one more question I want to ask my colleague. I remember—I personally have a vivid recollection of being in a meeting, our delegation was, just a few months ago in Baghdad, with the Sunni leader. Do you remember the insecurity he felt about whether our Nation would remain in Iraq? He made a commitment to join with this Government, and some of his Sunni people didn't agree with that. He realized that a precipitous withdrawal which he had heard something about in the media could jeopardize the ability of that country to hold together, and maybe even jeopardize his own life because he had stepped up and invested himself in trying to create a good and decent democratic government. Do you remember that discussion?

Mr. WARNER. I remember it very vividly. Senator LEVIN was there. He questioned these individuals quite thoroughly, as did I, and as did you. And it is clear there is an unfortunate dichotomy that the Sunni people are, in large measure, responsible for those areas—al Anbar and Baghdad—where this great instability and insurrection takes place today. At the same time, I think the Sunnis should recognize that it is the participation of the United States and the other coalition partners that gives them the security against the majority of the Shiites who could revolt in such a way and challenge them and their future.

So let us hope that this government, which is a unity government with Sunni representation, can take hold. But it must be given the opportunity to send its roots down, to gain its stability and give it a chance. This amendment, in my judgment, would send the wrong signal and strip them of that chance.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator for his comments and his leadership. It has been a privilege to be a part of this debate. I listened to this debate that has gone on tonight, this discussion between he and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who is most eloquent. But I would just say to Senator WARNER that your remarks tonight are worthy of the valor and the courage and the fidelity of the troops we have sent forth into harm's way, and I am honored to serve with you on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. President, looking at the resolution that Senator KERRY has proposed, I would just make a couple of summary comments. No. 1, he has a date in which the vast majority of our troops, virtually all combat forces, under this amendment would be out by next summer, whether or not that is the right thing militarily. At the same time, he proposes that we have some sort of regional conference, and that this regional conference would meet somewhere while we are pulling out troops. And it is going to meet and decide what is going to happen in Iraq. I would just say that is not the way the world works.

Does anybody here think if we get a group of nations in that region to gather somewhere and meet and talk about Iraq, while we pull out troops, and violence escalates, that they are just going to pass a resolution, and somehow these terrorists, these Baathists are going to stop their fighting? Does anybody think that? I wish it were so.

Wouldn't it be wonderful if we could just get the nations in that region to go off somewhere and have a conference in Rome or London or Paris and have a vote about Iraq and the war would all end and there would be peace and we could just take our soldiers out and these other nations who are concerned about it, and if things get bad in that country of Iraq, they are just going to send their troops in and fix it? We really have to be more clear in our thinking about these issues.

That is not going to happen. That is fantasy land, let me say, with all seriousness. I wish we could do that. Wouldn't it be wonderful if we could. Would it were so, they would just step up, the other nations in the region, and take over and fix this problem for us. And wouldn't it be nice if we could just have some sort of conference in Iraq and bring in the hostile parties and sit them down at a table and just reach an agreement? Wouldn't it be nice if we could do that? I wish it were so. I wish the enemy we faced was not the kind of enemy that when their new top leader captures two American soldiers, he personally brags about brutalizing them as he kills them. Wouldn't it be nice if the enemy we faced were more principled than that? Wouldn't it be better?

But I am afraid the reality is different. I am afraid the reality is that we are facing a radical terrorist enemy that knows it can't win a war conventionally, knows it can't win a vote of the people so therefore they have settled upon an asymmetric method of warfare to utilize whatever destructive capacity they can generate, even the suicide of women and children to carry out their diabolical ends, and they are going to continue that. Mr. President, it is the kind of threat that we are just going to have to face, and we are going to have to strengthen this Iraqi Government.

I heard it said that we can never be involved in a civil war. Well, we were there and we talked about whether there was a civil war, and I think those of us who understand in terms of the United States of America what a civil war is, that is not a civil war in Iraq. But there is a high level of violence, a higher level of violence than we cannot accept and the Iraqi people cannot accept. We know that. It is not quite the same thing as a civil war. But that conflict can be brought under control. I believe we are on the verge of bringing it under control, but it will not be easy.

Some say we haven't done anything like this before. Well, how about Bosnia? Wasn't that a brutal sectarian war that we had to send forces into? What about Kosovo? Wasn't that basically a civil war that we sent our troops into? It hasn't been settled perfectly today, but both of those countries are having some stability. They don't have strong governments, frankly. I have been somewhat disappointed in how Kosovo's Government has come together, but at least it is a peaceful country and operating in a fairly decent way. So to say that we can't help make a difference when there is sectarian violence by the utilization of American forces, I think, is wrong. We have done it before, and we can do it again.

I would say to my colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts, he has just had a litany of criticisms of the conduct of this war. I wonder what he would have said were he in the Senate during the Civil War. With all the problems and the years that went by, and General Lee with smaller forces defeated repeatedly the larger forces, what would the Senator from Massachusetts be saying about that? Would he be saying: We need to pull back our troops? And what about World War II and all of the problems we had, and World War I for example? Senator WARNER just gave me on the trip I referred to recently a book about World War I, and I just completed it. We lost 18,000 people killed in 1 day at the Battle of Meuse, Argonne, in World War I—18,000 in 1 day.

I have talked to Alabama families who lost children in Iraq. We have lost 2,500 in Iraq in the time that we have been there, and that is a grim number. Every one of those losses represents the best kind of people this country can produce, and my heart breaks for those families. But the cost of freedom has always been high, and our interests in fighting a war on terrorism is high, and we have to be smart about it. We have to be careful about it. We have to have a debate in this country, and that is all right. But I would say again that I was very proud of this Senate when we voted a few days ago on the original Kerry amendment to have the troops out by the end of this year, and it was voted down 93 to 6. Presumably, he may have accumulated some more votes now for moving the date to 6 months later, but I suspect he will not have a whole lot of votes for that because it is just not good policy.

We have a country that has only really formed on a permanent basis in the last few weeks. The Prime Minister was elected just a couple of months ago. His last Cabinet members were just recently selected. They were voted on by the Parliament, elected by the people. Millions of Iraqis have gone out and voted three times now.

So this Government, the real Government, not a transitional or interim government, but the real Government, fully elected by the people, has only been in office a few weeks. And the enemy knows that if this Government is successful, their message of violence and hatred, extremism, oppression of women, they know those visions, those ideas they have that they want to impose on the people will be lost, and they don't want that to happen. And they are doing everything they possibly can to win the war in Iraq.

The Iraqi Army and the Iraqi police are taking far more casualties now than the Americans are. They are out front in many provinces in Iraq. They are conducting military operations on a regular basis by themselves. Sometimes we go together; sometimes we have embedded Americans with the Iraqi forces. They are stepping up. But they are not ready yet. Their military is not there yet. It is not as fully equipped and it is not as fully trained. They don't have the confidence and the chain of command, their logistics are not where we would like them to be compared to a modern American Army. And they can be vulnerable to these kinds of terrorist attacks by which small groups of the military can be overrun or attacked and it can destabilize that country right now.

So I think the best course is to listen to our military leaders as we decide how and whether to conduct our military operations there.

I remember being with GEN John Abizaid, commander for CENTCOM, the combatant commander for this region of the world. He has been involved in this closely. He speaks Arabic. He grew up for a number of years in the Middle East. He understands this area. He has been a student of it. He is a brilliant general. He told me on an airplane back when people were saying: We need to send in more troops—he said: No, we don't need—in his opinion—he said: We don't need to send in more troops. We need to train up the Iraqi forces so we can reduce our presence.

I say that to you, Mr. President, because I want the American people to know that the combatant commander, the one who is giving the advice to President Bush, does not believe in excessively maintaining forces in Iraq. He understands that it would be better if we could reduce them.

But he also understands the challenges that exist in Iraq today.

That is why his recommendation is that we not have a resolution like this. And General Casey likewise, it is his recommendation that we not have a resolution like this.

I thought about the idea that somehow we can have, as one Senator said, an accelerated redeployment, or really a date for withdrawal, under Senator KERRY's amendment. Will this pullout, cut-and-run mentality, help us and help the Iraqis defeat al-Qaida? Really? If we pull out right now, will that help the Iraqis defeat the al-Qaida forces? Will it help reduce sectarian violence?

I wish it were so. I wish we could pull right out and they would all be nice and we wouldn't have any more fighting.

Would it help reduce the criminality in the country? Would it help strengthen and provide confidence to those members of the new Iraqi Government? Or would it increase their nervousness, would it increase their insecurity, at a time when we need to get that government off to a good start and, as Senator WARNER said, send their roots into the soil for stability?

Would it help establish the police force if we just pulled out? A lot of

Iraqis are signing up every day to be policemen. They have become targets of the terrorists on a regular basis. But I think they are provided confidence and comfort to know the American military is there to support them. Right now I do not believe there is enough strength in the Iraqi military, in the context of the Iraqi people, to survive a precipitous withdrawal. I think it could destabilize them. Maybe not, but I think there is a real likelihood of it.

I just would say we ought to think carefully about what our generals have told us.

The amendment submitted by Senator KERRY, I think, goes too far. I do not believe a conference, a meeting in any capital city anywhere in the world is going to settle the conflict in Iraq. I do not believe pulling our troops out is going to reduce the threats in Iraq. I believe what we have to do is do what General Abizaid and General Casey have told us; let's maintain our presence, let's draw it down as rapidly as we can, but let's do it consistent with the raising up of a legitimate military and police force in that country. And let's do what we can to strengthen and create credibility in the Iraqi Government.

You should never tell your enemy what your plan is. You should never give him a guaranteed plan of withdrawal or any other plan that you are going to execute, particularly when you are dealing with an asymmetric enemy like these terrorists.

Clausewitz warned of this type of war planning and making your intentions known. He said this ''the essence of the defense''—think what these terrorists are about. They are defending their dream of a terrorist-dominated state.

Clausewitz says:

> The essence of the defense is waiting: waiting until the attacker clarifies his own intentions; waiting until the balance of forces shifts; waiting for any improvement in the defender's situation, whether from the culminating process described above, from outside intervention, from mobilization of his own resources, or from some chance development. Time is almost always on the side of the defender.

Our Nation is on the offensive in the war against terror and we have been blessed that, since 9/11, we have not had another attack on our homeland. Who would have thought that possible? Certainly people were afraid to get on an airplane for weeks afterwards. They wouldn't go to shopping malls. We have been blessed to have gone this far without another attack.

The terrorists are using every desperate act they can to break the will of the Iraqis and our U.S. forces and our U.S. political system. This would undercut the foundation of our military efforts. So victory must be tied to results and victory is what we must have—not an amendment calling for redeployment measured in days or hours.

President Bush has established a strategy for a victory in Iraq that is condition-based, not based on arbitrarily selected dates.

Why not December 31? Why not April 1? Why not July 4? It is not a way to make a strategy in a military situation. The President's strategy focuses, rather, on the accomplishment of specific objectives.

President Bush has said:

> Victory will come when the terrorists and the Saddamists can no longer threaten Iraq's democracy, when the Iraq security forces can provide for the safety of their own citizens, and when Iraq is not a safe haven for terrorists to plot new attacks on our Nation.

The President knows Iraq must stand up and do its part. In his most recent visit to Iraq the President urged the Iraqis to ''seize the moment and we, the United States, will help them succeed. When America gives a commitment, America keeps its word.''

He said:

> If the United States of America leaves before this Iraqi government can defend itself and sustain itself and govern itself, it will be a major blow to the war on terror.

I certainly would agree with that, as Senator WARNER has so eloquently stated.

Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld explained why a time-phased plan for redeployment is wrong. He said:

> Once you start doing that, then you are stuck with a number and a date and it just doesn't do any good. The decision to withdraw is based [must be based] on conditions on the ground.

Some supporting this amendment and others who are calling for this exit strategy of time-phased withdrawals stake their claim on past experiences in other conflicts. This global war on terror is different. The enemy here has not surrendered. He does not wear a uniform. He is not sequestered in a country bounded by borders. He has not signed a peace accord and he has not given up his arms.

He, unlike Vietnam, is sworn to attack this country if he is successful and emboldened and gets his hands on the wealth of the Iraqi oil. Will our country be safe? Will they stay in Iraq and not continue to attack us, as they have, if the terrorists take over their country? He fights in an asymmetric fashion unlike any we fought before, and we cannot put our people and our allies at risk by shirking our responsibilities in any way that will undermine the opportunity that we have to have a victory and a stable government in Iraq.

Our generals on the ground understand this and have offered their perspectives on what impact this type of time-phased redeployment would have on the Iraqi situation. I know we have had people here who have served. Senator WARNER has served in World War II and Korea. Senator KERRY served in Vietnam. But what about General Abizaid, Commander of the U.S. Central Command? He has given his life to the service of the military and in that region of the world. He has overall responsibility for Operation Iraqi Freedom, and he recently spoke to Prime Minister Maliki and said:

> The Iraqi people don't want to go back to the 6th century. The Afghanis don't want to live under the rule they experienced under the Taliban. They don't want bin Laden to win. There is clear preference expressed by the people in both Iraq and Afghanistan to vote. The fact that they voted is their way of reaching out to the future.

General Abizaid warns of leaving the region without proper conditions on the ground with respect to the terrorists in that all they, the terrorists. He says:

> All they do is destroy and kill and try to grab headlines. They believe by doing that they can gain time and eventually the coalition will leave. And when we leave there will be states vulnerable to their ideology.

General George Casey—he is the commander of all our forces in Iraq—recently said this:

> I think as long as the Iraqi security forces continue to progress and as long as this national unity government continues to operate that way and move the country forward, I think we are going to be able to see continued gradual reductions of coalition forces over the coming months and into the next year.

That is his prediction. Somehow I have the vision of, out in the country, the dogs we used to have. You would get in the car and drive down the road and the dog would chase after the car, thinking somehow, I guess, that it made the car run off, that the car was afraid of it. I think sometimes some in this body are afraid we are actually going to be able to draw down troops in the next year or so. They think if they can just pass a resolution mandating it, then they can claim credit for it.

General Casey's comments do mention the force reduction, but he ties the reduction to the status of the development of the Iraqi security forces and the national unity government's success.

This amendment, the Kerry amendment, calls on the President to begin a deployment, beginning in 2006, in stark contrast to the best judgment of the most senior United States commanders in Iraq. Who should we listen to? General Abizaid and General Casey, I submit.

U.S. Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad, whom we met in Iraq a few weeks ago, said the formation of the government, with crucial involvement from Saddam's once dominant fellow Sunnis is a great sign of progress. He states:

> I believe that with the political changes taking place—the emphasis on unity and reconciliation, with effective ministers . . . that conditions are likely to move in the right direction that would allow adjustment in terms of the size, composition and mission of our forces.

In closing, I would like to highlight the recent comments by the man entrusted with advising Prime Minister Maliki on the national security of the new Iraqi democracy and what his items are concerning a time-phased reduction in U.S. forces.

Mowaffak al-Rubaie, the recently approved Iraq minister for national security, expressed his concerns in the Washington Post. I believe it was today or yesterday. He stated:

There has been much talk about a withdrawal of U.S. and coalition troops from Iraq, but no defined timeline has yet been set. There is, however, an unofficial roadmap to foreign troop reductions that will eventually lead to total withdrawal of U.S. troops. This roadmap is based, not just on a series of dates but, more important, on the achievement of a set of objectives for restoring security in Iraq.

I want to conclude by saying how proud I am of our military. I was pleased that the original Kerry amendment was voted down 93 to 6. I think by moving that date forward 6 months, the vote is not going to change very much.

I know Senator LEVIN has offered an amendment. I will just say this about it. I serve with Senator LEVIN on the Armed Services Committee. I am sure he is trying to reach some sort of compromise, some sort of unifying amendment for the Democratic side. I am really sort of disappointed at it, because I don't think, if adopted, it will serve any purpose and could cause much mischief and be misinterpreted.

I urge my colleagues to vote against both amendments, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the President. I apologize to the President for having to sit there at this late hour. It wasn't my doing. But I did want to speak on this issue. It is one of major importance, and one about which I have not spoken on the Senate floor previously. So I beg the indulgence of the Chair at this late hour.

Mr. President, on May 3, I introduced a resolution in the Senate that offered a clear break from our current counterproductive course in Iraq allowing our Armed Forces to return to their focus to defeating the terrorists who attacked us on September 11, 2001.

The resolution would do three things.

First, it states that the United States should not maintain a permanent military presence or military bases in Iraq.

Second, it states that the United States should not attempt to control Iraq's oil.

And, third, it states that the United States Armed Forces should be redeployed from Iraq as soon as practicable after the completion of Iraq's constitution-making process, or December 31 of 2006, whichever comes first.

My resolution is identical to the resolution introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative MIKE THOMPSON of California with at least six Republican cosponsors. As far as I know, it is the only Iraqi resolution introduced that has bipartisan support. So I introduced the same measure here in the Senate.

I continue to believe that only this resolution offers a clear, unambiguous, principled stand—a stand that can produce the results that we all want.

Only when the Iraqi Government faces a firm timetable for U.S. redeployment will it have the incentive to resolve its internal differences and stand on its own two feet.

And only when our government faces a firm timetable will it make urgent policy changes necessary to right our course in Iraq.

President Bush has it exactly backwards. He said that our Army will stand down only as the Iraqi Army stands up. The truth is that the Iraqi Army and government will stand up only when it is clear that the American military is committed to standing down by a date certain.

My resolution is a clear, unambiguous statement of our intention to move beyond the strategic blunder of Iraq which has distracted us from the fight against those who attacked us on September 11. Only such a clear break will allow us to recommit our military and intelligence resources to the unfinished task of crushing al-Qaida and capturing or killing Osama bin Laden.

We need this new decisive direction because President Bush is unwilling to change his current policies in Iraq which are manifestly a failure.

Let us be clear. Staying the course effectively means stay forever. It means to stay and pay and stay and pay and stay and pay.

Already we have paid with more than 2,500 dead and more than 18,000 wounded. We will continue to pay a terrible price in terms of lives and treasure, not only to the end of President Bush's term but well into the term of his successor and beyond. And for what? For a failed approach in Iraq that in the judgment of a large majority of national security experts is damaging America's national security and making us less safe.

Because I believe we need a new direction, I will vote for both the Levin-Reed amendment and the Kerry-Feingold-Boxer amendment.

I commend my friend and my colleague, Senator KERRY, for his leadership on this issue. I was here this evening listening to him. I listened to his colloquy with the Senator from Virginia. I think it is clear that Senator KERRY is on the right course. Also, Senator LEVIN, I believe is also on the right course. So I will support both, and I do so because I believe that both are better than what we have now.

But I also want to be clear that neither one is going to pass. We know that. So we shouldn't agonize over which one we can support. It doesn't matter what we do; it won't become law.

So why are we doing this? We are doing it because we must put pressure on the President. We do it because we need to speak for the American people who are way ahead of us, way ahead of the President, way ahead of the White House, and way ahead of the Congress on this issue. They know what we are doing in Iraq—costing $7 billion a month, $9 million an hour, 2,500 dead, 18,000 maimed and injured—they know it is wrong. They know we have been misled into this war.

My position is simply that anything we can do to give voice to the American people that will hopefully pull the President back to a more rational, reasonable and sane policy, anything that will do that I will support.

I realize that some, including the President's top political adviser, are eager to politicize this issue in an election year. They can't wait to frame this as a debate between those who support our troops and those who want to retreat, between those who want to fight and those who want to surrender.

This is outrageous, and it is false. It is the same inflammatory demagoguery that tore our country apart during the Vietnam war. Just as we were misled into the Vietnam war, so we were in Iraq. All you have to think is weapons of mass destruction equals the Tonkin Gulf. Weapons of mass destruction is to Iraq what the Tonkin Gulf was to Vietnam. Both misled us into a drastic, terrible war.

Just as the Nixon administration was bent and misused intelligence to fit a preconceived belief on Vietnam, so would President Bush in Iraq. Just as we heard the arguments in the early 1970s about Vietnam, that we have to fight the Communists there or we will be fighting them here, now we hear that we have to fight the terrorists in Iraq before we fight them here.

Just as we said in Vietnam we will have to support the government because it is a free government elected by 80 percent of the people, so now we hear the same thing about Iraq and terrorists.

The echoes are resounding about what we hear from this administration and their policies for Iraq and what we heard for Vietnam.

Let us be clear about what I think this debate is really about. It is about charting a smarter, more focused offensive against the terrorists who attacked us on September 11. It is about acknowledging that Iraq did not attack us on September 11, but that our invasion and occupation of Iraq has been a costly distraction from our fight against those who did attack us.

It is about giving the government in Iraq incentives to get its act together; to overcome sectarian divisions and stand up a viable, self-sustaining army.

This debate is about acknowledging that staying the course is no virtue if the course we are on is demonstrably wrong. Indeed, it is about acknowledging that staying the course means stay and pay. Stay and pay. It means that our Armed Forces will continue to stay and pay dearly with more than 20,000 already killed, maimed, and wounded. For our beleaguered taxpayers, it means stay and pay more of their hard-earned tax dollars and the debt that is being piled on for our children and grandchildren to pay—$350 billion already on Iraq and counting.

The men and women of our Armed Forces deserve better than this.

Instead of putting bumper-stickers on our cars saying ''support our

troops,'' let us actually support our troops. Let us give them some hope for a way forward from the current stalemate and quagmire.

They have brilliantly completed the task they were sent to Iraq to accomplish. Saddam Hussein's dictatorship has been deposed. We are certain that Iraq does not possess weapons of mass destruction—and never did. And the Iraqi people have a constitution and a democratically elected government.

To our troops goes great credit. They have achieved these things despite a series of disastrous decisions by their civilian leaders here in Washington.

President Bush himself has acclaimed the installation of a permanent Iraqi Government as a historic ''turning point.''

So the question is, why aren't our troops returning? Why are we still in Iraq with no commitment whatsoever even to a graduated redeployment?

Why has President Bush stated that we will be in Iraq at least through the end of his administration and into his successor's administration?

Why are we building what appears to be permanent military bases?

Why are we in the process of building a gigantic new United States embassy in Baghdad that will span 104 acres, the size of nearly 80 football fields?

What message does it send when the House Republican leadership 2 weeks ago insisted on stripping from the emergency supplemental appropriations bill Senate-passed language asserting that we will not build permanent bases or attempt to control Iraq's oil? We passed that in the Senate. The House Republicans took it out.

What message does that send to the insurgents and al-Qaida and the terrorists who would do us harm? None of these things give the impression that the United States plans on winding down our military and civilian presence or relinquishing our grip on Iraq.

To the contrary, it is easy to see how ordinary Iraqis as well as people across the world view this as the behavior of a conquering power that has no intention of leaving. Unfortunately, this perception creates continuing resentment. It feeds anti-Americanism. It continues to give powerful fuel to the insurgency, both in terms of motivation and recruitment, and it puts our American Armed Forces at greater risk.

It has now been more than 3 years since President Bush's speech on the flight deck of the USS *Abraham Lincoln*. On that occasion, with a giant banner behind him a claiming ''Mission Accomplished,'' President Bush said triumphantly, ''Major combat operations in Iraq have ended.''

But today, 133,000 troops remain on the ground. President Bush again and again has signaled that the U.S. military presence in Iraq is open-ended and of indefinite duration.

This has given rise to suspicions that the United States has long-term designs on Iraq and its oil and deprives the Iraq Government of the incentives to resolve its internal divisions and stand on its own feet.

With the war in Iraq now in its fourth year, it is clear that the present course is not a strategy for success. It is a strategy for continued stalemate and stagnation.

As I said, stay the course means stay and pay. Stay and pay. One-third of a trillion dollars we have spent so far and counting.

Indeed, I fear that stay the course also means stay forever—and this sends exactly the wrong signal. It stokes the insurgents who believe that the U.S wants a permanent military presence in Iraq.

Don't think for a second that they do not know and they aren't putting out the word that the Republican leadership in the House 2 weeks ago stripped the language out of the Senate bill which stated that we were not going to have permanent bases and we will not control their oil. Don't think for a minute that they haven't broadcast that, that they aren't using that as a recruiting tool. Of course they are.

When President Bush says it will be through his administration and into his successor's administration before we decide what to do in Iraq, that is a powerful recruiting tool for the insurgents and the terrorists.

Our open-ended commitment to stay in Iraq as long as it takes has had the effect of taking away any incentive for the Iraqi Government to resolve its internal division and get its act together.

Parliamentary elections were held way back in early December. Has Baghdad descended into vicious sectarian violence? It took the Iraqis nearly 7 months to chose a prime minister and to fill all the ministries.

Now, as the Iraqis face a deadline for U.S redeployment, there is no way they would have squandered 6 months before forming a government, nor would the Iraqis be dragging their feet in standing up a viable, self-sustaining army and police force.

I just heard the Senator from Alabama quoting a general. A lot of generals have been quoted around here. I guess I can quote a general too. How about General Casey, our commander in Iraq, who told the Senate last September. He said:

> Increased coalition presence feeds the notion of occupation, contributes to the dependency of Iraqi security forces on the coalition [and] extends the amount of time that it will take for Iraqi security forces to become self-reliant.

Last September, General George Casey said that.

BG Donald Alston, the chief U.S. military spokesman in Iraq, put it this way:

> I think the more accurate way to approach this right now is to concede that . . . this insurgency is not going to be settled . . . through military options or military operations. It is going to be settled in the political process.

Nor, I must add, is there a military solution to most of the critical problems confronting Iraq—sectarian strife, out-of-control crime, rampant corruption, widespread unemployment, chronic shortages of electricity and water and gasoline, and on and on. There is not a military solution to that; it is a political solution.

The Iraqi people also believe that a redeployment of U.S. forces would give a boost to the political process. According to a recent poll conducted by the University of Maryland, more than 80 percent of Iraqis want U.S. forces to leave Iraq. When asked what the impact of a withdrawal of U.S. troops would be, large majorities of Iraqis believe that insurgent attacks will decrease, sectarian violence will decline, and the sectarian factions in Parliament will be more willing to cooperate. That is what a majority of Iraqis believe. Yet somehow this administration believes differently.

We all hope the Sunni, Shia, and Kurdish leaders are sincere in their stated desire to avoid an all-out civil war. Prime Minister Maliki has formed a national unity Cabinet. As I said, President Bush has hailed this new Government as a turning point. We hope that is the case. But whether or not Mr. Maliki is willing or able to make good on his pledges, it is certainly time for a turning point in U.S. policy in Iraq.

The coming months must be a period of transition to full Iraqi sovereignty. It is time to hand off security responsibilities to the Iraqi Army and police, to redeploy most of our U.S. Armed Forces from Iraq by the end of this year. This strategic redeployment must involve converting our vast military presence on the ground in Iraq to a quick reaction force, staged in countries bordering Iraq, countries that share our interest in a stable Iraq and that view our military presence in the region as a stabilizing force.

This substantial over-the-horizon force would be used to strike at al-Qaida and its affiliates whether in Iraq or elsewhere. These forces would be able to respond in a timely manner, as they did 2 weeks ago in targeting and killing Al-Zarqawi.

I would expect, as our troops withdraw from Iraq, this would free up U.S. forces to combat the resurgence of the Taliban in Afghanistan. Other troops would be available to send to the emerging terrorist threats in countries such as Somalia, Sudan, and Yemen, which threaten to become major breeding grounds for terrorists.

The harsh fact is that the Iraq war has led to a decline in the overall readiness of U.S. ground forces. It has decimated our capacity to put large numbers of boots on the ground were we to face an emergency elsewhere, such as on the Korean peninsula.

At a Senate hearing last year, GEN Richard A. Cody, Army vice chief of staff, said:

> What keeps me awake at night is what will this all-volunteer force look like in 2007?

He stated this in the context of a discussion about whether we could sustain

the operational tempo of deployments at the rate we have had since the beginning of the Iraq war. For all the military superiority we displayed in the invasion of March 2003, 3 years later, a guerilla conflict is grinding away at our military manpower and equipment.

We need to redeploy from Iraq in order to reset and reequip the force—ground forces in particular—so they are prepared for a more focused campaign against the terrorists who attacked us and continue to threaten us.

At the same time we are redeploying our Armed Forces, we need to foster sustained diplomatic engagement, working with Middle Eastern nations to facilitate rival Iraqi factions in reaching a political settlement. Iraq's neighbors have a profound stake in this stability, but they currently have no incentive to get involved. Once it is clear that the United States is leaving, those nations will be highly motivated to facilitate a coming together of the factions within Iraq.

Some say that U.S. forces in Iraq are the only thing that stands between the Sunnis, Shiites, the Kurds, and all-out civil war. I disagree. It is the ongoing presence of U.S. forces and the prospect that we will be in Iraq as a babysitter for years to come that has delayed progress on the political front. It is the ongoing presence of U.S. forces and statements by this President that we will be there for as long as it takes, it is actions such as were taken by the House Republicans in stripping that language out we put in that said we are not going to have permanent bases, we are not going to control the world, it is those actions which have delayed progress on the political front and have given the insurgents the narrative, the story, the recruiting tool they need.

Our presence in Iraq is a propaganda victory and recruiting tool for the insurgency in Iraq and for Islamic extremists around the world. The insurgents and jihadists are threatened by the overwhelming perception in the Arab world that the U.S. military is an occupying force, that we are building what appears to be permanent bases, that our continuing presence in Iraq is all about controlling oil.

Meanwhile, let's be clear on what continuing our current policy of stay and pay will entail. The Congressional Research Service reports that we are now spending $6.4 billion a month in Iraq, up sharply from last year. That is $9 million an hour every hour of every day. And we are doing so at a time when our budget, the budget put through by the Republicans who control the Congress, is slashing funds for education, cancer research, health care, other essential needs at home. The budget this year will mean we have 1,100 fewer research grants from the National Institutes of Health than we had 3 years ago. That is the path we are on. We have spent a grand total of about $350 billion in Iraq.

As I have said, more than 2,500 troops have been killed, 18,000 wounded. More than 8,500 of the troops are wounded so seriously they were listed as wounded in action, not to return to duty. Are we going to stay and pay for another 3 years, spending another $300 billion, sacrificing more American troops, with more killed, more maimed and injured for life? Is that what we mean by supporting the troops? Is that what we mean, to stay more, with more killed, more maimed? Why in the world would we want to stay on a course that is so clearly counterproductive, so clearly a failure?

Last week, the Center for American Progress and Foreign Policy Magazine released the results of their survey of more than 100 of America's top terrorism and national security experts from across the ideological spectrum. The results show fewer than 2 in 10 believe the United States is winning the war on terror; 87 percent believe the war in Iraq has had a negative impact on our national security. So 87 percent of the top 100 national security experts around America say Iraq has had a negative impact on our national security.

Last Thursday, the Department of Defense issued a highly partisan ''debate prep book,'' designed to help Republicans defend the war in Iraq. Likewise, the President and Vice President are staying the course with their endless happy-talk about progress in Iraq, about how democracy is on the march. But the facts on the ground tell a different story. I believe we should base our policy choices not on happy talk but on facts on the ground.

Clearly, by preemptively attacking Iraq, we have committed a major strategic error in the larger war against the terrorists who attacked us. Simply put, we took our eyes off the ball. We deferred our military and intelligence resources away from Afghanistan, away from the hunt for bin Laden. The consequences were plain to see. It is no coincidence today the Taliban has powerfully resurfaced in southern Afghanistan despite President Bush's claim on September 27, 2004, that ''the Taliban no longer is in existence.'' Say again? As fighting in Afghanistan has intensified over the past 3 months, the United States has conducted 340 airstrikes in Afghanistan, more than twice as many as the 160 airstrikes carried out in the war in Iraq during the same period.

Meanwhile, while we have been distracted in Iraq, al-Qaida-like Islamic fighters have retained control of the Somalia capital of Mogadishu and have dealt a major blow to our counterterrorism efforts in the horn of Africa. Nor is it a coincidence that Osama bin Laden is still at large, still directing al-Qaida operations, still encouraging jihadists around the world.

Nearly 5 years ago, before a joint session of Congress, President Bush pledged he would ''bring Bin Laden to justice or bring justice to bin Laden.'' That was 5 years ago. President Bush has done neither. Instead, he allowed bin Laden to escape and has gotten the U.S. military bogged down in a civil war in Iraq—a huge strategic gift not only to bin Laden but also to Iran. Not only has our open-ended Iraqi entanglement taken the heat off the terrorists who attacked us on September 11, it has given them a propaganda victory and, as I said, a major recruiting tool. The sooner we acknowledge the strategic blunder and take steps to reverse it and the sooner we redeploy our military and strategic assets to confront our real enemies, the better off we will be.

The resolution I introduced setting a firm timetable for redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq is about accelerating the emergence of Iraq as an independent nation willing to stand on its own feet. But it is also about the unity and security of the American people. This misbegotten, misguided, mismanaged war is dividing our Nation. I already mentioned how the President's top political strategist is planning to inflame passions in the war on Iraq in the months between now and the election. Again, I state, it is eerie, eerie how defenders of the Iraq policy, of our policy in Iraq are sounding exactly like defenders of Nixon's policies in Vietnam.

It is eerie how the defenders of Bush's policies in Iraq are sounding like the defenders of Nixon's policies in Vietnam in the early 1970s. Back in 1972, Nixon and his defenders were saying that we were winning the war, that we must stay the course. And guess what. They were saying we must not cut and run, that we must prop up the ''democratic government'' in Saigon, which was, of course, elected, as you know, by 80 percent of the people, and on and on and on.

I can remember a time when I sat in a room with a group of Congressmen in Saigon, listening to then-President Thieu tell us that we must stay in Vietnam and fight the communists there or we would be fighting them in the Philippines and in Japan and on our doorstep.

What do we hear now? We have to fight them over in Iraq or we will be fighting them here. Eerie, as I said. Eerie.

Quite frankly, I say today President Bush is saying almost the exact same things that Richard Nixon said, and he has no more credibility than Richard Nixon did.

Likewise, back in 1972, President Nixon and his supporters were arguing that withdrawal would undermine U.S. credibility in the world. But as LTG William Odom, Director of the National Security Agency under President Reagan, states in a current issue of Foreign Policy magazine—I want to quote him—

> A rapid reversal of our current course in Iraq would improve U.S. credibility around the world.

I am going to repeat that. LTG William Odom, Director of the National Security Agency under President Reagan, in the current issue of Foreign Policy magazine, said:

A rapid reversal of our current course in Iraq would improve U.S. credibility around the world.

General Odom went on to say:

[I]nvading Iraq was not in the interests of the United States. It was in the interests of Iran and al Qaeda. For Iran, it avenged a grudge against Saddam [and left Iran as the strongest power in the Persian Gulf]. For al Qaeda, it made it easier to kill Americans.

That is not me. That is LTG William Odom, Director of the National Security Agency under President Reagan.

Beyond dividing our country, our endless, open-ended presence in Iraq has distracted our Government from urgent priorities, as I have said, in health care, education, law enforcement, and even a smarter approach to the very real terrorist threats of today and tomorrow.

The men and women of our Armed Forces have sacrificed greatly. I don't know why it is that because they have sacrificed so greatly—and the fact is, the Commander in Chief told them what to do, and they did it. So what. So to honor them, to honor what they have done in Iraq, we stay longer? We sacrifice more of our young people? We have more who are maimed for life? To honor them, we drain the Treasury of more of our dollars from taxpayers? Is that what it means to support our troops? I don't think so. I do not believe so.

I believe to support our troops is to do exactly what LTG William Odom said: A rapid reversal of our current course in Iraq.

It is time to allow the political process to go forward in Iraq. It is time to give Iraqi politicians greater incentive to bridge their differences and take responsibility for their country's future.

It is time to bring home as many troops as possible, consistent with force protection requirements.

It is time to redeploy as many as necessary to successfully pursue and crush bin Laden and al-Qaida and to protect our vital interests around the world.

President Bush tells us to be patient. He says Iraq will become a flourishing democracy that will spread the flame of freedom across the entire Middle East. But, with due respect to President Bush and to Vice President CHENEY and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, they have been consistently wrong—disastrously wrong—in all their predictions with regard to Iraq.

Before the invasion, Vice President CHENEY said that Iraq had ''reconstituted nuclear weapons.'' Secretary Rumsfeld said he knew exactly where Saddam was storing his weapons of mass destruction. And, as I noted 3 long years ago, President Bush said that major combat operations were over, mission accomplished.

Many of President Bush's people assured us that the war would be self-financed thanks to Iraq's oil—Paul Wolfowitz.

Vice President CHENEY said, more than a year ago, that the insurgency was ''in its last throes.''

Just yesterday, at the National Press Club, Vice President CHENEY defended and repeated his claim that the insurgency is in its last throes.

I guess if you repeat something often enough—will people believe it? Listen to what Abraham Lincoln once said: You can fool some of the people all the time. You can fool all the people some of the time. But you can't fool all the people all the time.

Mr. CHENEY, you may have fooled some people. The American people are not buying it any longer.

I could go on and on with this litany of false assertions—prediction after prediction that turned out to be 100 percent wrong.

There are those who say: But if we leave, there may be civil war in Iraq. As I have stated, I think the longer we stay, there will be more sectarian strife, more insurgency. But to be honest, I can't tell for sure what the likely outcome will be. How can anyone tell what the likely outcome will be, when we can't trust what the administration is telling us, when we can't trust, any longer, the intelligence as it is being given to us by the administration? We can't tell for sure.

So at this point, President Bush has not only spent his political capital, I think he has squandered the last shred of credibility when it comes to Iraq. Specifically, as I said, with regard to America's departure from Iraq, I think the President has it backwards. He says our Army will stand down only as the Iraqi Army stands up. The truth is that the Iraqi Army and Iraqi Government will stand up—make the hard political decisions—only when it is clear that the American military is committed to standing down by the end of this year.

So I repeat, I will vote in favor of both the Levin-Reed amendment and the Kerry-Feingold amendment. As I said, anything is better than what we have now, even though I think both could go further in setting a clear, decisive new direction. I stand by my conviction—and the wording in my resolution, the same as was introduced in the House by Representative MIKE THOMPSON, with at least five if not six Republican cosponsors—that it is time to set a firm timetable for redeploying our troops from Iraq and redoubling our fight against those who attacked us on September 11. Only this new course will produce the results we all want, both on the ground in Iraq and in the campaign against al-Qaida and rebuilding, reconstituting our forces and rebuilding and reuniting the people of our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I thank the Senate for allowing me to explain briefly, this evening, why I will be voting to stay the course in Iraq until the progress we are making there now ripens into complete victory. And I want to put that conflict in context.

The United States is in a war against a transnational army of fanatical extremists who routinely use terror against civilians its a weapon. The terrorists began attacking us before September 11. They attacked us in the 1980s and in the 1990s, when they bombed Khobar Towers, attacked the USS *Cole* and our embassies abroad, and first tried to bomb the World Trade Center. Our government did not recognize the threat and did not respond vigorously until after they escalated the war by the attacks on September 11.

We know who the terrorists are—an interlocking network of highly trained, deadly, and adaptive terrorist organizations funded largely by the Saudi Wahabbists and Iran. We know what their goals are from the al-Zawahiri letter which was intercepted in July of 2005. They want, first, to radicalize Islam by converting, suppressing, or killing those Muslims who resist their twisted and extreme interpretation of that religion. They want to exclude the principles of enlightenment thought from Islamic countries and set up a series of Taliban-like caliphates throughout the Muslim world. Those regimes would be run by religious thought police who would ruthlessly suppress free expression, religious dissent, social pluralism, political activity, and women's rights. We know that such regimes are possible; one existed in Afghanistan before America intervened, and another exists in Iran today.

We know the tactics they will use. The terrorists are patient, in the sense that they think generationally. They infiltrate mosques and they feed off the discontent and hopelessness many young Muslims feel. They see Western democracies as weak and feckless; they hope that with time and intimidation they can control the policies of these countries. They hope to gain control of sources of energy on which the West depends. And, the terrorists want to acquire weapons of mass destruction. Since they have no national base and no concern whatsoever for innocent human life, traditional means of deterrence—the threat of a counterattack—would be unlikely to prevent the terrorists from using such weapons should they get them.

The point is that the terrorists are trying to achieve these goals, and they are not going to stop voluntarily. There is no conceivable acceptable accommodation we could reach that would cause them to leave us alone. We must therefore counter their efforts, and to be effective we must fight on three ''fronts,'' as it were, at once: we must rebuild our intelligence and covert operations capability, we must deprive the terrorists of national bases of support, and we must work with mainstream Islam around the world to show Mideast Muslims in particular that there is a future for them in the principles of liberal democracy.

The operation in Iraq is a central part of all three of these ''fronts.'' Our

goal there was, first, to remove Saddam Hussein. His regime was an organic threat to world peace; he had twice invaded his neighbors and was systematically violating the commitments he made after Desert Storm. He had harbored and trained terrorists; more fundamentally, he was a tyrant who wanted weapons of mass destruction and was obstructing the war against the terrorists.

Second, the United States, in cooperation with mainstream Iraqi leaders from all parts and ethnic groups in the country, is building a multi-ethnic democracy in Iraq that will be a strong ally in the war on terror and will confront and confound the vision of the terrorists for the Muslim world.

The terrorists know how important the struggle in Iraq is to the overall war. That is why they are trying so hard to disrupt the new government. Yet they are not succeeding. The sacrifice and hardships endured by all the soldiers and families whose loved ones are serving in Iraq have resulted in major achievements for the Iraqi people.

In the 3 years since Iraq was liberated, the Iraqi people have assumed sovereignty over their country, held free elections, drafted a democratic constitution, approved that constitution in a nationwide referendum, elected a permanent representative under the new constitutional framework, and formed a government with representatives from all sections and religious groups within the country.

The Iraqi Government has become more capable of providing essential services to its people. The 2005 per capita GDP was more than double the 2003 amount, and exceeds the prewar 2002 amount by more than 30 percent. There are over 100 independent newspapers and magazines, 44 commercial television stations, and 72 commercial radio stations now operating in Iraq.

America continues to actively fight the terrorists, while building and training capable and effective Iraqi security forces, which eventually will take the lead in the fight and take responsibility for the safety and security of their citizens. Over 250,000 Iraqi security forces have been trained and equipped, which is an increase of 123,500 troops from January 2005. In addition, there are now more than 100 ground combat battalions of Iraqi military and special police forces conducting operations against the insurgency.

I do not begrudge anyone their discontent with how some of our operations have been conducted in Iraq. There have been mistakes.

The administration underestimated how long it would take to stabilize the Sunni triangle; our active duty army is too small and this has strained Reserve components; we have relied too much on technology and not enough on intelligence in counteracting the improvised explosive devices. Wars are messy and failures are inevitable; yet the Bush administration has had the authority for the last 5 years, and I do not blame anyone for holding the administration accountable for the operational mistakes that have been made.

Yet I do ask everyone to recognize that this war is serious and necessary and must be won. I believe the decision to invade Iraq was, whatever mistakes have been made operationally, the only possible strategic choice. President Clinton was, quite properly, building the case for action against Saddam during his last years in office, even before the attacks on 9/11. I was in the House at the time and I remember clearly that Secretary Albright, Vice President Gore and the President himself repeatedly warned that Saddam was a major threat. In short, the war in Iraq, like the global war on terror of which it is a part, is America's war, which we must fight and win to protect our safety and freedom and to preserve from violence and oppression hundreds of millions of innocent people around the world. And we will win it, despite the mistakes, provided that we do not let strategic incoherence, partisan politics, or personal disaffection with the administration divide or discourage us.

For many of us, the hardest thing about war is not the physical or monetary sacrifice. It is the burden of having to confront unpleasant realities, choose consistently from unpalatable options, and sacrifice objectives that apart from the war would justifiably claim a priority. But if we really do value freedom, safety, pluralism, and justice, we must all resolve that we will shoulder this burden for as long as it takes. Our service men and women are doing their duty magnificently, and will continue doing it until they have won. They have shown by their sacrifice how much they value the safety of their families and the freedom of their country. We need to back them up.

That means, among other things, resolving to stay and fight in Iraq until the battle is won. To pull out now or to set an artificial timeline on withdrawal—especially after the victories of the last few weeks—would imperil everything the sacrifice that our service men and women has gained. It would encourage the enemy to struggle even more tenaciously and ruthlessly in the hope that America could be made to quit. It would demoralize our friends and it would convince those who have yet to take sides that the United States cannot be trusted to keep its commitments.

I want to encourage everyone about the progress we have made. We are winning, not just in Iraq, but in the larger global war on terror. We have allies now we didn't have 5 years ago—in Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Iraq—and we have cooperation and support throughout the Muslim world that a few years ago would not have been possible. The operation against Zarqawi shows the value of our alliance with the new Iraqi Government and the increasing sophistication of our intelligence. In short, there is no question that the United States, with its coalition partners, has the power to win in Iraq. The question is whether we have the resolution to win.

Most wars are combat operations with psychological components. Wars against terrorists might better be described as psychological operations with combat components. They are struggles between leaders, peoples, and ''narratives'' of the world. By that, I mean ways of looking at or judging the worth of human beings and the fundamental principles of human society. I know the American people have the strength and resolution to prevail, as they have prevailed in similar struggles for freedom throughout our history. I know our ''narrative'' of the world—our belief in the inherent dignity and equality of all human beings—is right and strong. I trust our leaders will be resolute in the struggle as well, and that by its votes tomorrow, the Senate will signal that we too have confidence in the success of our efforts, the worth of our sacrifice, and the justice of our cause.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today, as we resumed consideration of the Defense authorization bill, we have debated two very important amendments on U.S. policy in Iraq.

After the votes on the minimum wage amendments offered by Senators KENNEDY and ENZI, there were 5 hours of debate on the amendment on Iraq offered by Senators LEVIN and REED. Following this debate, Senator KERRY offered his amendment.

These amendments would call upon the United States to cut and run from Iraq, just when the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi people need us the most. It is important for all of us to fully understand the dangerous implications of a premature withdrawal from Iraq.

If we withdraw from Iraq before the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi people are capable of defending their new democracy, the terrorists would see this as a vindication of their strategy of intimidation and violence. This would only embolden them to challenge us, as well as our friend and allies, elsewhere in the Middle East, around the world, and even right here at home.

While the new Governmment in Iraq is making substantial progress every day, it is not fully ready to defend itself and provide security for the Iraqi people. If we were to cut and run before Iraq can defend itself, the violence in Iraq would certainly increase. The terrorists could be expected to mount even deadlier attacks against the new Iraqi Governmment and innocent Iraqi civilians. Chaos would result. Bloody civil war would almost certainly follow, as terrorists and rival militias tore the country apart. In the process, they would kill thousands of innocent Iraqis.

In addition, the very unity of Iraq—a unity that we along with our coalition partners and the Iraqi people have worked so hard and sacrificed so much to secure—would be destroyed.

Sectarian violence would tear the country apart. It would split Iraq into segments controlled by terrorists or ethnic and tribal militias. This would allow the terrorists to achieve one of their highest priorities: to turn Iraq into a safe haven for terrorists and a base from which to launch attacks against our friends and allies in the region and even the American homeland.

The terrorists affiliated with bin Laden and Zarqawi have clearly stated their aim of overthrowing moderate governments throughout the Middle East. We therefore would have to worry about close friends that have cooperated with us in the global war on terror, such as Jordan, being transformed into terrorist regimes. The violence and instability that the terrorists seek to sow in Iraq would spread throughout the Middle East.

The terrorists have also demonstrated a strong interest in acquiring weapons of mass destruction for use as the ultimate terrorist tool. They seek to obtain these weapons and use them against innocent civilians. Given the presence in Iraq of many of Saddam Hussein's former weapons scientists, an Iraq under the control of terrorists likely would become a safe haven for the covert production of chemical and biological weapons.

President Bush has repeatedly stated that the potential combination of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction poses the greatest threat to the United States. The destruction of 9/11 would pale in comparison to the devastation terrorists could inflict with weapons of mass destruction produced in Iraq and covertly slipped across Iraq's porous borders.

Cutting and running from Iraq would allow the threat posed by the combination of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction to materialize. This is an unacceptable risk to the American people, and we simply cannot allow that to happen.

It is clear that those calling for an early withdrawal of American troops from Iraq fail to understand the potentially catastrophic implications of their proposal. Cutting and running before Iraq can defend itself would pose unacceptable risks to all Americans.

We, our coalition partners, and the Iraqi people have come too far. We cannot turn back now. We must stay until the job is done.

I look forward to today's debate on these amendments, and I urge my colleagues to speak out against the strategy of cutting and running from Iraq. It is a strategy that guarantees failure. And failure in Iraq is not an option.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague Senator BOND in discussing S. 2658, the National Defense Enhancement and National Guard Empowerment Act of 2006. A version of this groundbreaking legislation has been adopted by the Senate as an amendment to the fiscal year 2006 Defense authorization bill.

Our amendment would tangibly strengthen our national security by giving the National Guard more of a voice in decisionmaking and in ensuring that our Nation is able to optimally tap the enormous experience and capabilities that exist within the National Guard.

Today's Guard is a 21st century military organization that is carrying its weight and more in Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as here at home, whenever disaster strikes. But today's Guard is needlessly frozen in a 20th century Pentagon organization chart. The implications of that show up in everything from the Guard's depleted equipment stockpiles, to training and staffing and mission decisions. Our amendment clears away some institutional cobwebs to let the National Guard be the best it can be.

The Bond-Leahy amendment specifically increases the rank of the chief of the National Guard from lieutenant general to full general. It will ensure that the deputy commander of U.S. Northern Command come from the ranks of the National Guard. Additionally, the bill makes the National Guard a joint activity of the Department of Defense, giving the National Guard greater latitude to talk around the Pentagon. Finally, the Guard would be given greater ability to identify gaps in capabilities in our States' ability to respond to emergencies at home.

This amendment differs somewhat from the baseline legislation that Senator BOND and I introduced earlier this year. The amendment does not include a requirement that the chief of the National Guard sit on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and we also removed the provision that would give the National Guard separate budget authority. We heard some strong objections from other members about these two provisions, and, as chairs of the wide-reaching Senate National Guard Caucus, we wanted to do the best we could to accommodate every Guard supporter.

However, we still strongly believe in the importance of opening to the chief of the National Guard Bureau a position on the Joint Staff and of giving to the Guard more general flexibility in procuring equipment to match the needs of its missions. We will fight for these provisions another day.

Given that we have dropped the core objections that some have raised against Guard empowerment, there was absolutely no reason that any member of the Senate could oppose this legislation. This amendment is about fairness and effectiveness. It is about fairness in that it makes sure that the National Guard is not treated like a stepchild in key budget and policy deliberations. Giving greater institutional standing to the Guard makes it a lot harder for the Guard to get short-thrift in these discussions.

Our amendment is about effectiveness in that it will improve the use of the Guard in homeland security matters, which is becoming quite a regular phenomenon. The National Guard is being used regularly in a so-called title 32 status to increase security and provide military disaster response. Under this status, the Guard serves under command and control of the Nation's Governors, with Federal financing. In addition to the recent Southern Border mission, the National Guard served spectacularly during Katrina in this way, providing one of the most effective responses to that disaster. By allowing the National Guard to talk regularly across the Department of Defense and to work closely with the States to identify gaps, our amendment takes advantage of the knowledge of the members of the National Guard to help plug holes in our homeland defense. And we make this whole process for activating the Guard in title 32 far smoother.

The National Guard is critical to the Nation's defense on a number of levels. We must have the trust and confidence in this force to give them more responsibility. At the same time, we simply cannot have a repeat of the ill-advised recommendations from the Army and the Air Force that sought to slash the National Guard personnel levels. The Army wanted to cut the Army Guard by more than 17,000 troops and the Air Guard by almost 14,000. These proposed cuts made absolutely no sense.

We need to turn this dynamic around. We cannot keep asking the Guard to do more for the country, and then force it to justify its existence. The National Guard needs institutional standing and leadership commensurate with its missions and capabilities.

Our National Guard stands willing to do even more to protect the country, and this amendment will give them a key tool to help them contribute to the Nation's defense.

I thank my colleagues and friends, the chair and ranking members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, for their support of this amendment. We cannot afford to let our Guard down.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Levin-Reed amendment on U.S. policy in Iraq. Before I continue, I would like to say a word about our troops and their families. We owe our brave servicemembers and their families a debt of gratitude for their selfless service and great sacrifice in Iraq, over the last 3 years. Members of our Armed Forces are at this moment deployed in harm's way, many on their second or third deployment. They and their families should know they have our wholehearted support and gratitude, with deeds, not just with words. Our troops need to know, what is our exit strategy?

In October 2002, as the Senate debated giving the President authority to invade Iraq, I asked whether our troops would be greeted with land mines or parades. Three years later, we know the answer. Our forces have faced a violent insurgency and terrorist attacks that have claimed the lives of 2,500 brave American servicemembers. We went to war with Iraq, but today we find ourselves at war in Iraq. After 3 years, it is time for a new approach.

Mr. President, 2006 must be a year of transition in Iraq. We want Iraqis to lead, so we can leave. It is important for Iraqis to take ownership of Iraq. They must provide for their own security, take charge of economic development, and restore civic order. Iraq is beginning to move in the right direction, but our open-ended presence is keeping them from making faster progress.

That is why I am proud to support this amendment, which calls on the President to begin reducing U.S. troop levels in Iraq by the end of 2006. This amendment gives us a plan for a phased, structured withdrawal of our troops so Iraqi forces can take control of their country in an orderly way.

This is not about cut and run. This is about getting out of the way so Iraqis can run their own country. Iraqi security and police forces are getting stronger by the day, and the U.S. commander in Iraq, General George Casey, thinks it will be possible to reduce the U.S. presence in Iraq by as many as 30,000 troops by the end of 2006.

Iraqi National Security Adviser, Mowaffak al-Rubaie, has said that the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's Government in the eyes of its people. In an excellent article in the June 20, 2006 Washington Post, he details the ''road map'' for restoring security in Iraq and reducing the presence of foreign troops. The road map's objectives are similar to the benchmarks for withdrawal of U.S. forces outlined last year in legislation offered by Senator WARNER and Senator LEVIN, which I supported.

Here is what Mr. Rubaie said can be done: ''With the governors of each province meeting these strict objectives, Iraq's ambition is to have full control of the country by the end of 2008. We envisage the U.S. troop presence by year's end to be under 100,000, with most of the remaining troops to return home by the end of 2007.'' He went on to say that ''. . . the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people. . . . [T]he draw-down of foreign troops will strengthen our fledgling government to last the full four years it is supposed to.'' Mr. Rubaie concluded, ''Iraq has to grow out of the shadow of the United States and the coalition, take responsibility for its own decisions, learn from its own mistakes, and find Iraqi solutions to Iraqi problems, with the knowledge that our friends and allies are standing by with support and help should we need it.'' We salute and support the position the Iraqis themselves are taking. This is what the Levin-Reed amendment does. Iraqis want full control of their country by the end of 2008, and we should help them toward that goal.

We need to ensure that an adequate number of Iraqi Army battalions can operate independently to defeat the insurgency and protect Iraq's borders, and we must ensure an adequate number of Iraqi police and security units are trained and equipped to maintain law and order. The Iraqi Government is committed to meeting these benchmarks as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, our brave men and women are serving with great honor in Iraq. Their service has paved the way for democratic elections and for the formation of a new unity government. We are all tremendously proud of their accomplishments and grateful for their sacrifice. It is time for the Iraqi Government to stand up, so our troops can begin to stand down.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an amendment that I intended to offer to the Defense Authorization bill to address the situation in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The amendment would have required that the United States charge, repatriate, or release individuals held at Guantanamo within 180 days of the enactment of the Defense Authorization bill. If for some reason the Government failed to comply within the timeframe provided under the amendment, the Department of Defense would have to provide a report regarding why they have not complied. The amendment would not have closed Guantanamo, and nothing in the amendment would have required the Government to release individuals who are a threat to our national security.

I think this is a reasonable approach. These are all options that the President has said that he is moving forward on. I have decided, however, not to offer my amendment at this time for a number of reasons. First, given the looming cloture vote, it is clear we will not have time to have a full and open debate on this issue. I believed that this is an important issue that deserved more time. I have also been advised by other Senators that they need additional time to study the proposal.

I strongly believe that the indefinite imprisonment of persons without charges is inconsistent with the traditions and values of the United States, and that it will continue to cause difficulty in our relations with other nations, including the allies that we rely on in confronting the threat of terrorism.

As President Bush said on June 14, 2006:

> No question, Guantanamo sends a signal to some of our friends—provides an excuse, for example, to say the United States is not upholding the values that they're trying to encourage other countries to adhere to.

I think the President is right.

According to an article in today's Miami Herald, Retired Army GEN Barry McCaffery, who recently visited Guantanamo, said: ''We are in a political and legal mess that is beyond belief'' and political leaders need to fix the ''legal schizophrenia'' that exists by continuing to hold individuals at Guantanamo.

I completely agree, and it is my hope that the Senate will afford time to debate this issue in the near future.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, America has long been a beacon of human rights and democracy in the world. But Guantanamo demonstrates the administration's disrespect for the rule of law.

The administration is trying to have it both ways. They claim the detainees at Guantanamo are prisoners of war and thus should be held until the end of hostilities. At the same time they refuse to treat them as prisoners of war under the Geneva Conventions.

In the first gulf war, the International Committee of the Red Cross said that our Nation's compliance with the Geneva Conventions was the best of any country in any conflict in the history of the conventions. Sadly, this administration has presided over the steepest and deepest fall from grace in our Nation's history.

The administration did not give the detainees the field hearings required under article 5 of the conventions, when the information relating to their capture was most readily available. Over 2 years later, the administration created combatant status review tribunals to substitute for the field hearings they should have held.

It is no surprise that it is often very difficult to find the necessary evidence. Yet the administration doesn't even try. The Boston Globe recently reported that 34 detainees convinced officials that overseas witnesses would provide relevant testimony. But in every case—every case—the administration said the witnesses could not be found. Yet in three days, Boston Globe reporters found three out of four witnesses—one of whom is teaching right here at the Pentagon's own National Defense University.

The shocking ease with which the Boston Globe located these witnesses suggests that the Government didn't make an effort to find them and raises serious questions about the administration's good faith in dealing with the detainees at Guantanamo. We have an even greater obligation to make sure we have a strong case now, since we have already kept these people for so long.

The administration not only ignored the law when it came to ensuring that these people were properly classified, but it also failed to give them the proper treatment.

The Geneva Conventions clearly state the standard for humane treatment of prisoners of war:

> No physical or mental torture, nor any other form of coercion, may be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of any kind whatever. Prisoners of war who refuse to answer may not be threatened, insulted, or exposed to unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind.

This administration threw out the golden rule that had served us so well for so long. Instead, they adopted new rules that allowed cruel tactics such as waterboarding, use of military dogs, and stress positions. The administration consistently overruled the objections of experienced military personnel and those who represent American interests abroad, including Alberto Mora, the former general counsel of the Navy.

As Secretary of State Colin Powell warned the White House, ''It will reverse over a century of U.S. policy and practice in supporting the Geneva Conventions and undermine the protections of the law of war for our troops.'' Senior Defense officials were warned that changing the rules could lead to so-called ''force drift,'' in which, without clearer guidance, the level of force applied to an uncooperative detainee might well result in torture.

But these wise words fell on deaf ears. Officials at the highest levels of the administration viewed the rule of law as inconvenient and quaint. As Lawrence Wilkerson, former chief of staff to Secretary Powell, said, ''I don't think, in our history, we've ever had a presidential involvement, a secretarial involvement, a vice-presidential involvement, an attorney general involvement in telling our troops essentially carte blanche is the way you should feel.''

There is little doubt that some of those detainees are cold-blooded killers intent on harming Americans. They should be charged for their crimes and locked away. But far too many were swept up in raids by the Afghans and turned over to the Americans for reward money. Some were seized from the streets of Africa, Thailand, or Europe. As Jay Hood, the former commander of Guantanamo, said, ''Sometimes we just didn't get the right folks.''

The terrorists don't obey the Geneva Conventions. But we can't win the war on terror by stooping to their level. We do not win by repudiating the very ideals our soldiers are fighting for. We win by setting an example—by doing unto others as we would have them do unto us.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have argued that we need to hold these people until the end of the war on terror.

We have created legal and literal black holes where detainees are being held without hope of receiving due process or fair and humane treatment, and that is nothing short of a travesty. We criticize such tactics in repressive regimes for doing exactly that. It is the height of hypocrisy. It violates the basic principles on which our Nation was founded. Indefinite detention is not the American way. We need to restore our standing in the eyes of the world as a beacon of human rights, and the best way to start is by closing Guantanamo.

I understand the Senator from New Mexico was unable to get sufficient time to debate his amendment and will not insist on a vote. I hope that he will continue to fight for its adoption, and I urge my colleagues to support the Bingaman amendment when it is offered again.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a matter that has tremendous potential to decrease cancer deaths among the millions of military dependents and retirees served by the TRICARE health program. I am talking about colonoscopy, a medical procedure used very commonly to screen for colon cancer. Medical specialists tell me that colonoscopy is the most accurate test for detecting colon cancer at the very earliest stages, when it is highly treatable.

As my colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee are aware, I have been very concerned that DOD's TRICARE medical plan hasn't covered colonoscopy to screen for colon cancer in average-risk beneficiaries over age 50, even though both Medicare and the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program did so. Instead, DOD's policy has been to pay for screening colonoscopy to detect colon cancer only for a very narrow group of high-risk individuals. This limitation meant that many of our military retirees and dependents have not been able to get access to this sensitive cancer screening test, and as a result, they may well have been subject to adverse health consequences from delayed cancer detection.

I called this omission to the attention of the committee and introduced legislation to rectify the situation. I was pleased to be joined in these efforts to fix this problem by Senators MIKULSKI and BINGAMAN.

Mr. President, I am pleased to say today that DOD has done the right thing by modifying the TRICARE criteria for screening colonoscopy so that all average-risk TRICARE beneficiaries over age 50 have access to this important cancer screening test. This new policy, which is retroactive to procedures performed since March 15, 2006, is good news in the ongoing battle against colon cancer, and I would hope that DOD would disseminate widely the news of the availability of this important preventive service.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues Senators BOXER and BINGAMAN in introducing an amendment to the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Act concerning the Park Service's management of Santa Rosa Island within the Channel Islands National Park.

I remain deeply concerned about a provision in the House version of the Defense authorization bill regarding the future use of Santa Rosa Island.

Under a binding court settlement, non-native deer and elk must be removed from the island by 2011. The House language would prohibit the Park Service from eliminating this non-native herd by providing for a 4-year period of intensive hunting beginning in 2008.

The Park Service is firmly opposed to the House provision. Nor, to my understanding, did the Department of Defense ask for the language.

I am particularly concerned that the House provision would waste taxpayer dollars and deny public access.

The taxpayers paid approximately $30 million to acquire Santa Rosa Island in 1986 to restore its native ecology and provide public access.

In addition to the $30 million, the previous owners agreed to what would seem to be a fair deal: they were permitted to keep hunting and grazing on the land through 2011. A court settlement in the late 1990s removed the cattle immediately but reaffirmed that the non-native deer and elk would have to be removed by 2011.

Now, under the House provision, the prior owners will be able to continue charging $16,000 or more for their privately operated hunting trips. Even though the Government purchased the island from them for $30 million in taxpayer money, they would get to keep essentially everything they had before and that is simply not in the public interest.

As I said earlier, I strongly oppose the loss of public access to the island. This is the public's land. It is a national park, and the public should be able to visit it.

But these privately operated hunting trips require the closure of 90 percent of the island to the public for 4 to 5 months of the year, even sometimes during peak season.

Now while the House language doesn't specifically say this, I understand one of its purposes was to provide hunting opportunities for disabled veterans. Yet it should be pointed out that in California today, there are already nine military installations that permit hunting five that can accommodate disabled service members.

Two of these military installations, Camp Pendleton and Vandenberg Air Force Base, are adjacent to the Channel Islands National Park, and allow disabled veterans to hunt a variety of animals including deer, waterfowl, quail, feral pigs, small game, and coyote.

All together there are over 100 U.S. military installations where hunting is permitted, over 70 of which are currently accessible to disabled servicemembers and veterans.

Consequently, I strongly believe that the Park Service should continue managing this National Park for the benefit of the general public.

It is simply unfair to the taxpayers to allow a provision in the House version of the Defense authorization bill to impede on the public's right to access the island.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS, in offering the Military Family Support Act as an amendment to S. 2766, the fiscal year 2007 Defense authorization bill. This amendment would bring a small measure of relief to the families of our men and women in uniform as they seek to maintain a sense of normalcy here at home while their loved ones are deployed in service to our country. Our ongoing large-scale deployments in Iraq continue to demand so much from our men and women in uniform and their families. Passing this amendment is the least we can do.

As part of the predeployment process, military personnel with dependent

children or other dependent family members, such as elderly parents who require care, designate a caregiver for their dependents. This person will act in the deployed personnel's place to provide care for these family members during the period of deployment. The caregiver could be a spouse, parent, sibling, or other responsible adult who is capable of caring for, and willing to care for, the dependents in question.

The Jeffords-Feingold amendment would create two programs to provide additional leave options for persons who have been designated as caregivers. The first program would require the Office of Personnel Management, OPM, to create a program under which Federal employees who are designated as caregivers could use accrued annual or sick leave, leave bank benefits, and other leave available to them under title 5 for purposes directly relating to or resulting from their designation as a caregiver.

This amendment would also encourage the Secretary of Labor to establish a voluntary program under which private sector companies would create similar programs for their employees and to solicit participation from private sector companies. I commend the many employers around the country for their understanding and support when an employee or a family member of an employee is called to active duty, and I hope that companies in Wisconsin and around the country will participate in this voluntary program.

In addition, our amendment would require the Government Accountability Office to report to Congress with an evaluation of both the OPM program and the voluntary Department of Labor program. It is my hope that this evaluation will demonstrate the utility of such a leave program for designated caregivers and that these pilot programs could then be expanded to the designated caregivers of additional deployed military personnel.

This amendment builds on a measure that I introduced last year, S. 798, the Military Families Leave Act. That bill would provide a similar benefit to military families by allowing eligible employees whose spouses, parents, sons, or daughters are military personnel who are serving on or called to active duty in support of a contingency operation to use their Family and Medical Leave Act, or FMLA, benefits for issues directly relating to or resulting from that deployment. These instances could include preparation for deployment or additional responsibilities that family members take on as a result of a loved one's deployment, such as child care. I also introduced this bill during the 108th Congress.

Let me be clear, that the Jeffords-Feingold amendment does not amend the FMLA in any way. In fact, FMLA benefits are specifically exempted from the types of leave that can be used by designated caregivers for purposes directly related to or resulting from their caregiver responsibilities. While I believe that the FMLA could serve as the basis for providing additional leave opportunities for designated caregivers, opposition in some quarters to the original FMLA makes this a difficult proposition. I am proud to have been a cosponsor of this landmark law, and I believe that the FMLA continues to provide much needed assistance to millions of workers around the country as they seek to care for their own serious health condition or that of a family member or as they welcome the birth or adoption of a child. I will continue to support this law and efforts to ensure that the vital benefits that it provides are not eroded.

The Military Family Support Act is endorsed by the National Guard Association of the United States, NGAUS, the National Military Family Association, NMFA, the Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the United States, EANGUS, the Military Officers Association of America, MOAA, and the National Partnership for Women and Families.

I thank the Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS, for his work on this important measure, and I thank the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee for agreeing to accept this amendment.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment to the 2007 Defense authorization bill which I cosponsored with my esteemed colleague from California, Senator BARBARA BOXER. I also thank my other colleagues who have joined us in cosponsoring this amendment.

It is my strong belief that all prisoners of war who die in captivity should be eligible for the Purple Heart, regardless of the cause of death, for they all will have paid the ultimate price. Approximately 17,000 prisoners of war—including fine servicemembers from my own great State of Maine—have died while in captivity since December 7, 1941—the start of World War II. More than 8,100 Korean war servicemen—46 from Maine—and more than 1,800 Americans—14 from Maine—remain unaccounted for from Vietnam.

In rightful honor of all our prisoners of war, I am proud to be co-offering this amendment to the DOD authorization bill that would bestow the Purple Heart upon those Americans who perished while held captive as a result of starvation, disease, or maltreatment. Currently, only prisoners of war who die during their imprisonment of wounds inflicted by an instrument of war—such as a gunshot wound or intentional poisoning—are eligible for posthumous Purple Heart recognition. Those who die of starvation, disease, or other causes during captivity are not.

How can we say that anyone who dies at the hands of our enemy doesn't deserve this mark of respect and honor from a grateful nation—whether they make the ultimate sacrifice on the battlefield or behind barbed wire? They fought for America and died at the hands of our enemy—what more do we need to know and what more could they have given than their very lives? They and their families have earned this honor.

The intent of this amendment is to correct this injustice by requiring the President, our Commander in Chief, to review the current circumstances establishing eligibility for the Purple Heart and advise Congress on modifications to the criteria for the Purple Heart award, which I strongly believe should take into account such inhuman war tactics as the deliberate withholding of medical treatment for injury or disease by enemy forces.

Last month, the House Armed Services Committee adopted their version of the Honor Our Fallen Prisoners of War Act—which had 216 cosponsors—during committee markup of the Defense authorization bill. The Honor Our Fallen Prisoners of War Act has been endorsed by a number of prominent military and veterans organizations, including the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Korean War Veterans Association, National League of POW/MIA Families, and the Tiger Survivors.

The posthumous awarding of the Purple Heart Award to members of the armed services who died while in captivity or died due to injury or illness incurred while in captivity would be of only some comfort to the next of kin of these fine service men and women. I sincerely hope that the Senate Armed Service Committee will follow suit by taking similar action as the House and adopt this legislation.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM DAY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, yesterday, my colleague and friend, Senator SANTORUM, hosted a bipartisan, bicameral event to evaluate the status of religious freedom in America and around the world. I thank Senator SANTORUM for his passionate commitment to the cause of religious liberty, as well as my colleagues NORM COLEMAN and SAM BROWNBACK for their participation.

Religious freedom is the bedrock of our founding principles. Indeed, it is the very first clause of the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution:

''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.''

As George Washington wrote in his letter to the United Baptist Chamber of Virginia, May of 1789: ''Every man, conducting himself as a good citizen,

and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshiping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience.''

We are blessed to live in a country built on freedom of conscience, thought, and action. Waves and waves of hopeful aspirants have flocked to these shores to exercise this basic human right.

But in every era, religious freedom, like all other freedoms, has come under challenge. And in every era, we have been called upon to promote and defend religious liberty here at home and in faraway lands. We do so as a matter of principle. Freedom of conscience and religion is the most basic, fundamental human right. No person should be persecuted, imprisoned or harmed because of their personal faith. But as 9/11 showed us with such terrible force, we also do so as a matter of national security.

I thank Senator SANTORUM for bringing this topic front and center to Capitol Hill yesterday, along with his distinguished panelists.

We heard from the eminent U.N. Ambassador John Bolton on the gains that are being made around the globe. We also heard from courageous dissidents, including Dr. Wafa Sultan and Eli El-Khoury, who have suffered for their faith and been persecuted for their convictions.

America must remain ever vigilant to the threats, challenges, and opportunities we face. From North Korea to the troubled Middle East, for millions of people, religious liberty is still a fragile hope they look to us to nurture.

It is our duty as Americans and our honor as sons and daughters of the greatest revolution and the ongoing American experiment in ordered liberty and religious freedom.

TRIBUTE TO MANNY CORTEZ

Mr. REID. Mr. President, when people around the world think of my home State of Nevada, their first thoughts are usually of Las Vegas.

Around the world, people know us for our first-class entertainment and resorts, our world-class dining, and for slogans like ''what happens in Vegas, stays in Vegas.'' But what most people don't know is that Las Vegas is the city it is today because of the hard work of one man—Manny Cortez. Manny was a friend, and it is with great sadness that I come to the chamber today to pay tribute to his life. He passes away from a heart attack on Sunday. He was 67.

Manny Cortez achieved so much in life. He served on the Clark County Commission, the Taxi Authority, and in the district attorney's office. He was, however, best known as the president of the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority. He held this post for 13 years, from 1991 to 2004. Under Manny's tenure, Las Vegas went from seeing 21 million visitors a year to more than 35 million, from 1.8 convention delegates to nearly 6 million, and from 73,000 hotel rooms to 140,000 hotel rooms.

As his successor on the convention board, Rossi Ralenkotter, said: Manny was one of the cornerstones that made Las Vegas the success it is today.

Former Clark County Commissioner Paul Christensen has echoed that sentiment, saying: Putting Manny Cortez in charge of the (convention authority) was one of the better moves we ever made. He never ever told you he would so something that he wouldn't back up.

Throughout his life, Manny was recognized as an astute marketer and businessman. For example, he was named Person of the Year by Travel Magazine in 1999. He was past president of the Boys and Girls Clubs in Las Vegas. He served on a number of boards. But for all his achievements and success, I think the Las Vegas community will remember Manny more for being a leader and good man.

In Monday's Las Vegas Sun, Editor Brian Greenspun shares this recollection of Manny.

> When the late Gov. Mike O'Callaghan appointed Manny to the Taxi Authority, he said that in Manny he had a man who cared about people and about doing what was right. Manny lived that obligation throughout his life.

That is how I will remember Manny too, as a good man who always did the right thing.

Manny—like Las Vegas—was a true American success story. He was born in Las Cruces, NM. His father was a baker. His mother was a retailer. They moved to Las Vegas when Manny was 5. A product of Las Vegas schools, he held a degree from Nevada Southern University. He didn't start at the top, but he ended up there.

Manny leaves behind his wife Joanna, two daughters, Catherine and Cynthia, and two grandchildren, Andrew and Christina. Today, Mr. President, our prayers are with them.

Many is gone. He will be missed. And his presence will be felt by everyone who visits Las Vegas.

IMPROVING SERVICES FOR HOMELESS VETERANS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced legislation to improve services for homeless veterans, and prevent chronic homelessness amongst our returning servicemen and women in the war on terror. This bill will expand the housing and services available to our Nation's homeless veterans and their dependents, and improve the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, to provide health care services to this same group of deserving Americans. I will take a few moments now to explain the provisions of this legislation.

Public Law 107–95 was the last comprehensive homeless veterans assistance act signed into law. A number of the authorizations in that law, aimed at preventing and reducing homelessness amongst veterans, have expired or will expire this year. In March, I held a hearing on these needs, at which VA, its Federal partners, and community-based service providers to the homeless testified about what is working, what isn't, what duplication might be eliminated, and where deficiencies exist that must be addressed.

At the hearing, we learned that this year alone, more than a half dozen Federal agencies will devote over $2 billion to homelessness. VA alone will spend upward of $221 million on grants, housing and treatment of underlying conditions. In fact, the budget the Senate passed included record-level funding for the sixth straight year for targeted programs for homeless veterans. These figures do not include the total costs of the law enforcement and emergency medical treatment for the homeless, which are astounding.

Plainly stated, America's chronically homeless are some of the most expensive people in communities across this country, yet they live lives no one wants to imagine having. We must ensure that our resources are invested carefully so that homeless veterans can resume their self-sufficiency and independence. I believe this bill will help us realize this shared goal.

Among other things, this measure extends the authorization of appropriations for comprehensive services for homeless veterans, a grant program for homeless veterans with special needs, a technical assistance program, and extends the authority of the Advisory Committee on Homeless Veterans. It also extends the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to transfer properties obtained through foreclosures of Department home mortgages to certain organizations to assist homeless veterans and their families in acquiring shelter. The bill also includes the authorization of appropriations for a program designed to prevent homelessness by providing financial assistance to eligible entities to provide and coordinate the provision of supportive services for very low-income veteran families occupying permanent housing.

I am pleased to introduce the Comprehensive Homeless Veterans Assistance and Prevention Act of 2006 along with my committee ranking member, Senator AKAKA, as well as two committee members who have been particularly active on issues facing homeless veterans, Senators BURR and OBAMA.

Over the coming days, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will be taking up this bill and other legislation introduced to improve the range of services and benefits available to our Nation's veterans. I look forward to working with my colleagues throughout the rest of this Congress on these and other important efforts.

GRATITUDE FOR KATRINA VOLUNTEERS IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, the way the American people responded to the loss and suffering wrought by Hurricane Katrina was probably unprecedented and surely unforgettable. We in Mississippi, and our neighbors elsewhere along the gulf coast, will always remember the aid, the labor, the rescues, the prayers—everything our fellow citizens did to bring us through that terrible ordeal.

I wish it were possible to acknowledge every individual who came to assist us when we most needed them, but that honor roll is far too long for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Moreover, their names, I am sure, are inscribed in a more important book, and their lasting reward will be much greater than our praise.

I do want to take note of one particular group of volunteers from the State of North Carolina. On short notice, on September 2, 2005, more than 90 health care professionals left their homes and their jobs to come to Hancock County, where Katrina had left the towns of Waveland and Bay St. Louis in ruins. Because Hancock Regional Hospital was flooded, the Carolina volunteers created a field hospital that operated for 2 months and cared for more than 7,000 patients. During that time, more than 400 doctors, nurses, paramedics, and other health care professionals rotated through the facility, caring for local residents until Hancock Regional Hospital could again admit patients.

These men and women selflessly served the people of Mississippi during one of the worst disasters ever to confront our country. One of them, I should point out, is part of the Senate's extended family. Chris Ogden, an RN, is the daughter of our own Joy Ogden, manager of the Senate's Appointments Desk at the North Door of the Capitol.

To Chris, and to the more than 400 like her who brought hope and comfort to Hancock County, I offer the heartfelt gratitude of all the people of Mississippi.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JIM WILLIAMS

• Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize a tremendous public servant for his good work in leading an important Federal Government program for the past several years. Jim Williams, who currently holds the position of Director of the US–VISIT Program at the Department of Homeland Security, will soon leave this position to become the Commissioner of the Federal Acquisition Service at the General Services Administration.

There's little question that the Department's loss will be the Commission's gain. However, the good news is that one of our most accomplished, capable and experienced federal employees will continue serving his country.

In May 2003, Jim Williams took over as Director of the US–VISIT Program, a critical border-management program that collects point-of-entry and exit information on visitors entering and exiting the United States. The program uses biometric identifiers—digital finger scans and photographs—to make entering the United States easier for legitimate tourists, students, and business travelers, while making it more difficult for those who might do us harm to enter and stay in the United States illegally. Hundreds of thousands of visitors cross the Texas border each year, and the US–VISIT system has improved security without slowing down legal trade and tourism.

Mr. Williams' job was to develop a solid foundation of policies and practices that would guide the program for the foreseeable future. It was a critical moment for the program, and Mr. Williams skillfully seized this opportunity. In a little more than 2 years, Mr. Williams helped develop US–VISIT into a viable program. Mr. Williams built the team that developed and deployed the effort, which today is crucial to our immigration and border-management system.

Under Mr. Williams' leadership, US–VISIT has met its congressional deadlines on time and under budget and has helped establish the foundation of the U.S. Government's 21st century immigration and border-management system.

Jim Williams is a model public servant and leader. He has left a tremendous imprint on the US–VISIT Program and on the many people who work with him at US–VISIT and across the Government. Because of his leadership, US–VISIT has cultivated a talented team that will guide the program in the years ahead. They will continue to help overcome the challenges that face our Nation, and Mr. Williams will continue to provide the American people with the very best of Government service. We wish Mr. Williams well and thank him for his continued service to our country.•

RETIREMENT OF AIR FORCE CHIEF MASTER SERGEANT GERALD R. MURRAY

• Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, I am honored to recognize Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force Gerald R. Murray on the occasion of his retirement from the Air Force after 29 years of faithful and selfless service.

Chief Murray grew up in Boiling Springs, NC, and entered the Air Force in October 1977. His background includes various duties in aircraft maintenance, and as a command chief master sergeant at wing, numbered Air Force, and major command levels. He served this great Nation in assignments in the States of Texas, Florida, South Carolina, Washington, Hawaii, Washington, DC, and also served overseas in Turkey, Japan, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia in support of operations Desert Storm and Southern Watch.

As the 14th Chief Master Sergeant appointed to the highest noncommissioned officer position, Gerald R. Murray represents the highest enlisted level of leadership within the Air Force. He provided direction for the enlisted corps and represented their interests to the American public and to those in all levels of Government. He served as the personal adviser to the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of the Air Force on all issues regarding the welfare, readiness, morale, and proper utilization and progress of the enlisted force.

Chief Murray served our country with great responsibility, dedication, loyalty, and integrity. I know my Senate colleagues join me in congratulating him on his retirement, and I am proud to publicly commend him on a truly remarkable and distinguished career. I wish him every success in the years to come.•

BILL AND ROSE MARY MOONEY BROOKS' 60TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the 60th anniversary of Bill and Rose Mary Mooney Brooks on July 6, 2006. Their life together truly represents the American ideal. They met when Bill, an Army captain, took a weekend leave, with his fellow officer and best buddy Lewis Mooney. Lew introduced Bill to his younger sister Rose Mary that weekend in Philadelphia. Shortly after the war ended, they were married and Rose Mary and Bill returned to his home State where they made their home in Sioux Falls, SD. There they built a construction business and a family. Quite a family in fact, their first child and only daughter Barbara has shared my life for the last 37 years. Barbara was followed by six sons, Theodore, Robert, Ronald, Raymond, Richard, and Stephen.

During their years together, their business, Brooks Construction, and later Brooks Concrete, was always known for quality work but, most importantly, for integrity. Bill was also a founding officer of the South Dakota Air National Guard where he served until he retired as a lieutenant colonel. Then, as now, guard service required sacrifice. During the Korean war, Bill had to leave his new business and move his young family to Duluth, MN, where, once again, he served his country.

They were active members and leaders in their church where Rose Mary enjoyed singing in the choir. Her Irish sensibilities and intelligence gave her grace and wit in raising the children. They were strong supporters of whatever their seven children chose to participate. Whether it was a starring role on the football team, an all-day wrestling meet, a lead in a musical, or one line in a class play, Bill and Rose Mary were in the stands. Their children will tell you that they were and are wonderful parents.

There are many American ideals that apply to Bill and Rose Mary. Their love story truly captures the American dream and I am proud to be part of their family, and honored to offer my congratulations on their 60th anniversary.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF MOBRIDGE, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 100th anniversary of the founding of Mobridge, SD. Mobridge is a beautiful community located on the Missouri River, with friendly people and a strong local economy.

Long before the settlers arrived, the site of Mobridge was inhabited by mound dwellers. Following the mound dwellers were the Woodland Indians, who in turn were followed by the Mandan and Arikaras. The Sioux Indians arrived later, coming from the East. In the late 1800s settlers began moving onto the land that eventually became the site of Mobridge. General S.E. Olson owned the land on which the city was built. The idea that Mobridge should be the place where the Milwaukee Railroad met the Missouri River came to him while goose hunting. The name ''Mobridge'' came from the abbreviating of ''Missouri Bridge.'' The Milwaukee Railroad reached Mobridge on September 9, 1906. A.H. Brown contributed materially to give Mobridge a convention center and marketplace. Monuments can still be found around the town, including the A.H. Brown Library, the Mascot Theatre, the Mobridge Wholesale building, and the Brown Palace Apartments.

Mobridge offers immense opportunities to those who enjoy the outdoors. With Lake Oahe near the city, Mobridge is able to hold national and regional fishing tournaments every year. The area also presents many good hunting opportunities, as well.

In Mobridge, there is a school, library, nursing home, three clinics, a beautiful nine-hole golf course, municipal airport, three parks, an outdoor swimming pool, the Mobridge Tribune, and 12 churches along with many other thriving businesses.

Each year Mobridge offers events such as parades, carnivals, and rodeos. The Lewis and Clark Renaissance Festival reenacts the visit of the famous explorers to the area, and local jazz bands can often be heard entertaining in the gazebos of parks.

The city will be celebrating this memorable occasion July 1st through the 4th with events such as a pancake breakfast, a school reunion, a dance, rodeo, parade, and fireworks along with other various activities. This celebration is an appropriate way to honor the past and a chance to look toward the future. I am pleased to recognize the achievements of Mobridge and to offer my congratulations to the residents of the community on this historic milestone.●

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF CROCKER, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to the 125th anniversary of the founding of the city of Crocker, SD.

A cafe was the first business to open in Crocker in 1906. The cafe was soon followed by the Lambert Lumber Company and the Crocker State Bank. Eventually the town expanded to include a clothing store, pool hall, drug store, hardware farm machinery store, and a blacksmith. The first train ran through Crocker in 1907. Soon there were four trains a day, with a sleeper on one train en route to Minneapolis. The post office was established on February 6, 1907. The first Crocker school was moved into the town in 1908, on the corner of Vera Street and Third Avenue.

Today the Crocker Lutheran Church, which was founded in 1917, still remains a thriving place for its congregation.

I am proud to publicly honor Crocker on this memorable occasion. Small communities like Crocker are part of the backbone of our great State and help to preserve our agricultural roots and deep-seated character. After 125 years, Crocker still exemplifies what it means to be a great South Dakota community.●

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF MOUNT VERNON, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to the 125th anniversary of the founding of Mount Vernon, SD.

Mount Vernon, originally named ''Arlandton,'' is thought to be named by a Virginian or someone who had wanted to pay tribute to George Washington's estate. The town plat was recorded in 1882 around the same time period that John Pease established the Mount Vernon Gazette. Closely following this, a hardware store, livery stable, lumber yard, drug store, cigar manufactory, hotel, and various other firms were established. Mount Vernon's survival, like many South Dakota communities, was largely dependent on the newly constructed railroad.

The community endured a fair share of hardship during the early years. In 1888, a ferocious blizzard caused conditions so intense that people froze to death just a few feet from shelter. Then in 1889, a fire burned down 53 buildings in the fledgling town and caused damage to many more. However, the community spirit was resilient, and the residents rebuilt.

Mount Vernon currently holds an estimated population of 477 citizens. It is still home to many thriving businesses, as well as the high school's Mount Vernon Mustangs.

I am pleased to announce that Mount Vernon celebrated its 125th anniversary with a community celebration on June 16 to 18. There were numerous events scheduled, including a petting zoo, tractor show, golf tournament, and parade. This celebration was a fitting way to recognize Mount Vernon's long and productive history.

Even 125 years after its founding, Mount Vernon continues to be a vital community and a great asset to South Dakota. I am proud to publicly honor Mount Vernon on this memorable occasion.●

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF WEBSTER, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to the 125th anniversary of the founding of the city of Webster, SD. Webster is a vibrant community and an asset to the State of South Dakota. It is the county seat of Day County.

Webster is an excellent destination for outdoorsmen. Hunters will find an abundance of ringneck pheasant, as well as many duck varieties, Canada geese, and doves. Anglers will enjoy the excellent fishing at nearby Waubay Lake and many other area glacial lakes. For the winter months, miles of snowmobiling trails run around the town and the rest of Day County. It truly is ''a place for all seasons.''

Webster also boasts a variety of man-made attractions. The Blue Dog Lake Fish Hatchery opened in 1982, and it is the only cool and warm water fish hatchery in South Dakota. The facility sits on scenic Blue Dog Lake, which has a variety of hiking trails and outdoor facilities. Webster is also home to the Day County Museum and the Museum of Wildlife, Science & Industry. Residents benefit from the services of six churches, a golf course, the Webster Reporter & Farmer, and a variety of other businesses.

Today, Webster is a credit to South Dakota and our way of life. The town has just constructed a new high school to help educate its next generation of young people and to ensure the vibrancy and vitality of the Webster community for years to come. The people of Webster will celebrate their town's 125th anniversary from July 27 through the 30. I am proud to publicly honor this community on this special occasion.●

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF SIOUX FALLS, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 150th anniversary of the founding of Sioux Falls, SD. Sioux Falls is the largest city in South Dakota and growing at a phenomenal rate. Sioux Falls is a progressive and diverse community with all the opportunities normally associated large metropolitan areas and the friendliness of a small town. I offer my congratulations to the people of Sioux Falls on this momentous occasion.

The waterfalls for which Sioux Falls is named have long been an attractive feature. Burial mounds have been found near the site dating as far back as 500 B.C. The area was settled by Europeans in the 1850s, when two groups made claims to land around the falls. Fort Dakota was established in 1865, and shortly thereafter the town began to blossom. The railroads arrived in the 1880s, and over the course of the decade the population leapt from 2,164 to 10,167. Other major events for the area include the opening of the John Morrell plant in 1909, establishment of an airbase in 1942, and the conclusion of construction of the interstate highways in the early 1960s.

Modern Sioux Falls boasts a wide variety of educational, cultural, artistic, and recreational opportunities. The city has offerings from both public and private universities, including Augustana University and the University of Sioux Falls, as well as many specialized and technical schools for those seeking to further their educational goals. The city is served by the Argus Leader newspaper. The Old Courthouse Museum and the Pettigrew Museum are major attractions, as is the historic downtown area generally. The Washington Pavilion of Arts and Science, the Great Plains Zoo, and St. Joseph's Cathedral are only a small sample of the interesting places and activities in Sioux Falls.

Sioux Falls is celebrating its sesquicentennial with a variety of events over the summer, such as ''150 Candles!'', a musical tribute to the history of Sioux Falls; historic building tours; a sesquicentennial gala ball; a performance by He Sapa Dancers and Lakota Drum Group; a commemorative Sioux Falls Canaries baseball game and fireworks display; and a parade ending at Falls Park with a community picnic to follow. These activities will serve as a reminder of the shared history of the community and bring the close-knit people of Sioux Falls even closer together.

This anniversary is a significant milestone for Sioux Falls. After 150 years, the city is stronger than ever. I am pleased to publicly honor the achievements of this wonderful South Dakota community as they reach this juncture. As the slogan of the community celebration states, the citizens of Sioux Falls are ''Honoring the Past, Shaping the Future.''●

CENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF ORTLEY, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to the centennial of the founding of the community of Ortley, SD.

Ortley is situated in the southwestern corner of Roberts County. Ortley was established on the Sisseton Wahpeton Indian Reservation when C.E. Anderson purchased the land in 1906. The town was originally named Anderson Townsite. However, the name was later changed to Ortley to correspond with the name of the township in which it is located. The town was incorporated in 1907, and the first elected trustees were C.E. Anderson, Paul Halvorson, and D.L. Branum.

One year after the land was purchased, Ortley experienced an immense building boom. In 1907, a railway company established a depot and stockyard in the town. A labor yard, meat market, hotel, bank, hardware store, and general stores were also constructed. In the area in which Ortley is located the principal industries have been farming, raising livestock, and dairying.

Small towns like Ortley add to the character of our wonderful State. I am pleased to announce that Ortley will be celebrating its centennial on July 1, 2006. There are numerous events scheduled, including a car and motorcycle show, parade, softball game, and barbeque.

A hundred years after its founding, Ortley continues to be a vital community and a great asset to South Dakota. I am proud to honor the achievements of Ortley on this memorable occasion. ●

CENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF STRATFORD, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to the centennial of the founding of the city of Stratford, SD. A latecomer in inclusion into Brown County, Stratford sprung up rapidly in just weeks.

Stratford was founded 100 years ago on the Minneapolis and St. Louis railways. Stratford was a convenient commuter system to many of its neighboring cities at the time. In just 5 years, Stratford reached its peak population of 600.

Stratford is one of South Dakota's classic small towns. It has been the home of industry and farm-related businesses, and its meat market is known for its homemade sausages, hams, and liverwurst. The Taylor Honey Company, which processes about a million pounds of honey annually, was established in 1955 and is still a booming business. The community created Stratford's volunteer fire protection in 1911, and the post office and Badger Hole, a cafe and bar, are open to this day.

A hundred years after its founding, Stratford continues to be a vital community and a great asset to South Dakota. I am proud to honor the achievements of Stratford on this memorable occasion.●

CENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF WECOTA, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to the centennial of the founding of the town of Wecota, SD. The town, with its five streets and five avenues, is a place of great charm and character.

Wecota became a town when the Minneapolis and St. Louis railroad was completed. Although small, Wecota has had a rich history. The first building to be established in the community was a small schoolhouse. A year later, the town's post office was organized, which stayed in operation for 75 years. Of the original buildings that were built, a depot, school, bank, and elevators remain to this day.

The town has subsisted through many hardships. In 1919, a fire destroyed two grocery stores and the meat market. Then in 1926 a destructive hailstorm damaged most of the community's crops. After the hailstorm, many of Wecota's residents began to drift to other towns, though a core of dedicated residents still occupies the town.

The name ''Wecota'' is derived from an Indian word meaning ''friendship,'' and the town holds true to its name. A hundred years after its founding, Wecota continues to be a great asset to South Dakota. I am proud to honor the achievements of Wecota on this memorable occasion.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF TEA, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 100th anniversary of the founding of Tea, SD. Tea is enriched with a vibrant history reaching back to the growth of the railroads and continuing to the present, with Tea now being the fastest growing city in the State.

Tea's unusual name was discovered when the community was asked to submit 10 town names to the Postal Service but only 9 could be decided upon. A recess was called during a town meeting at which tea was served. Someone suggested the name ''Tea'' be added to the list. Shortly after, this tight-knit community was informed that their new name would be Tea. Tea was officially incorporated in 1906.

Tea's first bank was opened in 1900 in the place that is now O'Toole's bar. Unfortunately, the bank went broke in 1922 prior to the Depression. Despite the failure of the bank, Tea developed beautifully with its own post office, schoolhouse, cafes, general store, and lumberyard. Woodman Hall was the center of the town's social activities, hosting everything from roller skating to school plays. More recently, a new high school was opened in August 2005 and is a point of pride for the community. Tea is currently served by the Tea-Harrisburg Champion newspaper.

I congratulate Tea in achieving 100 wonderful years. During the week of June 10, the community gathered to celebrate with a Wild West Show, the coronation of Ma and Pa Teapot and Ecumenical church service. This celebration tied the community together even tighter, as they commemorated their history and looked to their future.

One century after its inception, Tea continues to be a valuable addition to the State of South Dakota and source of pride for all those who live there.●

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF PLANKINTON, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to the 125th anniversary of the founding of the city of Plankinton, SD. As the county seat of Aurora County, this progressive community has been a center of commercial and civic activity since its inception.

This vibrant community was laid out by General Lawler of the Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company, after he purchased the land from the founding settler, Ira Wooden. The town was named ''Merrill'' initially but was later changed to Plankinton after a wealthy Milwaukee meat packer. The original town plat was eight blocks north of the railway and three to the south. In August of 1880, the first building was erected: a one-story frame building about 12 feet by 20 feet in size, which became a saloon. A post office and bank were constructed shortly thereafter.

Now Plankinton is home to three churches; a thriving business community, including the South Dakota Mail weekly newspaper; and excellent hunting and fishing. The new high school building is a point of regional pride, having been built following a tragic fire at the former building. Home to the South Dakota State Training School for many years, that campus awaits possible redevelopment.

I am pleased to announce that Plankinton will be celebrating its 125th anniversary with a community celebration on June 23 to June 25. There are numerous events scheduled including a golf tournament, time capsule opening, demolition derby, and a parade. This celebration is a fitting way to recognize Plankinton's long and productive history.

Even 125 years after its founding, Plankinton continues to be a vital community and a great asset to the wonderful State of South Dakota. I am proud to publicly honor Plankinton on this memorable occasion.●

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF HARTFORD, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to the 125th anniversary of the founding of the town of Hartford, SD. Home to over 2,000 residents, Hartford is a vibrant and flourishing town.

The area was originally known as Oaksville, after an early settler, I.E. Oakes. However, in 1879, the Oaksville train depot was renamed ''Hartford'' by two travelers from Hartford, CT. The settlement took shape in 1881, when a post office was established. Stores, hotels, grain warehouses, and other businesses soon followed. In 1896, the citizens of Hartford petitioned the county commissioners to hold an election to incorporate the area as the ''Town of Hartford.'' After holding an election, the town was divided into three districts and trustees were elected.

Hartford's city motto, ''Hartford on the Right Road,'' captures the progressive nature of the community. The city is located just west of Sioux Falls, in Minnehaha County, and has a volunteer fire department, law enforcement, churches, and many civic organizations. In addition to the many businesses already located in Hartford, the Hartford Area Development Corporation is working to bring even more commerce and industry to the area. The community is served by the Hartford Area News weekly newspaper. In downtown Hartford, the Hartford Area Veterans Memorial honors all the men and women of Hartford who have served our country in a war.

Hartford celebrated its 125th anniversary with a Quasquicentennial Jamboree Celebration from June 1 to June 4. There were carnivals, parades, softball tournaments, golf tournaments, and even paintball and XBOX tournaments. The celebration reflected the enthusiasm the residents of Hartford have toward commemorating the history of their wonderful community.

More than a century after its founding, Hartford continues to be a great asset to South Dakota. I am proud to honor the achievements of Hartford on this memorable occasion.●

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF HOWARD, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 125th anniversary of the founding of Howard, SD. Howard is a progressive community, offering many opportunities to a variety of people, and is also the county seat of Miner County.

The city of Howard is the first municipality to own and operate their own wind turbines to supply electricity to the entire city. In recent years, it has become a regional economic development leader through efforts such as the Miner County Community Revitalization and the new Rural Learning Center. These are examples of the innovative and progressive ideas abounding in Howard. Though agriculture is the primary driver of Howard's economy, the community has found many ways to diversify. In particular, Howard has developed an excellent local technology infrastructure, helping to attract new businesses. The community is served by the Miner County Pioneer newspaper.

In addition to this healthy business climate, Howard boasts some of the world's best hunting and fishing. In the third week in October, sportsmen come from around the globe to hunt pheasant in this hotspot. Howard is also near Lake Thompson, the largest natural lake in South Dakota, and home to excellent walleye fishing.

Howard is celebrating its 125th anniversary with a variety of events. The festivities start with an all-school reunion, including students, alumni, and faculty at Howard or St. Agatha schools. Other events include a road race, parade, children's games, baseball, music, and fireworks. The events will be held on July 1st through the 4th.

Even 125 years after its founding, Howard remains a vital community and a great asset to the wonderful State of South Dakota. I am pleased to honor this lively city on such a memorable occasion, and offer my congratulations on this historic milestone. ●

TRIBUTE TO ALABAMA'S VESTAVIA HILLS HIGH SCHOOL

● Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would like to make some remarks today about Alabama's State champion and national finalist in the ''We the People'' competition. Vestavia Hills High School placed fourth in the national We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution national finals, held in Washington, DC. This impressive competition, headed by the Center for Civic Education, engaged young people in the fundamental ideals and values of American constitutional government.

Members of this remarkable team from Vestavia Hills included Grace Anthony, Georgiy Bolshinskiy, Barrett Bowdre, Courtney Bragg, Jeannette Dooley, Daniel Driscoll, Claire Foster, Sarah Graffeo, Lauren Howard, Sarah McKibben, Patrick Mulligan, John Nicholson, Tiffany Parrish, Hanna Perry, John Phillips, Joseph Siegelman, Mary Kendal Spires, William Edward Stevenson, Emily Unnasch, Amy Watson, Ryan Woodford, and Ansley Zarra.

I congratulate Amy Maddox, the teacher who led this fine team. Teachers shape the future, and I appreciate Ms. Maddox's investment in these students. As a former educator and the father of three children, I have a great admiration for educators, and I am grateful that educators like Ms. Maddox are making a difference.

I thank U.S. District Judge Karon Bowdre for her involvement and support of the Vestavia Hills High School team. Judge Bowdre is a person of great intellectual and academic ability who understands and reveres our Constitution. I am very proud that she has given of her talents to this worthy project.

I thank Janice Cowin, the executive director of the Alabama Center for Law and Civic Education.

I applaud the efforts of students, teachers, and community leaders who made this accomplishment possible. Vestavia Hills High School is an exceptional school and has represented Alabama well. I encourage these students to continue pursuing a deep understanding of the Constitution and our Government. It is important that we raise up quality leaders who will serve our country in years to come.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:56 a.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. 1285. An act to extend for 3 years changes to requirements for admission of nonimmigrant nurses in health professional shortage areas made by the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999.

H.R. 4356. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraud in connection with major disaster or emergency funds.

H.R. 5631. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 367. Concurrent resolution honoring and praising the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution on the 100th anniversary of being granted its Congressional Charter.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1285. An act to amend the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999 to remove the limitation for nonimmigrant classification for nurses in health professional shortage areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4356. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraud in connection with major disaster or emergency funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5631. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

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–7238. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Direct Final Rule Amending Requirements in Parts 50 and 72 Regarding Requirement to Submit Annual Financial Reports'' (RIN3150–AH39) received on June 5, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7239. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, National Wildlife Refuge System, Fish and Wildlife Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Refuge-Specific Public Use Regulations for Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge'' (RIN1018–AU08) received on June 5, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7240. 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 ''Community Right-to-Know; Toxic Chemical Release Reporting Using North American Industry Classification System (NAICS); Final Rule'' ((RIN2025–AA10)(FRL No. 8180–2)) received on June, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7241. 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 ''Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements for the Import of Halon-1301 Aircraft Fire Extinguishing Vessels; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule'' (FRL No. 8181–2) received on June 6, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7242. 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 ''Revision of December 2000 Clean Air Act Section 112(n) Finding Regarding Electric Utility Steam Generating Units: and Standards of Performance for New and Existing Electric Utility Steam Generating Units: Reconsideration'' ((RIN2060–AN50)(FRL No. 8180–6)) received on June 6, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7243. 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 ''National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System—Final Regulations to Establish Requirements for Cooling Water Intake Structures at Phase III Facilities'' ((RIN2040–AD70)(FRL No. 8181–5)) received on June 6, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7244. 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; State of Missouri'' (FRL No. 8181–8) received on June 6, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7245. 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 ''Amendments to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Regulations for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Oil and Gas Exploration, Production, Processing, or Treatment Operations or Transmission Facilities'' ((RIN2040–AE81)(FRL No. 8183–3)) received on June 12, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7246. 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; Indiana'' (FRL No. 8176–4) received on June 12, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7247. 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; Maryland; Ambient Air Quality Standard for Ozone and Fine Particulate Matter'' (FRL No. 8183–4) received on June 12, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7248. 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; Maryland; Revised Definition of Interruptible Gas Service'' (FRL No. 8183–2) received on June 12, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7249. 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 ''Certain Polybrominated Diphenylethers; Significant New Use Rule'' ((RIN2070)(FRL No. 7743–2)) received on June 12, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7250. 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 ''Change of Official Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics' Mailing Address; Technical Amendments'' (FRL No. 7336–5) received on June 12, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7251. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a U.S. Coast Guard report entitled ''Report on Foreign-Flag Vessels 2006''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7252. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the report of a proposed bill entitled ''Pipeline Safety and Reliability Improvement Act of 2006''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7253. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (68); Amdt. No. 3169'' ((RIN2120–AA65)(Docket No. 30497)) received on June 6, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7254. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (22); Amdt. No. 3168'' ((RIN2120–AA65)(Docket No. 30496)) received on June 6, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7255. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification and Revocation of Restricted Areas R–3007A, B, C, D, and E; Townsend, GA'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(Docket No. 96–ASO–10)) received on June 6, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7256. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of VOR Federal Airway V–623; NJ and NY'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(Docket No. 05–AEA–23)) received on June 6, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7257. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of Class E Airspace; Atqasuk, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(Docket No. 06–AAL–03)) received on June 6, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7258. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of Class E Airspace; Big Lake, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(Docket No. 06–AAL–11)) received on June 6, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7259. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel, Hazardous Materials, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials: Requirements for UN Cylinders'' (RIN2137–AD91) received on June 6, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7260. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Alaska Plaice in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (I.D. 051006A) received on June 7, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7261. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Final Rule; Amendment 19'' (RIN0648–AT98) received on June 7, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7262. A communication from the Attorney, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position of Administrator, received on June 7, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7263. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Cuba: Revisions of Personal Baggage Rules'' (RIN0694–AD23) received on June 7, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7264. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Listing Determinations for Elkhorn Coral and Staghorn Coral'' (RIN0648–XB29) received on June 8, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7265. A communication from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Parts 2 of the Commission's Rules to Allocate Spectrum Below 3 GHz for Mobile and Fixed Services to Support the Introduction of New Advanced Wireless Services, including Third Generation Wireless Systems'' (ET Docket No. 00–258; FCC 06–45) received on June 12, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7266. A communication from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act and Broadband Access and Services'' (ET Docket No. 04–295; FCC 06–56) received on June 12, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7267. A communication from the Legal Advisor, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of the Commercial Spectrum Enhancement Act and Modernization of the Commission's Competitive Bidding Rules and Procedures, Order on Reconsideration of the Second Report and Order'' (WT Docket No. 05–211; FCC 06–78) received on June 12, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7268. A communication from the Acting Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Jurisdictional Separations and Referral to the Federal-State Joint Board, CC Docket No. 80–286, Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 06–70'' (FCC 06–70; CC Docket No. 80–286) received on June 12, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7269. A communication from the Acting Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau—Broadband Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Facilitating the Provisions of Fixed and Mobile Broadband Access, Educational and Other Advanced Services in the 2150–2162 and 2500–2690 MHz Band'' (FCC 06–46) received on June 12, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7270. A communication from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Part 2 of the Commission's Rules to Allocate Spectrum Below 3 GHz for Mobile and Fixed Services to Support the Introduction of New Advanced Wireless Services, Including Third Generation Wireless Systems (Fourth Memorandum Opinion and Order)'' (ET Docket No. 00–258, FCC 06–43) received on June 12, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3549. An original bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to strengthen Government review and oversight of foreign investment in the United States, to provide for enhanced Congressional Oversight with respect thereto, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 109–264).

By Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 3237. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Intelligence Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 109–265).

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2321. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Louis Braille.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WARNER for the Committee on Armed Services.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. James N. Soligan to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Garbeth S. Graham to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brigadier General Robert B. Bailey and ending with Colonel James C. Witham, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2006.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Timothy J. Wright to be Major General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Robert Wilson to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Raymond C. Byrne, Jr. to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Brigadier General Edward H. Ballard and ending with Colonel Steven N. Wickstrom, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 25, 2006.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. James N. Mattis to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Elizabeth A. Hight to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Mark D. Harnitchek to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) John M. Bird and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Peter J. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 6, 2006.

Navy nomination of Capt. Sean F. Crean to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Michael W. Broadway to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Patrick E. McGrath and ending with Capt. Michael M. Shatynski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 27, 2006.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Ann D. Gilbride to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Jon W. Bayless, Jr. and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) William H. Payne, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 27, 2006.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Sharon H. Redpath to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Norton C. Joerg to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Bruce E. MacDonald to be Judge Advocate General of the United States Navy.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the Records on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Christine L. Blicebaum and ending with Abner Perry V. Valenzuela, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 13, 2006.

Air Force nomination of Thomas L. Yoder to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Leonard S. Williams to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Bruce B. Brehm and ending with Robert W. Windom, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 31, 2006.

Army nominations beginning with Bruce D. Adams and ending with Lisa L. Zacher, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 31, 2006.

Army nominations beginning with Paul Antoniou and ending with Peter J. Varjeen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Army nominations beginning with Richard J. Hayes, Jr. and ending with Michael N. Selby, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Army nominations beginning with Manuel Castillo and ending with Andrew J. Wargo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Army nominations beginning with Todd S. Albright and ending with Eyako K. Wurapa, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Army nomination of Roy D. Steed to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Victor Catullo and ending with Paul Brisson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2006.

Marine Corps nomination of Brent A. Harrison to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Navy nomination of Lana D. Hampton to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Keith E. Simpson to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Norman W. Porter to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Patrick M. Leard and ending with Kirby D. Miller, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Alberto S. Delmar and ending with Sheldon D. Stuchell, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Wayne A. Estabrooks and ending with Milton W. Walser, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Steven M. Briese and ending with Jeffrey H. Robinson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Christian A. Buhlmann and ending with Christopher E. Zech, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Billy R. Arnold and ending with Peter D. Yarger, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Kim A. Arrivee and ending with Roger J. Sing, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Karen S. Emmel and ending with Eric C. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with John C. Abbott and ending with Teresa S. Whiting, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Thomas L. Adams III and ending with Matthew A. Zirkle, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael E. Belcher and ending with David J. Randle, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Shawn M. Callahan and ending with Karen J. Vigneron, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Patrick G. Byrne and ending with John L. Pagona, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Louis M. Borno III and ending with Eric J. Watkiss, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Leonard M. Abbatiello and ending with John B. Stubbs, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Steven J. Ashworth and ending with Eugene P. Potente, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Frank A. Arata and ending with George M. Sutton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with John W. V. Ailes and ending with Glenn W. Zeiders III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Conrad C. Chun and ending with John F. Kirby, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael D. Angove and ending with David J. Walsh, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Craig L. Eaton and ending with Richard E. Verbeke, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2006.

Navy nomination of Michael H. Johnson to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Michael A. Hoffmann to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Richard M. Burke, Jr. and ending with Peter M. Murphy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Frederick C. Davis and ending with Eleanor J. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nomination of Claude R. Suggs to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Matthew C. Hellman and ending with Derek A. Takara, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Angela J. Baker and ending with Harold S. Zald, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Louis V. Cariello and ending with Gregory J. Zielinski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with George E. Adams and ending with Robert T. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Anthony P. Brazas and ending with Francis K. Vredenburgh, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Collette J. B. Armbruster and ending with Susan W. Woolsey, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Gregory P. Belanger and ending with Brian S. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Dale P. Barrette and ending with Silva P. D. Westerbeck, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with James A. Blustein and ending with Joseph C. K. Yang, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert A. Alonso and ending with Kristen C. Zeller, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Virginia T. Brantley and ending with Maron D. Wylie, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Douglas E. Alexander and ending with James H. Schroeder, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Paul I. Burmeister and ending with Clyde C. Reynolds, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Philip P. Alford and ending with Robert L. Yarrish, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael S. Arnold and ending with Evelyn M. Webb, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Gregory Bridges and ending with William M. Wheeler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Honorato Aguila and ending with Kimberly A. Zuzelski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2006.

Navy nominations beginning with Luz V. Alicea and ending with Peter B. Dobson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 25, 2006.

By Mr. DOMENICI for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Philip D. Moeller, of Washington, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2010.

*Jon Wellinghoff, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2008.

*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.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. HATCH (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3546. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to serious adverse event reporting for dietary supplements and nonprescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

S. 3547. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraud in connection with major disaster or emergency funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. TALENT):

S. 3548. A bill to authorize appropriate action if negotiations with Japan to allow the resumption of United States beef exports are not successful, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S. 3549. An original bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to strengthen Government review and oversight of foreign investment in the United States, to provide for enhanced Congressional Oversight with respect thereto, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

S. 3550. A bill to allow members of the Selected Reserve enrolled in the TRICARE program to pay premiums with pre-tax dollars; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANTORUM (for himself and Mr. SPECTER):

S. 3551. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Tylersville division of the Lamar National Fish Hatchery and Fish Technology Center to the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. CHAFEE):

S. 3552. A bill to encourage and ensure the use of safe equestrian helmets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 3553. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require all gasoline sold for use in motor vehicles to contain 10 percent renewable fuel in the year 2010 and thereafter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. OBAMA (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 3554. A bill to establish an alternative diesel standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TALENT:

S. 3555. A bill to establish the Office of Veterans Identity Protection Claims to reimburse injured persons for injuries suffered as a result of the unauthorized use, disclosure, or dissemination of identifying information stolen from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MARTINEZ (for himself and Mr. NELSON of Florida):

S. Res. 519. A resolution congratulating the Miami Heat for winning the National Basketball Association Championship; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 370

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 370, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 619

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 619, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 713

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 713, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 1109

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1109, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payments to Medicare ambulance suppliers of the full cost of furnishing such services, to provide payments to rural ambulance providers and suppliers to account for the cost of serving areas with low population density, and for other purposes.

S. 1293

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1293, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the consolidation of life insurance companies with other companies.

S. 1741

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1741, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize the President to carry out a program for the protection of the health and safety of residents, workers, volunteers, and others in a disaster area.

S. 1840

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1840, a bill to amend section 340B of the Public Health Service Act to increase the affordability of inpatient drugs for Medicaid and safety net hospitals.

S. 2010

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2010, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to enhance the Social Security of the Nation by ensuring adequate public-private infrastructure and to resolve to prevent, detect, treat, intervene in, and prosecute elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation, and for other purposes.

S. 2393

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 2393, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to advance medical research and treatments into pediatric cancers, ensure patients and families have access to the current treatments and information regarding pediatric cancers, establish a population-based national childhood cancer database, and promote public awareness of pediatric cancers.

S. 2401

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2401, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain energy tax incentives, and for other purposes.

S. 2491

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2491, a bill to award a Congressional gold medal to Byron Nelson in recognition of his significant contributions to the game of golf as a player, a teacher, and a commentator.

S. 2545

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2545, a bill to establish a collaborative program to protect the Great Lakes, and for other purposes.

S. 2563

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2563, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require prompt payment to pharmacies under part D, to restrict pharmacy co-branding on prescription drug cards issued under such part, and to provide guidelines for Medication Therapy Management Services programs offered by prescription drug plans and MA–PD plans under such part.

S. 2590

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2590, a bill to require full disclosure of all entities and organizations receiving Federal funds.

S. 2599

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2599, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to prohibit the confiscation of firearms during certain national emergencies.

S. 2606

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2606, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make publicly available on the official Medicare Internet site medicare payment rates for frequently reimbursed hospital inpatient procedures, hospital outpatient procedures, and physicians' services.

S. 2658

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2658, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and the enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 2663

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2663, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish grant programs to provide for education and outreach on newborn screening and coordinated followup care once newborn screening has been conducted, to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2703

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2703, a bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

S. 2753

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2753, a bill to require a program to improve the provision of caregiver assistance services for veterans.

S. 2762

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2762, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure appropriate payment for the cost of long-term care provided to veterans in State homes, and for other purposes.

S. 2917

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2917, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure net neutrality.

S. 3061

At the request of Mr. TALENT, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3061, a bill to extend the patent term for the badge of the American Legion Women's Auxiliary, and for other purposes.

S. 3062

At the request of Mr. TALENT, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3062, a bill to extend the patent term for the badge of the American Legion, and for other purposes.

S. 3063

At the request of Mr. TALENT, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3063, a bill to extend the patent term for the badge of the Sons of the American Legion, and for other purposes.

S. 3486

At the request of Mr. BAYH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3486, a bill to protect the privacy of veterans, spouses of veterans, and other persons affected by the security breach at the Department of Veterans Affairs on May 3, 2006, and for other purposes.

S. 3487

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3487, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to reauthorize and improve the disaster loan program, and for other purposes.

S. 3506

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3506, a bill to prohibit the unauthorized removal or use of personal information contained in a database owned, operated, or maintained by the Federal government.

S. 3521

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3521, a bill to establish a new budget process to create a comprehensive plan to rein in spending, reduce the deficit, and regain control of the Federal budget process.

S. 3536

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of S. 3536, a bill to ensure oversight of intelligence on Iran, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 182

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 182, a resolution supporting efforts to increase childhood cancer awareness, treatment, and research.

S. RES. 312

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 312, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the need for the United States to address global climate change through the negotiation of fair and effective international commitments.

S. RES. 331

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 331, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding fertility issues facing cancer survivors.

S. RES. 482

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 482, a resolution supporting the goals of an annual National Time-Out Day to promote patient safety and optimal outcomes in the operating room.

S. RES. 507

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 507, a resolution designating the week of November 5 through November 11, 2006, as ''National Veterans Awareness Week'' to emphasize the need to develop educational programs regarding the contributions of veterans to the country.

S. RES. 508

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 508, a resolution designating October 20, 2006 as ''National Mammography Day''.

S. RES. 510

At the request of Mr. MARTINEZ, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 510, a resolution designating the period beginning on June 28, 2006, and ending on July 5, 2006, as ''National Clean Beaches Week'', supporting the goals and ideals of that week, and recognizing the considerable value and role of beaches in the culture of the United States.

S. RES. 513

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as

cosponsors of S. Res. 513, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week beginning September 10, 2006, as ''National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4196

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4196 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4197

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4197 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4202

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4202 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4216

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4216 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4224

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4224 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4228

At the request of Mr. CHAMBLISS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4228 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4261

At the request of Mr. CHAMBLISS, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4261 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4271

At the request of Mr. THUNE, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4271 proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4298

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4298 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4320

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4320 proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4322

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4322 proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4328

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4328 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4361

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4361 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4368

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4368 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3546. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to serious adverse event reporting for dietary supplements and nonprescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am proud to rise with my colleague, Senator DURBIN, to introduce S. 3546, the Dietary Supplement and Nonprescription Drug Consumer Protection Act.

We are joined in this effort by Senators HARKIN, ENZI, and KENNEDY.

As my colleagues are aware, over half our population regularly uses dietary supplements. In fact, one government survey in 2004 indicated that nearly 60 percent of Americans regularly use dietary supplements to maintain or improve their healthy lifestyles.

Nearly 12 years ago, Senator HARKIN and I joined with then-Representative Bill Richardson to author the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act, DSHEA, which sets out the framework by which the Food and Drug Administration, FDA, regulates dietary supplements.

Since that time, the industry has grown. By some estimates, it is a $20 billion industry today.

Critics of the industry see this growth as a negative, as an indication that the industry is ''unregulated.'' I disagree. I think the growth of dietary supplement sales is testimony to a vibrant industry that is producing positive benefits for our economy and our people.

This is an industry that is largely comprised of men and women of good will, who want to provide the public with healthy products.

Let me hasten to add that we all recognize there are bad actors in the supplement industry, those who break the law and mislead consumers. They should be the subject of swift and sure punishment by the FDA and the Federal Trade Commission. Their products should be removed from the marketplace and the full weight of the law should be brought down on these bad actors.

It is no secret that the FDA is a woefully underfunded agency, which will be the first to admit that its oversight of the dietary supplement industry has not been as aggressive as it could be, in part due to a lack of resources. For several years, Senator HARKIN and I have worked to rectify that shortcoming, and we are gratified that our Utah colleague, Senator BENNETT, chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, has joined hands with us to infuse some badly needed resources into the FDA.

When DSHEA was being debated in the Congress, one of the major points of contention was the belief by some that dietary supplements should be subject to premarket approval by the government. That would sound the death-knell for this industry, an industry that is largely comprised of products which have been sold safely for decades, if not centuries in many cases.

In 1994, the Senate agreed not once, but twice, to approve DSHEA by unanimous consent. The House also passed this bill by UC. It was not controversial.

Members recognized that supplements are largely safe. But just to make doubly sure there was adequate regulation, we provided the FDA with an arsenal of tools to take action against problematic products.

Then comes ephedra.

I do not think it is a constructive exercise to rehash the history of ephedra. There were mistakes and problems all around in how this product's safety was evaluated and addressed.

But something did stand out: one company had literally hundreds, if not thousands, of reports about products with this product, none of which were revealed to Federal authorities.

There is no question in my mind that the too-long safety evaluation of ephedra would have been shortened considerably had we known earlier about these reports.

Two years ago, I began discussing with those who are interested in dietary supplement regulation whether it would be wise to implement a system of mandatory adverse event reporting, AER, for those products.

While as a general principle, I am usually reluctant to argue for greater government regulation, in this instance it seemed to me a case could be made that an AER system for supplements could complement the work we achieved with DSHEA and improve the government's ability to address the relatively few problems which arose.

Senator DURBIN and Senator HARKIN were also having similar thoughts.

We joined forces and after much study, discussion and negotiation, produced S. 3546.

It may be surprising to many of our colleagues that Senators HATCH, DURBIN, HARKIN, ENZI and KENNEDY stand together on this legislation—we come from very different perspectives on dietary supplement regulation.

And while we are each very passionate about our views, we are united in a common goal: improving the public health.

The premise for this bill is simple: mandating a system to provide the government with information about serious adverse events associated with the use of two types of FDA-regulated products—dietary supplements and over-the-counter drugs—provides Federal authorities with a better tool to respond to any problems which might occur. This is an important public health initiative, which at the same time safeguards access to dietary supplements and over-the-counter drugs.

There is currently a voluntary reporting system for supplements and some OTC drugs—our bill would replace that with a mandatory system.

Senator HARKIN and I have a longstanding interest in regulation of these products, stemming back to our work on DSHEA.

Senator DURBIN, as the former chair of the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, is one of the most knowledgeable Senators in this body when it comes to FDA matters.

Our collaboration on this legislation, along with the distinguished chairman and ranking minority member of the committee of jurisdiction, the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions—HELP—Committee, both of whom were integral to this process, has produced a bill which strikes the right balance between necessary regulation and overregulation.

This is how the new system will work:

Manufacturers, packers or distributors of OTC drugs or dietary supplements marketed in the United States must provide to the FDA within 15 business days any reports of a serious adverse event associated with their products. Accompanying that report must be a copy of the label on or within the retail packaging of the supplement.

The definition of serious event is proscribed within the legislation. It is either an event that results in a death, life-threatening experience, inpatient hospitalization, persistent or significant disability or incapacity, or congenital anomaly or birth defect; or it is an event that requires based on reasonable medical judgment a medical or surgical intervention to prevent one of the outcomes I have just listed.

The bill requires that those reporting must, for 1 year, provide any new medical information related to the serious adverse event report. Again, that information must be submitted within 15 days.

In addition, manufacturers, packers and distributors must keep for 6 years records of any adverse event associated with the product, even though there is no reporting requirement unless the event meets the definition of serious.

For over-the-counter drugs, the definition of ''adverse event'' is a health-related event associated with the use of a nonprescription drug that is adverse, including: an event occurring from an overdose, whether accidental or intentional; an event occurring from abuse of the drug, or withdrawal from the drug; or any failure of pharmacological action.

For dietary supplements, an ''adverse event'' is defined as any health-related event associated with the use of a dietary supplement that is adverse.

The reports will be submitted on the current MedWatch form, unless the Secretary of Health and Human Services chooses to modify that form at some point.

The bill makes clear that State health officials may have access to the adverse event reports, but that the Federal reporting system would supersede any state reporting laws.

As we met to develop this legislation, one thing we struggled with was the need to encourage responsible reporting in a way that manufacturers could implement. Some manufacturers indicated to us, for example, that they were not medical experts and could not determine in every case if a reporter's problem met the definition of ''serious'' contained in the bill.

To address this, we allow manufacturers to contract with third parties to handle the collection of reports. The manufacturers, of course, would still be ultimately responsible for reporting.

We have also asked the FDA to issue guidance to help manufacturers interpret what a serious adverse event might be.

Another concern was making certain we appropriately defined the role of retailers, who are selling a range of products, some supplements, some OTCs, some not. We determined that retailers would not be considered reporting parties. If, however, a retailer contracts with manufacturers to distribute ''private label'' products, he or she may authorize the manufacturer or packer to submit reports, as long as the retailer directs to the manufacturer all reports it receives.

We also wanted to allow the FDA the flexibility to manage this program. At its request, we made the program self-implementing. We also included a provision to allow the Secretary, after notice and comment from interested parties, to establish an exemption to the reporting requirements if there would be no adverse effect on public health.

Finally, there are provisions in the bill to impose penalties for not reporting, not providing on the product label an address or phone number for reporting, and for providing a false report.

The law will go into effect 1 year after the date of enactment.

Before I close, I want to address some of the concerns that representatives of the dietary supplement industry have voiced with this legislation.

First, some have suggested there is no need for this legislation from a public policy or a consumer safety perspective. I disagree.

Many have unfairly criticized the industry over media reports that supplements are unsafe because there is no premarket approval. While I can never support any system that requires premarket approval for supplements, I have become convinced that having a system in place to identify problems quickly can only enhance the authorities we gave the FDA with DSHEA.

It is also good policy. As the industry matures, we need to separate out the good actors from the bad. This is one way to show that this industry is a respectable, mainstream industry. Other major industries—e.g. pharmaceuticals, devices—are subject to mandatory AER reporting. Supplements are only handled through the voluntary reporting system.

And, I disagree with those who avow there is no consumer safety benefit. Let's take an easy case—where there is a bad batch of a product. Enabling the FDA to know quickly there is a problem can help industry and the public.

Other critics note that the FDA fails to pursue egregious violations of DSHEA. They question why this program will help. As I discussed earlier, Senator HARKIN and I have been working to increase FDA's funding for responsible enforcement of DSHEA. I recently discussed this with the Commissioner-nominee, Dr. Andrew von Eschenbach.

One of my constituents who opposes this effort suggested that the FDA's voluntary system, the CAERS system, should be able to handle any reports of problems. Public health experts will agree that a voluntary system is not as good a sentinel as a mandatory system. In addition, those who report under the voluntary system are more likely to be physicians. Encouraging consumers to report to manufacturers through a phone number or address on the product's label will ensure a more thorough reporting system.

Yet another concern I have heard is that this bill has a significant economic impact that has not been studied appropriately. One estimate I have heard is that it could cost tens of millions of dollars a year to industry and consumers.

I have to say that these estimates do not seem to be supported by other industry representatives, many of whom are already instituting reporting systems of their own. During the drafting of this bill, we worked very hard to keep requirements to the minimum that would be necessary for a complete and full reporting of serious adverse events.

In addition, I have heard a suggestion that a better alternative to this bill would be a 1–800 number that consumers can use to contact FDA directly to report complaints. I discussed this with my colleagues and the FDA and found little support for this idea. What this could do is shift onto FDA the majority of reports about product problems. In other words, FDA fears that consumers would start phoning the agency, rather than the manufacturer, to report complaints for things like broken bottles or tablets, or to answer questions about usage. It is easy to see how this could end up relieving manufacturers of some of their consumer-related responsibilities and shift that onto the FDA.

Let me hasten to add that I understand the motivation behind these concerns. I will keep a close watch on this new program as it is implemented, and pledge to reexamine it should problems with implementation arise.

In closing, I thank my colleagues for the spirit of collaboration which led to development of this legislation. In particular, I thank Senator DURBIN for his leadership on this issue. While we may not have always agreed on every provision, we did forge a bill on which we can agree.

Senator HARKIN is a steadfast supporter of the dietary supplement industry, and his guidance undoubtedly made this bill a better product.

Senator ENZI and Senator KENNEDY, both longtime experts in food and drug law, have both been most generous in their time and in moving the process forward.

I must also note the groups that also support the bill—the Consumer's Union, the Center for Science in the Public Interest, the Consumer Healthcare Products Association, the National Nutritional Foods Association, the Council for Responsible Nutrition, the American Herbal Products Association, and finally and most importantly, the Utah Natural Products Association.

That these groups, not often united—at least on this subject—can rally around our bill today is a testament to good policy, good politics, and a surviving bipartisan spirit.

Chairman ENZI has placed this legislation on the HELP Committee agenda for the June 28 executive session. It is my hope the committee will give swift approval to this bipartisan measure and that the Senate will shortly thereafter do the same.

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 3553. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require all gasoline sold for use in motor vehicles to contain 10 percent renewable fuel in the year 2010 and thereafter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation that will take a bold step in reducing our dependence on fossil fuel and foreign oil. I am pleased to be joined by Senator JOHNSON and others in introducing the ''10 by 10 Act.''

The ''10 by 10 Act'' will require that 10 percent of each gallon of motor fuel sold beginning January 1, 2010, contain at least 10 percent renewable fuel. The ''10 by 10 Act'' is a signal that Congress remains interested and adamant in seeking energy independence by promoting the development of renewable fuels in the United States.

As President Bush stated in his State of the Union Address, America is addicted to oil. He also declared that we could displace at least 75 percent of the oil we import from the Middle East by 2025. I am here to say to America's agriculture community, that we're serious and we're going to do something about it.

Because the U.S. imports more than 60 percent of the crude oil we need, we have become dangerously reliant on foreign sources of energy. It is a threat to our national security for the United States to be dependent upon countries like Iran and Venezuela for our energy needs. It is also a threat to our economic security to be dependent on foreign countries for the energy that drives our economy. It is up to our farmers and ranchers to help liberate our consumers and our economy from the stranglehold of OPEC and other foreign countries on our energy needs.

This legislation will demonstrate to consumers, in a commonsense way, that each and every gallon of gasoline will contain at least 10 percent of domestically produced renewable fuel. It will show that we are serious about reducing our dependence on foreign oil, and it will show in a tangible way that we are working to reduce that dependence.

The ''10 by 10 Act'' is a commitment to our constituents that we are working to lower that dependence, and reduce our consumption of foreign oil in every gallon of fuel they pump. With this legislation, Americans would know with certainty that 10 percent of each gallon of motor fuel was home-grown by farmers and ranchers right here in America.

It is important for consumers to recognize that for the vast majority of cars on the road today, no modifications are necessary to operate on a 10-percent renewable fuel blend. No significant changes are required to the fuel distribution network to allow for a 10-percent blend. The only thing standing in the way of reduced dependence on foreign oil is a signal from Congress that we recognize the virtue of home-grown alternatives to foreign oil.

Today, ethanol, a renewable fuel produced from corn, is blended in more than 30 percent of the gasoline sold in the United States. There are currently 101 biorefineries prducing nearly 5 billion gallons of ethanol annually. By the end of 2007, it is projected that we will have the capacity to produce nearly 7 billion gallons annually.

We owe it to the American people to pursue aggressive policies to free our country from our foreign oil dependence. I hope my colleagues will join me in this effort to replace 10 percent of each gallon of gasoline with home-grown, environmentally friendly, renewable fuel.

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. 3553

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 ''10 by 10 Act''.

SEC. 2. 10 PERCENT RENEWABLE FUEL REQUIRED FOR MOTOR VEHICLES.

Section 211 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545) is amended—

(1) by inserting after subsection (o) the following:

''(p) 10 PERCENT RENEWABLE FUEL REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—After December 31, 2009, it shall be unlawful for any person to sell or offer for sale, supply or offer for supply, dispense, transport, or introduce into commerce, for use in any motor vehicle (as defined in section 216) any gasoline containing less than 10 percent renewable fuel by volume.

''(2) FUEL BLENDS.—For the purpose of enforcing this subsection, a blend of gasoline and renewable fuel shall be considered to be sold or offered for sale, supplied or offered for supply, dispensed, transported, or introduced into commerce in accordance with this subsection if the renewable fuel content, exclusive of denaturants and permitted contaminants, comprises not less than 9.2 percent by volume and not more than 10 percent by volume of the blend, as determined by the Administrator.

''(3) MANIFESTS AND LABELING.—By regulation effective January 1, 2010, the Administrator shall require that each bill of lading or transportation manifest for all gasoline containing renewable fuel and all gasoline not containing renewable fuel indicate the renewable fuel content of the gasoline.

''(4) NOTICES ON GASOLINE PUMPS; EXEMPTION FOR COLLECTOR VEHICLES.—The Administrator shall provide, by regulation, for—

''(A) appropriate notices to be displayed on gasoline pumps—

''(i) indicating the renewable fuel content of the gasoline dispensed by the pump; and

''(ii) notifying the public of the prohibition under this subsection; and

''(B) an exemption from the requirements of this subsection in the case of gasoline for use in collector motor vehicles, as defined by the Administrator.''; and

(2) by redesignating the second subsection (r) (as added by section 1512 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58; 119 Stat. 1088)) as subsection (t) and moving the subsection so as to appear at the end of the section.

By Mr. OBAMA (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 3554. A bill to establish an alternative diesel standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. COCHRAN, the Senator from Indiana, Mr. LUGAR, and the Senator from Delaware, Mr. CARPER, in introducing the Alternative Diesel Standard Act of 2006.

Last summer, Congress passed the Energy Policy Act, which included a bold, bipartisan initiative to help wean our Nation from its petroleum dependency. This initiative, known as the Renewable Fuels Standard, established that it is the policy of the United States that the 140 billion gallon national gasoline pool will consist of at least 7.5 billion gallons of ethanol by the year 2012.

We have seen tremendous response to this new policy. Almost 30 new ethanol plants have been proposed to be constructed in my State of Illinois alone, and many more are proposed nationwide. By comparison, over the past 30 years, no new petroleum refineries have been built in the United States. The Renewable Fuels Standard is probably one of the single most important legislative actions taken by Congress in recent years to strengthen our domestic energy security, and the legislation we introduce today takes this policy one step further by addressing the 40 billion gallon national diesel pool.

Petroleum-based diesel is used in a wide variety of transportation modes: transit buses; semitrucks; ships; heavy duty construction, farming and mining equipment; military vehicles; locomotives; barges; large scale generators; and in a range of cars and trucks. While not as large of a market as gasoline, petrodiesel is enormously significant to our economy, and reducing our reliance on foreign feedstocks for this diesel is of equal importance in our efforts to increase energy security.

Our bill, the Alternative Diesel Standard, simply requires that by the year 2015, the national diesel pool must consist of at least 2 billion gallons of alternative and renewable diesels.

This is but a modest 1 percent of the national diesel supply—hardly painful for the petroleum industry. It would not in any way dent the oil industry's record-shattering profits. Instead, it establishes certainty to those who know that alternative diesels can provide a real solution to our dependence on foreign oil and who are prepared to invest in alternative diesel production on a commercial scale.

Right now, there is an estimated 180 million gallons of biodiesel production capacity in the United States. Fifty-four companies have reported plans to construct dedicated biodiesel plants in the near future, but those plans are dependent upon regional and national demand prospects.

Moreover, entrepreneurs across the Nation have proven that we can make diesel from other plant oils, like sunflower seeds, or coal, manure, animal fats, and yes, even from recycled plastics or garbage. This bill sends a signal to those entrepreneurs that a market is planned in the future for these domestically produced fuels, attracting the necessary investment to establish a national infrastructure of domestic fuel production capabilities.

If we are serious about reducing our country's dependence on imported petroleum and insulating our economy from future supply disruption shocks—whether from the volatile Middle East or natural disasters such as Katrina—encouraging the construction of more domestic alternative fuel production capacity must be part of that strategy. Several billion gallons of alternative diesels are possible within the timelines proposed in our legislation, making another bold step to create jobs in rural America and strengthen our economic security. An Alternative Diesel Standard is the right course for the Nation's future. I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring this legislation, and I ask their support for swift enactment.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 519—CONGRATULATING THE MIAMI HEAT FOR WINNING THE NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. MARTINEZ (for himself and Mr. NELSON of Florida) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 519

Whereas on Tuesday, June 20, 2006, the Miami Heat defeated the Dallas Mavericks by a score of 95 to 92, in Dallas, Texas;

Whereas that victory marks the first National Basketball Association (NBA) Championship for the Miami Heat franchise;

Whereas after losing the first 2 games of the NBA Finals, the Heat came back to win 4 games in a row, which earned the team an overall record of 69-37 and the right to be named NBA champions;

Whereas Pat Riley, over his 11 seasons with the Heat, has maintained a standard of excellence within the franchise and has won his fifth championship as head coach of an NBA team;

Whereas Dwyane Wade, who averaged 34.7 points in the series, was named the Most Valuable Player of the NBA Finals following the Heat victory;

Whereas Shaquille O'Neal fulfilled his 2004 promise to his teammates and the residents of Miami by delivering the title to the Miami Heat;

Whereas each member of the Miami Heat roster, including Derek Anderson, Shandon Anderson, Earl Barron, Michael Doleac, Udonis Haslem, Jason Kapono, Alonzo Mourning, Shaquille O'Neal, Gary Payton, James Posey, Wayne Simien, Dwyane Wade, Antoine Walker, Jason Williams, and Dorell Wright, played a meaningful role in bringing the NBA Championship to Miami;

Whereas owner Micky Arison has built a top-flight sports franchise and shown a consistent commitment to bringing a winning team to Miami; and

Whereas, the Miami Heat and its fans are hot in the wake of its first NBA championship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(a) congratulates the Miami Heat for its victory in the 2006 National Basketball Association Championship; and

(b) requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit for appropriate display an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(1) the owner of the Miami Heat, Micky Arison; and

(2) the general manager and coach of the Miami Heat, Pat Riley.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4381. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr. NELSON, of Nebraska, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4382. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4383. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4384. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4385. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4386. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4387. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4388. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4389. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4390. Mr. TALENT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4391. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4392. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4393. Mr. AKAKA submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4394. Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. DORGAN, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4395. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4396. Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. BURNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4397. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. LEVIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4398. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4399. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4400. Mr. DODD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4401. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4402. Mr. SALAZAR (for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4403. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4404. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4405. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4406. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4407. Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mr. CONRAD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4408. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4409. Mr. OBAMA (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4410. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4411. Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4412. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr . BIDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4413. Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. CONRAD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4414. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4415. Mr. STEVENS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4416. Mr. CHAFEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4417. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. OBAMA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4418. Mr. OBAMA submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4419. Mrs. DOLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4420. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4421. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4422. Mr. SPECTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4423. Mr. BIDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4424. Mr. BIDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4425. Mr. McCAIN (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4426. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4427. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4428. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4429. Mr. CHAFEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4430. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4431. Mr. BROWNBACK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4432. Mr. JEFFORDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4433. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4434. Mr. McCAIN (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4435. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4436. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4437. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4438. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. LEVIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4439. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4440. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4441. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. DODD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4442. Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4443. Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mrs. LINCOLN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4444. Mr. KERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4445. Mr. BURNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4446. Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mrs. LINCOLN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4447. Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr . DOMENICI, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. REED, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. LOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4448. Mr. COLEMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4449. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4450. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4451. Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4452. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4453. Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4454. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4455. Mr. SHELBY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4456. Mr. SHELBY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4457. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4458. Mr. BIDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4459. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4460. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4461. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4462. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. KERRY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4463. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4464. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. KERRY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4465. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BURNS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. DEWINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4466. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4467. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4468. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4469. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4470. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4471. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4472. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4473. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4474. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4475. Mr. AKAKA submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4476. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4477. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. DOLE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. VOINOVICH, and Mr. SARBANES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4478. Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4479. Mr. NELSON, of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4480. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4381. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 178, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

(c) TRANSITION OF MILITARY DEPENDENTS FROM MILITARY TO CIVILIAN SCHOOLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and Secretary of Education shall work collaboratively to ease the transition of dependents of members of the Armed Forces from attendance in Department of Defense dependent schools to civilian schools in systems operated by local educational agencies.

(2) UTILIZATION OF EXISTING RESOURCES.—In working with the Secretary of Education under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense may utilize funds authorized to be appropriated for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities to share expertise and experience of the Department of Defense Education Activity with local educational agencies as dependents of members of the Armed Forces make the transition from attendance at Department of Defense dependent schools to attendance at civilian schools in systems operated by such local educational agencies, including such transitions resulting from defense base closure and realignment, global rebasing, and force restructuring.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) The term ''expertise and experience'', with respect to the Department of Defense Education Activity, means resources of such activity relating to—

(i) academic strategies which result in high scores on national standardized tests;

(ii) curriculum development consultation and materials;

(iii) teacher training resources and materials;

(iv) access to virtual and distance learning technology capabilities and related applications for teachers; and

(v) such other services as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate for the achievement of an educational standard comparable to the standard maintained in the Department of Defense dependent schools.

(B) The term ''local educational agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 8013(9) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7713(9)).

(4) EXPIRATION.—The authority of the Secretary of the Defense under this subsection shall expire on September 30, 2011.

SA 4382. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 486, strike lines 9 through 11, and insert the following:

SEC. 2001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Joel Hefley Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007''.

On page 535, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 2814. NAMING OF MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING FACILITY AT FORT CARSON, COLORADO, IN HONOR OF JOEL HEFLEY, A MEMBER FO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Representative Joel Hefley was elected to represent Colorado's 5th Congressional district in 1986 and has served in the House of Representatives since that time with distinction, class, integrity, and honor.

(2) Representative Hefley has served on the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives for 18 years, including service as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities from 1995 through 2000 and, since 2001, as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

(3) Representative Hefley's colleagues know him to be a fair and effective lawmaker who works for the national interest while never forgetting his Western roots.

(4) Representative Hefley's efforts on the Committee on Armed Services have been instrumental to the military value of, and quality of life at, installations in the State of Colorado, including Fort Carson, Cheyenne Mountain, Peterson Air Force Base, Schriever Air Force Base, Buckley Air Force Base, and the United States Air Force Academy.

(5) Representative Hefley was a leader in efforts to retain and expand Fort Carson as an essential part of the national defense system during the Defense Base Closure and Realignment process.

(6) Representative Hefley has consistently advocated for providing members of the Armed Forces and their families with quality, safe, and affordable housing and supportive communities.

(7) Representative Hefley spearheaded the Military Housing Privatization Initiative to eliminate inadequate housing on military installations, with the first pilot program located at Fort Carson.

(8) Representative Hefley's leadership on the Military Housing Privatization Initiative has allowed for the privatization of more than 121,000 units of military family housing, which brought meaningful improvements to living conditions for thousands of members of the Armed Forces and their spouses and children at installations throughout the United States.

(9) It is fitting and proper that an appropriate military family housing area or structure at Fort Carson be designated in honor of Representative Hefley, and it is further appropriate that division B of this Act, which authorizes funds for fiscal year 2007 for military construction projects, land acquisition, and family housing projects and facilities, be designated in honor of Representative Hefley.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary of the Army shall designate one of the military family housing areas or facilities constructed for Fort Carson, Colorado, using the authority provided by subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, as the ''Joel Hefley Village''.

SA 4383. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title IX, add the following:

SEC. 924. LIMITATION ON REDUCTION IN PERSONNEL OF AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than September 1, 2006, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the planned or proposed reductions in the personnel of the Air Force Space Command.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the planned or proposed reductions in the number of military personnel, civilian employees, or contractor support personnel, as the case may be, assigned to the Air Force Space Command.

(2) A justification for the planned or proposed reductions.

(3) An assessment of the effect of the planned or proposed reductions on the capacity of the Air Force Space command to conduct its mission in support of operational commanders.

(4) An assessment whether or not the effect of the planned or proposed reductions could be mitigated by granting the commander of the Air Forces Space Command, or the appropriate program executive officers, enhanced authority to make personnel and resource decisions in implementing such reductions.

(5) A certification that the planned or proposed reductions will not impede, disrupt, or otherwise diminish or interfere with the national security space acquisition programs of the United States, national security space operations of the United States, or national security space technology development by the United States.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SA 4384. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title IX, add the following:

SEC. 924. REDUCTION IN PERSONNEL OF AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND.

(a) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of the Air Force should not reduce the number of military personnel, civilian employees, or contractor support personnel assigned to the Air Force Space Command, or any component of the Air Force Space Command, from the number of such personnel or employees assigned to the Air Force Space Command as of January 1, 2006, until the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress the report described in subsection (b).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than September 1, 2006, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that includes the following:

(1) A description of the proposed reduction in the number of military personnel, civilian employees, or contractor support personnel, as the case may be, assigned to the Air Force Space Command.

(2) A justification for the proposed reduction.

(3) An assessment of the effect of the proposed reduction on the capacity of the Air Force Space command to conduct its mission in support of operational commanders.

(4) An assessment whether or not the effect of the proposed reduction could be mitigated by granting the commander of the Air Forces Space Command, or the appropriate program executive officers, enhanced authority to make personnel and resource decisions in implementing the proposed reduction.

(5) A certification that the proposed reduction will not impede, disrupt, or otherwise diminish or interfere with the national security space acquisition programs of the United States, national security space operations of the United States, or national security space technology development by the United States.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SA 4385. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, 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. ___. REPORT ON AIR FORCE SAFETY REQUIREMENTS FOR AIR FORCE FLIGHT OPERATIONS AT PUEBLO MEMORIAL AIRPORT, COLORADO.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than February 15, 2007, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on Air Force safety requirements for Air Force flight operations at Pueblo Memorial Airport, Colorado.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the range of Air Force flight operations at Pueblo Memorial Airport.

(2) An assessment of the effect of Air Force flight operations at Pueblo Memorial Airport on non-Air Force activities at the airport.

(3) A description of the Air Force safety requirements at Pueblo Memorial Airport with respect to Air Force flight operations at the airport.

(4) An assessment of the necessity of providing for a continuous fire-fighting capability at Pueblo Memorial Airport.

(5) A description and assessment of alternatives to Air Force flight operations at Pueblo Memorial Airport, including the cost and availability of such alternatives.

(6) A description of the funding required to assist the City of Pueblo, Colorado, in meeting Air Force safety requirements for Air Force flight operations at Pueblo Memorial Airport.

SA 4386. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 662. JOINT FAMILY SUPPORT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a joint family support assistance program for the purpose of providing assistance to families of members of the Armed Forces.

(b) LOCATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out the program for at least six regions of the country through sites established by the Secretary for purposes of the program in such regions.

(2) LOCATION OF CERTAIN SITES.—At least three of the sites established under paragraph (1) shall be located in an area that it geographically isolated from military installations.

(c) FUNCTIONS.—The Secretary shall provide assistance to families of the members of the Armed Forces under the program by providing at each site established for purposes of the program under subsection (b) the following:

(1) Financial, material, and other assistance to families of members of the Armed Forces.

(2) Mobile support services to families of members of the Armed Forces.

(3) Sponsorship of volunteers and family support professionals for the delivery of support services to families of members of the Armed Forces.

(4) Coordination of family assistance programs and activities provided by Military OneSource, Military Family Life Consultants, counselors, the Department of Defense, other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, State and local agencies, and non-profit entities.

(5) Facilitation of discussion on military family assistance programs, activities, and initiatives between and among the organizations, agencies, and entities referred to in paragraph (4).

(d) RESOURCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide personnel and other resources necessary for the implementation and operation of the program at each site established under subsection (b).

(2) ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN SERVICES.—In providing resources under paragraph (1), the Secretary may accept and utilize the services of non-Federal Government volunteers and non-profit entities.

(e) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall establish procedures for the operation of each site established under subsection (b) and for the provision of assistance to families of members of the Armed Forces at such site.

(f) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—

(1) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the first obligation of amounts for the program, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth a plan for the implementation of the program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the actions taken to select and establish sites for the program under subsection (b).

(B) A description of the procedures established under subsection (d).

(C) A review of proposed actions to be taken under the program to improve coordination on family assistance program and activities between and among the Department of Defense, other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, State and local agencies, and non-profit entities.

(g) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the first obligation of amounts for the program, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall include the following:

(A) A description of the program, including each site established for purposes of the program, the procedures established under subsection (d) for operations at each such site, and the assistance provided through each such site for families of members of the Armed Forces.

(B) An assessment of the effectiveness of the program in providing assistance to families of members of the Armed Forces.

(C) An assessment of the advisability of extending the program or making it permanent.

(h) ASSISTANCE TO NON-PROFIT ENTITIES PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO MILITARY FAMILIES.—The Secretary may provide financial, material, and other assistance to non-profit entities in order to facilitate the provision by such entities of assistance to geographically isolated families of members of the Armed Forces.

(i) SUNSET.—The program required by this section, and the authority to provide assistance under subsection (h), shall cease upon the date that is three years after the first obligation of amounts for the program.

(j) FUNDING.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(5) for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities, $5,000,000 may be available for the program required by this section and the provision of assistance under subsection (h).

SA 4387. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes: which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1066. ANNUAL REPORT ON ACQUISITIONS OF ARTICLES, MATERIALS, AND SUPPLIES MANUFACTURED OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 31 of each year, the head of each Federal agency shall submit a report to Congress on the amount of the acquisitions made by the agency in the preceding fiscal year of articles, materials, or supplies purchased from entities that manufacture the articles, materials, or supplies outside of the United States.

(b) CONTENT.—Each report required by subsection (a) shall separately indicate—

(1) the dollar value of any articles, materials, or supplies purchased that were manufactured outside of the United States;

(2) an itemized list of all waivers granted with respect to such articles, materials, or supplies under the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.); and

(3) a summary of—

(A) the total procurement funds expended on articles, materials, and supplies manufactured inside the United States; and

(B) the total procurement funds expended on articles, materials, and supplies manufactured outside the United States.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The head of each Federal agency submitting a report under subsection (a) shall make the report publicly available to the maximum extent practicable.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall not apply to acquisitions made by an agency, or component thereof, that is an element of the intelligence community as set forth in or designated under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)).

SA 4388. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. NO COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no adjustment shall be made under section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31) (relating to cost of living adjustments for Members of Congress) during fiscal year 2007.

SA 4389. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 181, strike lines 5 though 8, and insert the following:

Armed Forces, including dependents of members of the National Guard or Reserves called or ordered to active duty; and

(B) elementary and secondary school students who are dependents of civilian employees of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 574. CHILD CARE FOR CHILDREN OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES ON ACTIVE DUTY FOR OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM OR OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM.

(a) CHILD CARE FOR CHILDREN WITHOUT ACCESS TO MILITARY CHILD CARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In any case where the children of a covered member of the Armed Forces are geographically dispersed and do not have practical access to a military child development center, the Secretary of Defense may, to the extent funds are available for such purpose, provide such funds as are necessary permit the member's family to secure access for such children to State licensed child care and development programs and activities in the private sector that are similar in scope and quality to the child care and development programs and activities the Secretary would otherwise provide access to under subchapter II of chapter 88 of title 10, United States Code, and other applicable provisions of law.

(2) PROVISION OF FUNDS.—Funds may be provided under paragraph (1) in accordance with the provisions of section 1798 of title 10, United States Code, or by such other mechanism as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) PRIORITIES FOR ALLOCATION OF FUNDS IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.—The Secretary shall prescribe in regulations priorities for the allocation of funds for the provision of access to child care under paragraph (1) in circumstances where funds are inadequate to provide all children described in that paragraph with access to child care as described in that paragraph.

(b) PRESERVATION OF SERVICES AND PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall provide for the attendance and participation of children in military child development centers and child care and development programs and activities under subsection (a) in a manner that preserves the scope and quality of child care and development programs and activities otherwise provided by the Secretary.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense $25,000,000 to carry out this section for fiscal year 2007.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''covered members of the Armed Forces'' means members of the Armed Forces on active duty, including members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are called or ordered to active duty under a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(B) of title 10, United States Code, for Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom.

(2) The term ''military child development center'' has the meaning given such term in section 1800(1) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 575. EMERGENCY FUNDING FOR LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES ENROLLING MILITARY DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Help for Military Children Affected by War Act of 2007''.

(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to award grants to eligible local educational agencies for the additional education, counseling, and other needs of military dependent children who are affected by war or dramatic military decisions.

(2) FUNDING PLAN.—The Secretary shall develop and publish in the Federal Register a plan for awarding grants under this section. The plan shall—

(A) set forth the method for awarding grants under this section; and

(B) emphasize awarding grants under this section for military dependent children described in subsection (c)(3)(B).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term ''eligible local educational agency'' means a local educational agency that—

(A) had a military dependent child in average daily attendance in a school served by the local educational agency during the school year preceding the school year for which the determination is made; and

(B) is designated by the Secretary of Defense as impacted by—

(i) Operation Iraqi Freedom;

(ii) Operation Enduring Freedom;

(iii) the global rebasing plan of the Department of Defense;

(iv) the realignment of forces as a result of the base closure process;

(v) the official creation or activation of 1 or more new military units; or

(vi) a change in the number of required housing units on a military installation, due to the Military Housing Privatization Initiative of the Department of Defense.

(2) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term ''local educational agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(3) MILITARY DEPENDENT CHILD.—The term ''military dependent child'' means a child—

(A) described in subparagraph (B) or (D)(i) of section 8003(a)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(a)(1)); or

(B) of a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces who is called or ordered to active duty under a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(B) of title 10, United States Code, for Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom.

(d) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds provided under this section shall be used for—

(1) tutoring, after-school, and dropout prevention activities for military dependent children with a parent who is or has been impacted by war-related action described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subsection (c)(1)(B);

(2) professional development of teachers, principals, and counselors on the needs of military dependent children with a parent who is or has been impacted by war-related action described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subsection (c)(1)(B);

(3) counseling and other comprehensive support services for military dependent children with a parent who is or has been impacted by war-related action described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subsection (c)(1)(B), including the hiring of a military-school liaison; and

(4) other basic educational activities associated with an increase in military dependent children.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section for fiscal year 2007 and each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years.

(2) SPECIAL RULE.—Funds appropriated under paragraph (1) are in addition to any funds made available to local educational agencies under section 571, 572, 573 or 574 of this Act, sections 572 and 573 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), or section 8003 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703).

SA 4390. Mr. TALENT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. PATENT TERM EXTENSIONS FOR THE BADGES OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, THE AMERICAN LEGION WOMEN'S AUXILIARY, AND THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN LEGION.

(a) PATENT TERM EXTENSION FOR THE BADGE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION.—The term of a certain design patent numbered 54,296 (for the badge of the American Legion) is renewed and extended for a period of 14 years beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to such patent.

(b) PATENT TERM EXTENSION FOR THE BADGE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION WOMEN'S AUXILIARY.—The term of a certain design patent numbered 55,398 (for the badge of the American Legion Women's Auxiliary) is renewed and extended for a period of 14 years beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to such patent.

(c) PATENT TERM EXTENSION FOR THE BADGE OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN LEGION.—The term of a certain design patent numbered 92,187 (for the badge of the Sons of the American Legion) is renewed and extended for a period of 14 years beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to such patent.

SA 4391. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 648. EQUITY IN COMPUTATION OF DISABILITY RETIRED PAY FOR RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS WOUNDED IN ACTION.

Section 1208(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the

following new sentence: ''However, in the case of such a member who is retired under this chapter, or whose name is placed on the temporary disability retired list under this chapter, because of a disability incurred after the date of the enactment of this sentence for which the member is awarded the Purple Heart, the member shall be credited, for the purposes of this chapter, with the number of years of service that would be counted if computing the member's years of service under section 12732 of this title.''.

SA 4392. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title IX, add the following:

SEC. 913. INDEPENDENT REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY IN SPACE.

(a) INDEPENDENT REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for an independent review and assessment of the organization and management of the Department of Defense for national security in space.

(2) CONDUCT OF REVIEW.—The review and assessment shall be conducted by an appropriate entity outside the Department of Defense selected by the Secretary for purposes of this section.

(3) ELEMENTS.—The review and assessment shall address the following:

(A) The requirements of the Department of Defense for national security space capabilities, as identified by the Department, and the efforts of the Department to fulfill such requirements.

(B) The future space missions of the Department, and the plans of the Department to meet the future space missions.

(C) The actions that could be taken by the Department to modify the organization and management of the Department over the near-term, medium-term, and long-term in order to strengthen United States national security in space, and the ability of the Department to implement its requirements and carry out the future space missions, including the following:

(i) Actions to exploit existing and planned military space assets to provide support for United States military operations.

(ii) Actions to improve or enhance current interagency coordination processes regarding the operation of national security space assets, including improvements or enhancements in interoperability and communications.

(iii) Actions to improve or enhance the relationship between the intelligence aspects of national security space (so-called ''black space'') and the non-intelligence aspects of national security space (so-called ''white space'').

(iv) Actions to improve or enhance the manner in which military space issues are addressed by professional military education institutions.

(4) LIAISON.—The Secretary shall designate at least one senior civilian employee of the Department of Defense, and at least one general or flag officer of an Armed Force, to serve as liaison between the Department, the Armed Forces, and the entity conducting the review and assessment.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entity conducting the review and assessment shall submit to the Secretary and the congressional defense committees a report on the review and assessment.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall include—

(A) the results of the review and assessment; and

(B) recommendations on the best means by which the Department may improve its organization and management for national security in space.

SA 4393. Mr. AKAKA submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 762. TRANSFER OF CUSTODY OF THE AIR FORCE HEALTH STUDY ASSETS TO MEDICAL FOLLOW-UP AGENCY.

(a) TRANSFER.—

(1) NOTIFICATION OF PARTICIPANTS.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall notify the participants of the Air Force Health Study that the study as currently constituted is ending as of September 30, 2006. In consultation with the Medical Follow-up Agency (in this section referred to as the ''Agency'') of the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences, the Secretary of the Air Force shall request the written consent of the participants to transfer their data and biological specimens to the Agency during fiscal year 2007 and written consent for the Agency to maintain the data and specimens and make them available for additional studies.

(2) COMPLETION OF TRANSFER.—Custodianship of the Air Force Health Study shall be completely transferred to the Agency on or before September 30, 2007. Assets to be transferred shall include electronic data files and biological specimens of all the study participants.

(3) COPIES TO ARCHIVES.—The Air Force shall send paper copies of all study documents to the National Archives.

(b) REPORT ON TRANSFER.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 30 days after completion of the transfer of the assets of the Air Force Health Study under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the transfer.

(2) MATTERS COVERED.—At a minimum, the report shall include information on the number of study participants whose data and biological specimens were not transferred, the efforts that were taken to contact such participants, and the reasons why the transfer of their data and specimens did not occur.

(c) DISPOSITION OF ASSETS NOT TRANSFERRED.—The Secretary of the Air Force may not destroy any data or biological specimens not transferred under subsection (a) until the expiration of the one-year period following submission of the report under subsection (b).

(d) FUNDING.—

(1) COSTS OF TRANSFER.—The Secretary of Defense shall make available to the Air Force $850,000 for preparation, transfer of the assets of the Air Force Health Study and shipment of data and specimens to the Medical Follow-up Agency and the National Archives during fiscal year 2007 from amounts available from the Department of Defense for that year. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer the freezers and other physical assets assigned to the Air Force Health Study to the Agency without charge.

(2) COSTS OF COLLABORATION.—The Secretary of Defense may reimburse the National Academy of Sciences up to $200,000 for costs of the Medical Follow-up Agency to collaborate with the Air Force in the transfer and receipt of the assets of the Air Force Health Study to the Agency during fiscal year 2007 from amounts available from the Department of Defense for that year.

SA 4394. Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. DORGAN, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 27, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 29, line 5, and insert the following:

SEC. 144. RETIREMENT OF B–52H BOMBER AIRCRAFT.

(a) LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT PENDING REPORT ON BOMBER FORCE STRUCTURE.—No funds authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for retiring or dismantling any of the 93 B–52H bomber aircraft in service in the Air Force as of June 1, 2006, until 30 days after the Secretary of the Air Force transmits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the bomber force structure of the Air Force meeting the requirements of subsection (b).

(b) ELEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A report under subsection (a) shall set forth the following:

(A) The plan of the Air Force for the modernization of the B–52H bomber aircraft fleet.

(B) The plans of the Air Force for the modernization of the balance of the bomber force structure.

(C) The amount and type of bombers in the bomber force structure that is appropriate to meet the requirements of the national security strategy of the United States.

(D) A justification of the cost and projected savings of any reductions to the B–52H bomber aircraft fleet as a result of the retirement or dismantlement of the B–52H bomber aircraft covered by the report.

(E) The life expectancy of each bomber aircraft to remain in the bomber force structure.

(F) The date by which any new bomber aircraft must reach initial operational capability and the capabilities of the bomber force structure that would be replaced or superseded by any new bomber aircraft.

(G) The Analysis of Alternatives (AOA) completed for the Next Generation Long Range Strike program.

(2) AMOUNT AND TYPE OF BOMBER FORCE STRUCTURE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''amount and type of bomber force structure'' means the number of B–2 bomber aircraft, B–52H bomber aircraft, and B–1 bomber aircraft that are required to carry out the national security strategy of the United States.

(c) PREPARATION OF REPORT.—A report under this section shall be prepared and submitted by the Institute of Defense Analysis to the Secretary of the Air Force for transmittal by the Secretary in accordance with subsection (a).

(d) LIMITATION ON TRANSMITTAL OF REPORT.—The Secretary of Air Force may not transmit the report under subsection (a) as described in that subsection until the Comptroller General of the United States certifies that—

(1) the report is complete and accurate; and

(2) the Air Force has underway a viable program, funded in the Future-Years Defense Program of the Department of Defense, to provide a high probability of meeting the goal in the Quadrennial Defense Review of fielding a new, land-based, penetrating long-range strike capability by 2018 while modernizing the current bomber force.

SA 4395. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. EXTENSION OF RETURNING WORKER EXEMPTION.

Section 402(b)(1) of the Save Our Small and Seasonal Businesses Act of 2005 (title IV of division B of Public Law 109–13; 8 U.S.C. 1184 note) is amended by striking ''2006'' and inserting ''2009''.

SA 4396. Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. BURNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. CREDIT MONITORING AND DATA THEFT PROTECTION SERVICES FOR VETERANS AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AFFECTED BY THEFT OF PERSONAL INFORMATION FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) CONTRACT FOR SERVICES REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall enter into a contract with an appropriate entity under which contract such entity shall provide appropriate credit or identity protection monitoring services to veterans and members of the Armed Forces (including members of the National Guard and the Reserve) affected by the theft of personal information from the Department of Veterans Affairs on May 3, 2006.

(b) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that the contract under subsection (a) permits only those veterans and members of the Armed Forces who choose to receive monitoring services under such contract to elect to have personal information monitored by the contractor under such contract.

(c) FIXED PRICE FOR SERVICES.—The contract under subsection (a) shall, at a minimum, provide a fixed price for any veteran or member of the Armed Forces who elects to receive services under such contract. Such price for such services shall be in effect under such contract for not less than 12 months beginning on the date of the commencement of the provision of services under such contract.

(d) PROHIBITION ON CHARGES.—A veteran or member of the Armed Forces described in subsection (a) who receives services under the contract under that subsection may not be assessed a charge or fee for the receipt of such services. The cost of such services shall be borne by the Secretary in accordance with the prices established under subsection (c).

SA 4397. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. LEVIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. REPORT ON VEHICLE-BASED ACTIVE PROTECTION SYSTEMS FOR CERTAIN BATTLEFIELD THREATS.

(a) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall enter into a contract with an appropriate entity independent of the United States Government to conduct an assessment of various foreign and domestic technological approaches to vehicle-based active protection systems for defense against both chemical energy and kinetic energy top-attack and direct fire threats, including anti-tank missiles and rocket propelled grenades, mortars, and other similar battlefield threats.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—The contract required by subsection (a) shall require the entity entering in to such contract to submit to the Secretary of Defense, and to the congressional defense committees, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report on the assessment required by that subsection.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a detailed comparative analysis and assessment of the technical approaches covered by the assessment under subsection (a), including the feasibility, military utility, cost, and potential short-term and long-term development and deployment schedule of such approaches; and

(B) any other elements specified by the Secretary in the contract under subsection (a).

SA 4398. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title II, add the following:

SEC. 257. REPORT ON BIOMETRICS PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress, at the same time as the submittal of the budget of the President for fiscal year 2008 (as submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code) a submit a report on the biometrics programs of the Department of Defense.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report shall address the following:

(1) Whether the Department should modify the current executive agent management structure for the biometrics programs.

(2) The requirements for the biometrics programs to meet needs throughout the Department of Defense.

(3) Whether such programs as currently fielded meet requirements in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(4) Whether the current set of development programs will meet the future Department requirements.

(5) The actions being taken within the Executive Branch to rationalize requirements, programs, and resources among the departments and agencies of the Executive Branch with a role in using or developing biometrics capabilities.

(c) BIOMETRICS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''biometrics'' means an identity management program or system that utilizes distinct personal attributes, including DNA, facial features, irises, retinas, signatures, and voices, to identify individuals.

SA 4399. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 569. REPEAL OF 10-YEAR LIMIT ON USE OF VETERANS' AND RESERVE EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE BENEFITS.

(a) VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE BENEFITS.—

(1) ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 3031 of title 38, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 3018C(e)(3)(B) of such title is amended—

(i) by striking ''(B)(i)'' and inserting ''(B)''; and

(ii) by striking clause (ii).

(B) Section 3020 of such title is amended—

(i) in subsection (f)(1), by striking ''Subject to the time limitation for use of entitlement under section 3031 of this title, an'' and inserting ''An''; and

(ii) in subsection (h)(5), by striking ''Notwithstanding section 3031 of this title, a'' and inserting ''A''.

(C) The heading for subchapter IV of chapter 30 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''Subchapter IV—General and Administrative Provisions''.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis at the beginning of chapter 30 of such title is amended by striking the matter relating to the heading for subchapter IV and the item relating to section 3031 and inserting the following:

''SUBCHAPTER IV—GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS''.

(b) RESERVE EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE BENEFITS.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 16133 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1606 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 16133.

SA 4400. Mr. DODD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. ANNUAL REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT ON EQUIPMENT RESETS FOR THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) As a result of the unprecedented strain of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, the inventories of equipment, vehicles, and aircraft of the Army and Marine Corps have been gravely depleted. Having 16 to 18 Army brigades deployed in combat at one time for the last 3 years, in addition to other United States forces, has added to the strain on United States military equipment. Battle losses and so-called equipment ''wash-out'' are having a significant impact on the readiness of the Armed forces.

(2) In Operation Iraqi Freedom, United States tanks are being driven more than 4,000 miles per year, 5 times the expected annual usage of 800 miles per year. Army helicopters are experiencing usage rates roughly 2 to 3 times the planned peacetime rate. The truck fleet of the Army is experiencing some of the most pronounced problems of excessive wear, with usage rates of 5 to 6 times the peacetime rate, further exacerbated by the addition of heavy armor.

(3) This increased ''operational tempo'' (optempo) shortens the life of equipment, vehicles, and aircraft and demands much earlier and larger investments in maintenance and procurement. Other causes of degradation of equipment, vehicles, and aircraft include—

(A) sand and extreme heat that effects mechanical and electronic systems; and

(B) rocket-propelled grenade and improvised explosive device (IED) attacks.

(4) From 2003 to 2005, the Army claimed that it deployed more than 40 percent of its equipment in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. Recently, the Marine Corps estimated that approximately 40 percent of all Marine Corp ground equipment and 20 percent of aircraft assets are in use in support of current operations.

(5) According to the Government Accountability Office, although the Army reports high rates of equipment readiness in Operation Iraqi Freedom currently, it risks sacrificing long-term readiness through decisions to keep equipment in theater, to forgo depot repairs, and to rely almost exclusively on in-theater repair capabilities to keep equipment mission-capable. As a result, much Army equipment has not undergone high-level depot maintenance since the start of operations in March 2003. Continued usage at rates like those in Operation Iraqi Freedom, without higher levels of maintenance, could result in more equipment requiring more extensive and expensive repairs in the future and may result in the need for replacement rather than repair.

(6) Because most Army and Marine Corps equipment is staying in Iraq, Operation Iraqi Freedom is hampering—

(A) the ability of Government-run depots in the United States to retain the industrial base to meet recapitalization needs; and

(B) the ability of the Armed Forces to address future threats at home and abroad.

(7) Army Chief of Staff General Schoomaker recently testified that over the next 6 years, the Army projects that it will cost $36,000,000,000 to fund reset activities for equipment, vehicles, and aircraft, assuming that the United States fully draws down its forces from Iraq by the end of 2007. If the Army continues to operate in Operation Iraqi Freedom at current levels, the reset cost will total more than $72,000,000,000, and will eventually require steady reset expenditures for a full 2 years after the Armed Forces withdraws from Iraq.

(b) ANNUAL REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT ON EQUIPMENT RESET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General of the United States shall each—

(A) conduct a review and assessment of the equipment, vehicle, and aircraft reset requirements of the Armed Forces as a result of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom; and

(B) submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth—

(i) the results of such review and assessment; and

(ii) recommendations for actions to address the long-term preparedness challenges with respect to equipment, vehicles and aircraft for the Armed Forces that result from Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

(2) PARTICULAR REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out paragraph (1) each year, the Secretary and the Comptroller General shall each—

(A) assess the consequences of deferred depot maintenance on the equipment, vehicles, and aircraft of the Armed Forces;

(B) evaluate the impact of the need for resets of Army equipment, vehicles, and aircraft on Army force modernization initiatives (such as modularity) and on the development of the Future Combat Systems (FCS);

(C) identify a realistic multi-year schedule for the procurement, repair, and recapitalization to be required to reset equipment, vehicles, and aircraft for the Armed Forces, and, in the case of the Secretary, develop mechanisms for incorporating such schedule (and the funding required to implement such schedule) in coming Future-Years Defense Programs of the Department of Defense;

(D) develop, to the extent possible, an accurate estimate of the cost of the necessary reset of equipment, vehicles, and aircraft for the Armed Forces;

(E) review and assess the impact of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom on the defense industrial base of the United States in meeting the requirements of the Department of Defense for equipment, vehicles, and aircraft for the Armed Forces, including the regular components and reserve components of the Armed Forces, in order to ensure the full and continuing readiness of the Armed Forces to fulfill their national defense responsibilities; and

(F) develop recommendations, including recommendations on the utilization and expansion of existing authorities like the Defense Production Act, to improve the capacity and capability of the defense industrial base of the United States to meet such responsibilities.

(c) RESET DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ''reset'', when applied to equipment, vehicles, or aircraft, means the actions required to bring such equipment, vehicles, or aircraft to full combat readiness. Such actions include—

(1) repair, which generally involves restoration by military technicians and contractors deployed in the field;

(2) replacement; and

(3) recapitalization, which generally involves long-term depot-level maintenance to return equipment, vehicles, or aircraft to a status approximating not-previously used.

SA 4401. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 537, strike line 10 through the matter following page 539, line 19.

SA 4402. Mr. SALAZAR (for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 538, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 539, line 15, and insert the following:

''(b) ENVIRONMENTAL USE RESTRICTIONS.—The Secretary of a military department may grant or enter into a restrictive easement, covenant, or similar instrument under State law that restricts the future uses of real property as necessary to ensure the continued effectiveness of any remedial or corrective action selected or approved pursuant to any State or Federal environmental law.

''(c) LIMITATIONS.—(1) No easement or use restriction granted under this section may include more land than is necessary for the easement or use restriction.

''(2) Easements and use restrictions granted under this section shall be without consideration from the recipient.

''(3) Nothing in this section shall impair or limit any obligation of any military department to comply with any requirements of State or Federal environmental law.''.

SA 4403. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1065. CERTIFICATIONS ON CIVIL WAR IN IRAQ.

(a) CERTIFICATIONS REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until all United States combat brigades have been redeployed from Iraq, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State, make a determination as to whether there is a civil war in Iraq. The Secretary of Defense shall submit each such certification to Congress in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) DETERMINATION CRITERIA.—The Secretary of Defense shall include with each certification submitted to Congress under this section a description of the criteria underlying the determination of the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, for purposes of such certification as to whether there is a civil war in Iraq, including—

(A) an assessment of levels of sectarian violence;

(B) the numbers of civilians displaced;

(C) the degree to which government security forces (including the army, police, and special forces) exercise effective control over major urban areas;

(D) the extent to which units of the security forces respond to militia and party leaders rather than to their national commands;

(E) the extent to which militias have organized or conducted hostile actions against the United States Armed Forces;

(F) the extent to which militias are providing security; and

(G) estimates of civilian casualties as a result of sectarian violence.

(2) INFORMATION FOLLOWING DETERMINATION OF NO CIVIL WAR.—If the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, determines for purposes of a certification under this section that there is not a civil war in Iraq, the Secretary of Defense shall, in submitting such certification to Congress under this section, submit to Congress with such certification the following information (in unclassified format):

(A) A description of the efforts by the United States Government to help avoid civil war in Iraq.

(B) The strategy of the United States Government to protect United States Armed Forces in the event of civil war in Iraq.

(C) The strategy of the United States Government to ensure that United States Armed Forces will not take sides in the event of civil war in Iraq.

(3) INFORMATION FOLLOWING DETERMINATION OF CIVIL WAR.—If the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, determines for purposes of a certification under this section that there is a civil war in Iraq, the Secretary of Defense shall, in submitting such certification to Congress under this section, submit to Congress with such certification the following information (in unclassified format):

(A) A statement of the mission and duration of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

(B) The strategy of the United States Government to protect United States Armed Forces while they remain in Iraq.

(C) The strategy of the United States Government to ensure that United States Armed Forces will not take sides in the civil war.

SA 4404. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1066. SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS OF CERTAIN PRESIDENTIAL DAILY BRIEFINGS ON IRAQ.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees any Presidential Daily Briefing (PDB), or any portion of a Presidential Daily Briefing, of the Director of Central Intelligence during the period beginning on January 20, 1997, and ending on March 19, 2003, that refers to Iraq or otherwise addresses Iraq in any fashion.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''congressional intelligence committees'' means—

(1) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SA 4405. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1066. REPORT ON FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING REGIONAL COMBATANT COMMAND FOR AFRICA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives a report on the establishment of a United States Armed Forces regional combatant command for Africa.

(b) CONTENT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a feasibility study on the establishment of a United States Armed Forces regional combatant command for Africa;

(2) an assessment of the benefits and problems associated with establishing such a command; and

(3) an estimate of the costs, time, and resources needed to establish such a command.

SA 4406. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations released a report on March 30, 2006, entitled ''An Assessment of U.S. Efforts to Secure the Global Supply Chain'' (in this section referred to as the ''Senate Report''). That report, among other things, analyzed the unique security risks posed by the importation into the United States of cargo containers carrying trash.

(2) The Senate Report contained several important findings including the following:

(A) Containers carrying trash pose inherent security risks fundamentally different from those posed by containers carrying consumer products because—

(i) it is difficult, if not impossible, to trace the supply chain for trash cargos, given the variety of different individuals and entities that contribute to trash collections and the lack of any screening system to identify contributions as they are made;

(ii) the density of trash cargos makes inspection through irradiation impossible; and

(iii) physical inspection of trash cargos is difficult and dangerous.

(B) Importers of consumer products, by contrast, have more control over the specific content and the origin of the imported products, making it easier to take steps to monitor and ensure the security of the supply chain.

(C) There are few, if any, security measures in place to screen trash or ensure that trash does not conceal illegal or harmful materials, such as weapons or nuclear material.

(3) Growing imports of trash present an increasingly serious security problem.

(4) For example, according to the Senate Report, Canada shipped roughly 100,000 containers of trash across United States borders into Michigan in 2004 alone, an 8 percent increase over 2003.

(5) Another 10,000 containers of trash come through 9 other ports of entry on both the northern and southern borders of the United States each year.

(6) The Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security has found that from 2003 to 2004, tons of illegal drugs and millions of dollars in illegal currency have been transported into the United States in trash containers, among other forbidden cargo.

(7) The Senate Report concluded that the Department of Homeland Security should ban imports of trash into the United States entirely until the Secretary of Homeland Security ''can ensure that the supply chain of a trash importer is secure or develops protocols ensuring adequate inspections of individual trash containers''.

(8) To pay for more rigorous inspections to protect people in the United States from the security risks currently associated with trash containers, the Senate Report recommended enacting into a law a ''fee on international shipments of trash''.

(b) INSPECTIONS OF IMPORTED MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE.—

(1) INSPECTIONS OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection shall commence inspections of international shipments of municipal solid waste that enter the customs territory of the United States.

(2) FEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection shall levy a fee on each importer of international municipal solid waste that enters into the customs territory of the United States.

(B) AMOUNT.—The fee under subparagraph (A) shall be limited in amount to the approximate cost of the inspection described in paragraph (1) and shall not constitute a source of revenue for the United States Treasury.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CUSTOMS TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term ''customs territory of the United States'' has the meaning given the term in general note 2 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(2) MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the term ''municipal solid waste'' means—

(i) all waste materials discarded for disposal by households, including single and multifamily residences, and hotels and motels; and

(ii) all waste materials discarded for disposal that were generated by commercial, institutional, municipal, and industrial sources, to the extent such materials—

(I) are essentially the same as materials described in clause (i); and

(II) were collected and disposed of with other municipal solid waste described in clause (i) as part of normal municipal solid waste collection services, except that this subclause does not apply to hazardous materials other than hazardous materials that, under regulations issued under section 3001(d) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6921(d)), are not subject to regulation under subtitle C of that Act (42 U.S.C. 6921 et seq).

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''municipal solid waste'' includes food and yard waste, paper, clothing, appliances, consumer product packaging, disposable diapers, office supplies, cosmetics, glass and metal food containers, household hazardous waste, and debris resulting from construction, remodeling, repair, or demolition of structures.

(C) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ''municipal solid waste'' does not include the following:

(i) Any solid waste identified or listed as a hazardous waste under section 3001 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6941 et seq.), except for household hazardous waste.

(ii) Any solid waste, including contaminated soil and debris, resulting from—

(I) a response action taken under section 104 or 106 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604 and 9606);

(II) a response action taken under a State law with authorities comparable to the authorities of such section 104 or 106; or

(III) a corrective action taken under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.).

(iii) Recyclable materials that have been separated, at the source of the waste, from waste otherwise destined for disposal or that have been managed separately from waste destined for disposal.

(iv) Scrap rubber to be used as a fuel source.

(v) Materials and products returned from a dispenser or distributor to the manufacturer or an agent of the manufacturer for credit, evaluation, and possible reuse.

(vi) Any solid waste that is—

(I) generated by an industrial facility; and

(II) transported for the purpose of treatment, storage, or disposal to a facility or unit thereof that—

(aa) is owned or operated by the generator of the waste;

(bb) located on property owned by the generator or a company with which the generator is affiliated; or

(cc) the capacity of which is contractually dedicated exclusively to a specific generator, so long as the disposal area complies with local and State land use and zoning regulations applicable to the disposal site.

(vii) Any medical waste that is segregated from or not mixed with solid waste.

(viii) Combustion ash generated by resource recovery facilities or municipal incinerators, or waste from manufacturing or processing (including pollution control) operations not essentially the same as waste normally generated by households.

SA 4407. Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mr. CONRAD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 502, in the table preceding line 1, strike ''$8,000,000'' in the amount column of the item relating to Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, and insert ''$9,000,000''.

On page 503, in the table following line 10, strike ''$171,188,000'' in the amount column of the item relating to Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, and insert ''$170,188,000''.

On page 504, line 23, strike ''$862,661,000'' and insert ''$863,661,000''.

On page 505, line 16, strike ''$1,183,138,000'' and insert ''$1,182,138,000''.

SA 4408. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X, add the following new subtitle:

Subtitle J—Wartime Treatment Study Act

SEC. 1091. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Wartime Treatment Study Act''.

SEC. 1092. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) During World War II, the United States successfully fought the spread of Nazism and fascism by Germany, Italy, and Japan.

(2) Nazi Germany persecuted and engaged in genocide against Jews and certain other groups. By the end of the war, 6,000,000 Jews had perished at the hands of Nazi Germany. United States Government policies, however, restricted entry to the United States to Jewish and other refugees who sought safety from Nazi persecution.

(3) While we were at war, the United States treated the Japanese American, German American, and Italian American communities as suspect.

(4) The United States Government should conduct an independent review to assess fully and acknowledge these actions. Congress has previously reviewed the United States Government's wartime treatment of Japanese Americans through the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians. An independent review of the treatment of German Americans and Italian Americans and of Jewish refugees fleeing persecution and genocide has not yet been undertaken.

(5) During World War II, the United States Government branded as ''enemy aliens'' more than 600,000 Italian-born and 300,000 German-born United States resident aliens and their families and required them to carry Certificates of Identification, limited their travel, and seized their personal property. At that time, these groups were the two largest foreign-born groups in the United States.

(6) During World War II, the United States Government arrested, interned or otherwise detained thousands of European Americans, some remaining in custody for years after cessation of World War II hostilities, and repatriated, exchanged, or deported European Americans, including American-born children, to hostile, war-torn European Axis nations, many to be exchanged for Americans held in those nations.

(7) Pursuant to a policy coordinated by the United States with Latin American countries, many European Latin Americans, including German and Austrian Jews, were captured, shipped to the United States and interned. Many were later expatriated, repatriated or deported to hostile, war-torn European Axis nations during World War II, most to be exchanged for Americans and Latin Americans held in those nations.

(8) Millions of European Americans served in the armed forces and thousands sacrificed their lives in defense of the United States.

(9) The wartime policies of the United States Government were devastating to the Italian Americans and German American communities, individuals and their families. The detrimental effects are still being experienced.

(10) Prior to and during World War II, the United States restricted the entry of Jewish refugees who were fleeing persecution and sought safety in the United States. During the 1930's and 1940's, the quota system, immigration regulations, visa requirements, and the time required to process visa applications affected the number of Jewish refugees, particularly those from Germany and Austria, who could gain admittance to the United States.

(11) Time is of the essence for the establishment of commissions, because of the increasing danger of destruction and loss of relevant documents, the advanced age of potential witnesses and, most importantly, the advanced age of those affected by the United States Government's policies. Many who suffered have already passed away and will never know of this effort.

SEC. 1093. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) DURING WORLD WAR II.—The term ''during World War II'' refers to the period between September 1, 1939, through December 31, 1948.

(2) EUROPEAN AMERICANS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''European Americans'' refers to United States citizens and permanent resident aliens of European ancestry, including Italian Americans, German Americans, Hungarian Americans, Romanian Americans, and Bulgarian Americans.

(B) ITALIAN AMERICANS.—The term ''Italian Americans'' refers to United States citizens and permanent resident aliens of Italian ancestry.

(C) GERMAN AMERICANS.—The term ''German Americans'' refers to United States citizens and permanent resident aliens of German ancestry.

(3) EUROPEAN LATIN AMERICANS.—The term ''European Latin Americans'' refers to persons of European ancestry, including Italian or German ancestry, residing in a Latin American nation during World War II.

PART I—COMMISSION ON WARTIME TREATMENT OF EUROPEAN AMERICANS

SEC. 1094. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON WARTIME TREATMENT OF EUROPEAN AMERICANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established the Commission on Wartime Treatment of European Americans (referred to in this part as the ''European American Commission'').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The European American Commission shall be composed of 7 members, who shall be appointed not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act as follows:

(1) Three members shall be appointed by the President.

(2) Two members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the minority leader.

(3) Two members shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, in consultation with the minority leader.

(c) TERMS.—The term of office for members shall be for the life of the European American Commission. A vacancy in the European American Commission shall not affect its powers, and shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) REPRESENTATION.—The European American Commission shall include 2 members representing the interests of Italian Americans and 2 members representing the interests of German Americans.

(e) MEETINGS.—The President shall call the first meeting of the European American Commission not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) QUORUM.—Four members of the European American Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(g) CHAIRMAN.—The European American Commission shall elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among its members. The term of office of each shall be for the life of the European American Commission.

(h) COMPENSATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Members of the European American Commission shall serve without pay.

(2) REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES.—All members of the European American Commission shall be reimbursed for reasonable travel and subsistence, and other reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

SEC. 1095. DUTIES OF THE EUROPEAN AMERICAN COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be the duty of the European American Commission to review the United States Government's wartime treatment of European Americans and European Latin Americans as provided in subsection (b).

(b) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—The European American Commission's review shall include the following:

(1) A comprehensive review of the facts and circumstances surrounding United States Government actions during World War II that violated the civil liberties of European Americans and European Latin Americans pursuant to the section 4067, 4068, 4069, or 4070 of the Revised Statutes (50 U.S.C. 21, 22, 23, and 24) (referred to in this part as the ''Alien Enemies Acts''), Presidential Proclamations 2526, 2527, 2655, 2662, Executive Orders 9066 and 9095, and any directive of the United States Government pursuant to such law, proclamations, or executive orders respecting the registration, arrest, exclusion, internment, exchange, or deportment of European Americans and European Latin Americans. This review shall include an assessment of the underlying rationale of the United States Government's decision to develop related programs and policies, the information the United States Government received or acquired suggesting the related programs and policies were necessary, the perceived benefit of enacting such programs and policies, and the immediate and long-term impact of such programs and policies on European Americans and European Latin Americans and their communities.

(2) A review of United States Government action with respect to European Americans pursuant to the Alien Enemies Acts and Executive Order 9066 during World War II, including registration requirements, travel and property restrictions, establishment of restricted areas, raids, arrests, internment, exclusion, policies relating to the families and property that excludees and internees were forced to abandon, internee employment by American companies (including a list of such companies and the terms and type of employment), exchange, repatriation, and deportment, and the immediate and long-term effect of such actions, particularly internment, on the lives of those affected. This review shall include a list of all temporary detention and long-term internment facilities.

(3) A brief review of the participation by European Americans in the United States Armed Forces including the participation of European Americans whose families were excluded, interned, repatriated, or exchanged.

(4) A recommendation of appropriate remedies, including how civil liberties can be better protected during war, or an actual, attempted, or threatened invasion or incursion, an assessment of the continued viability of the Alien Enemies Acts, and public education programs related to the United States Government's wartime treatment of European Americans and European Latin Americans during World War II.

(c) FIELD HEARINGS.—The European American Commission shall hold public hearings in such cities of the United States as it deems appropriate.

(d) REPORT.—The European American Commission shall submit a written report of its findings and recommendations to Congress not later than 18 months after the date of the first meeting called pursuant to section 1094(e).

SEC. 1096. POWERS OF THE EUROPEAN AMERICAN COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The European American Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this chapter, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and request the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandum, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. The European American Commission may request the Attorney General to invoke the aid of an appropriate United States district court to require, by subpoena or otherwise, such attendance, testimony, or production.

(b) GOVERNMENT INFORMATION AND COOPERATION.—The European American Commission may acquire directly from the head of any department, agency, independent instrumentality, or other authority of the executive branch of the Government, available information that the European American Commission considers useful in the discharge of its duties. All departments, agencies, and independent instrumentalities, or other authorities of the executive branch of the Government shall cooperate with the European American Commission and furnish all information requested by the European American Commission to the extent permitted by law, including information collected as a result of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians Act (Public Law 96–317; 50 U.S.C. App. 1981) or the Wartime Violation of Italian American Civil Liberties Act (Public Law 106–451; 114 Stat. 1947). For purposes of the section 552a(b)(9) of title 5, United States Code (referred to in this subtitle as the Privacy Act of 1974), the European American Commission shall be deemed to be a committee of jurisdiction.

SEC. 1097. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

The European American Commission is authorized to—

(1) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that the compensation of any employee of the Commission may not exceed a rate equivalent to the rate payable under GS–15 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title;

(2) obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of such title;

(3) obtain the detail of any Federal Government employee, and such detail shall be without reimbursement or interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege;

(4) enter into agreements with the Administrator of General Services for procurement of necessary financial and administrative services, for which payment shall be made by reimbursement from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator;

(5) procure supplies, services, and property by contract in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and to the extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts; and

(6) enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and agencies for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of the duties of the Commission, to the extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts.

SEC. 1098. FUNDING.

Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice, $500,000 shall be available to carry out this part.

SEC. 1099. SUNSET.

The European American Commission shall terminate 60 days after the date that the report required by section 1095(e) is submitted to Congress.

PART II—COMMISSION ON WARTIME TREATMENT OF JEWISH REFUGEES

SEC. 1099A. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON WARTIME TREATMENT OF JEWISH REFUGEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established the Commission on Wartime Treatment of Jewish Refugees (referred to in this part as the ''Jewish Refugee Commission'').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Jewish Refugee Commission shall be composed of 7 members, who shall be appointed not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act as follows:

(1) Three members shall be appointed by the President.

(2) Two members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the minority leader.

(3) Two members shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, in consultation with the minority leader.

(c) TERMS.—The term of office for members shall be for the life of the Jewish Refugee Commission. A vacancy in the Jewish Refugee Commission shall not affect its powers, and shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) REPRESENTATION.—The Jewish Refugee Commission shall include 2 members representing the interests of Jewish refugees.

(e) MEETINGS.—The President shall call the first meeting of the Jewish Refugee Commission not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) QUORUM.—Four members of the Jewish Refugee Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(g) CHAIRMAN.—The Jewish Refugee Commission shall elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among its members. The term of office of each shall be for the life of the Jewish Refugee Commission.

(h) COMPENSATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Members of the Jewish Refugee Commission shall serve without pay.

(2) REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES.—All members of the Jewish Refugee Commission shall be reimbursed for reasonable travel and subsistence, and other reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

SEC. 1099B. DUTIES OF THE JEWISH REFUGEE COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be the duty of the Jewish Refugee Commission to review the United States Government's refusal to allow Jewish and other refugees fleeing persecution in Europe entry to the United States as provided in subsection (b).

(b) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—The Jewish Refugee Commission's review shall cover the period between January 1, 1933, through December 31, 1945, and shall include, to the greatest extent practicable, the following:

(1) A review of the United States Government's refusal to allow Jewish and other refugees fleeing persecution and genocide entry to the United States, including a review of the underlying rationale of the United States Government's decision to refuse the Jewish and other refugees entry, the information the United States Government received or acquired suggesting such refusal was necessary, the perceived benefit of such refusal, and the impact of such refusal on the refugees.

(2) A review of Federal refugee policy relating to those fleeing persecution or genocide, including recommendations for making it easier for future victims of persecution or genocide to obtain refuge in the United States.

(c) FIELD HEARINGS.—The Jewish Refugee Commission shall hold public hearings in such cities of the United States as it deems appropriate.

(d) REPORT.—The Jewish Refugee Commission shall submit a written report of its findings and recommendations to Congress not later than 18 months after the date of the first meeting called pursuant to section 1099A(e).

SEC. 1099C. POWERS OF THE JEWISH REFUGEE COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Jewish Refugee Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this part, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and request the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandum, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. The Jewish Refugee Commission may request the Attorney General to invoke the aid of an appropriate United States district court to require, by subpoena or otherwise, such attendance, testimony, or production.

(b) GOVERNMENT INFORMATION AND COOPERATION.—The Jewish Refugee Commission may acquire directly from the head of any department, agency, independent instrumentality, or other authority of the executive branch of the Government, available information that the Jewish Refugee Commission considers useful in the discharge of its duties. All departments, agencies, and independent instrumentalities, or other authorities of the executive branch of the Government shall cooperate with the Jewish Refugee Commission and furnish all information requested by the Jewish Refugee Commission to the extent permitted by law, including information collected as a result of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians Act (Public Law 96–317; 50 U.S.C. App. 1981) or the Wartime Violation of Italian American Civil Liberties Act (Public Law 106–451; 114 Stat. 1947). For purposes of the section 552a(b)(9) of the Privacy Act of 1974, the Jewish Refugee Commission shall be deemed to be a committee of jurisdiction.

SEC. 1099D. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

The Jewish Refugee Commission is authorized to—

(1) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that the compensation of any employee of the Commission may not exceed a rate equivalent to the rate payable under GS–15 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title;

(2) obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of such title;

(3) obtain the detail of any Federal Government employee, and such detail shall be without reimbursement or interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege;

(4) enter into agreements with the Administrator of General Services for procurement of necessary financial and administrative services, for which payment shall be made by reimbursement from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator;

(5) procure supplies, services, and property by contract in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and to the extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts; and

(6) enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and agencies for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of the duties of the Commission, to the extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts.

SEC. 1099E. FUNDING.

Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice, $500,000 shall be available to carry out this part.

SEC. 1099F. SUNSET.

The Jewish Refugee Commission shall terminate 60 days after the date the report required by section 1099B is submitted to Congress.

SA 4409. Mr. OBAMA (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 587. REPORT ON PROVISION OF ELECTRONIC COPY OF MILITARY RECORDS ON DISCHARGE OR RELEASE OF MEMBERS FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the feasibility and advisability of providing an electronic copy of military records (including all military service, medical, and other military records) to members of the Armed Forces on their discharge or release from the Armed Forces.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An estimate of the costs of the provision of military records as described in subsection (a).

(2) An assessment of providing military records as described in that subsection through the distribution of a portable, readily accessible medium (such as a computer disk or other similar medium) containing such records.

(3) A description and assessment of the mechanisms required to ensure the privacy of members of the Armed Forces in providing military records as described in that subsection.

(4) An assessment of the benefits to the members of the Armed Forces of receiving their military records as described in that subsection.

(5) If the Secretary determines that providing military records to members of the Armed Forces as described in that subsection is feasible and advisable, a plan (including a schedule) for providing such records to members of the Armed Forces as so described in order to ensure that each member of the Armed Forces is provided such records upon discharge or release from the Armed Forces.

(6) Any other matter to relating to the provision of military records as described in that subsection that the Secretary considers appropriate.

SA 4410. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CHANNEL ISLANDS NATIONAL PARK.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Channel Islands National Monument was designated in 1938 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt under the authority of the Act of June 8, 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.);

(2) Channel Islands National Monument was expanded to include additional islands and redesignated as Channel Islands National Park in 1980 to protect the nationally significant natural, scenic, wildlife, marine, ecological, archaeological, cultural, and scientific values of the Channel Islands in California;

(3) Santa Rosa Island was acquired by the United States in 1986 for approximately $29,500,000 for the purpose of restoring the native ecology of the Island and making the Island available to the public for recreational uses;

(4) Santa Rosa Island contains numerous prehistoric and historic artifacts and provides important habitat for several threatened and endangered species; and

(5) under a court-approved settlement agreement, the nonnative elk and deer populations are scheduled to be removed from the Park by 2011 and the Island is to be restored to management consistent with other National Parks.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ISLAND.—The term ''Island'' means Santa Rosa Island, which is part of Channel Islands National Park in the State of California.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.—The term ''settlement agreement'' means the 1998 court-approved settlement agreement among the National Park Service, Vail & Vickers, and the National Parks Conservation Association for case numbers 96–7412 WJR and 97–4098 WJR.

(c) MANAGEMENT OF SANTA ROSA ISLAND.—The Secretary shall ensure that Channel Islands National Park (including the Island) is administered by the National Park Service in accordance with—

(1) title II of Public Law 96–199 (16 U.S.C. 410ff et seq.);

(2) the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(3) any other applicable laws (including the regulations and polices of the National Park Service relating to the management of units of the National Park System).

(d) PROTECTION OF PARK RESOURCES.—The Secretary shall manage the Island in a manner that ensures that—

(1) the natural, scenic, and cultural resources of the Island (including threatened species, endangered species, and other native plant and animal populations) are properly protected, restored, and interpreted for the public; and

(2) visitors to the Island—

(A) are provided with a safe and enjoyable experience; and

(B) are not denied access to significant portions of the Island.

(e) SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act voids or nullifies the settlement agreement concerning the management of nonnative deer and elk on the Island.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the population of nonnative deer and elk are removed from the Island not later than December 31, 2011, in accordance with the schedule set forth in the settlement agreement.

SA 4411. Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 519, line 21, strike ''$242,143,000'' and insert ''$245,743,000''.

SA 4412. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. BIDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 662. AUTHORITY TO PAY GRATUITY TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES FOR SLAVE LABOR PERFORMED FOR JAPAN DURING WORLD WAR II.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) During World War II, members of the United States Armed Forces fought valiantly against Japanese military forces in the Pacific. From December 1941 until May 1942, United States military personnel fought valiantly against overwhelming Japanese military forces on Wake Island, Guam, the Philippine Islands, including the Bataan Peninsula and Corregidor, and the Dutch East Indies, thereby preventing Japan from accomplishing strategic objectives necessary for achieving a preemptive military victory in the Pacific during World War II.

(2) In military action in the Philippines, United States troops were ordered to surrender on April 9, 1942, and were forced to march 65 miles to prison camps at Camp O'Donnell, Cabanatuan, and Bilibid. More than 10,000 Americans died during the march, known as the ''Bataan Death March'', and during subsequent imprisonment as a result of starvation, disease, and executions.

(3) Beginning in January 1942, the Japanese military began to transport United States prisoners of war to Japan, Taiwan, Manchuria, and Korea to perform slave labor to support their war industries. Many of the unmarked merchant vessels in which the prisoners were transported, called ''Hell Ships'', were attacked by American naval and air forces, which, according to some estimates, resulted in more than 3,600 American fatalities.

(4) Following the conclusion of World War II, the United States Government agreed to pay compensation to United States ex-prisoners of war amounting to $2.50 per day of imprisonment. This compensation was paid from Japanese assets frozen by the United States Government and do not begin to fully compensate those ex-prisoners of war for the short-term and long-term costs of the slave labor they endured. Neither the Government of Japan nor any Japanese corporations admit any liability for further payment of such compensation.

(5) Other nations, including Canada, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands, have authorized payment of gratuities to their surviving veterans who were captured by the Japanese during World War II and required to perform slave labor.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to recognize, by the provision of compensation, the heroic contributions of the members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the United States who were captured by the Japanese military during World War II and denied their basic human rights by being made to perform slave labor by the Imperial Government of Japan or by Japanese corporations during World War II.

(c) PAYMENT OF GRATUITY AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may pay a gratuity to a covered veteran or civilian internee, or to the surviving spouse of a covered veteran or civilian internee, in the amount of $20,000.

(d) COVERED VETERAN OR CIVILIAN INTERNEE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered veteran or civilian internee'' means any individual who—

(1) was a member of the Armed Forces, a civilian employee of the United States, or an employee of a contractor of the United States during World War II;

(2) served in or with United States combat forces during World War II;

(3) was captured and held as a prisoner of war or prisoner by Japan in the course of such service; and

(4) was required by the Imperial Government of Japan, or one or more Japanese corporations, to perform slave labor during World War II.

(e) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PAYMENTS.—Any amount paid a person under this section for activity described in subsection (d) is in addition to any other amount paid such person for such activity under any other provision of law.

(f) INAPPLICABILITY OF TAXATION OR ATTACHMENT.—Any amount paid a person under this section shall not be subject to any taxation, attachment, execution, levy, tax lien, or detention under any process whatever.

SA 4413. Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. CONRAD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

SEC. 215. REMOTE VISUAL ASSESSMENT.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities is hereby increased by $10,900,000.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities, as increased by subsection (a), $10,900,000 may be available for ICBM Security Modernization (PE #0604851) for Remote Visual Assessment for security for silos for intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs).

(c) OFFSET.—

(1) PROHIBITION ON DEACTIVATION OF MINUTEMAN III ICBMS.—No funds authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2007 may be obligated or expended for the deactivation of any Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile.

(2) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(4) for operation and maintenance for the Air Force is hereby reduced by $10,900,000, with the amount of the reduction to be allocated to amounts otherwise available to the United States Space Command for the deactivation of Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles.

SA 4414. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year

for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IX, add following:

SEC. 903. MILITARY DEPUTIES TO THE ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS FOR ACQUISITION, LOGISTICS, AND TECHNOLOGY.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION.—There is hereby established within the Department of the Army the position of Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology.

(2) LIEUTENANT GENERAL.—The individual serving in the position of Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology shall be a lieutenant general of the Army on active duty.

(3) EXCLUSION FROM GRADE AND NUMBER LIMITATIONS.—An officer serving in the position of Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology shall not be counted against the numbers and percentages of officers of the Army of the grade of lieutenant general.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION.—There is hereby established within the Department of the Navy the position of Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology.

(2) VICE ADMIRAL.—The individual serving in the position of Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology shall be a vice admiral on active duty.

(3) EXCLUSION FROM GRADE AND NUMBER LIMITATIONS.—An officer serving in the position of Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology shall not be counted against the numbers and percentages of officers of the grade of vice admiral.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION.—There is hereby established within the Department of the Air Force the position of Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology.

(2) LIEUTENANT GENERAL.—The individual serving in the position of Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology shall be a lieutenant general of the Air Force on active duty.

(3) EXCLUSION FROM GRADE AND NUMBER LIMITATIONS.—An officer serving in the position of Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology shall not be counted against the numbers and percentages of officers of the Air Force of the grade of lieutenant general.

SA 4415. Mr. STEVENS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. WAIVER FOR TRANSPORTATION TO COOK INLET.

Notwithstanding section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. App. 883) or any other law restricting the operation of a foreign-flag vessel in the coastwise trade, the foreign-flag vessel TAI AN KOU (IMO number 9223277) may engage in the coastwise trade of the United States to transport a jack-up drilling rig from a place near Port Arthur, Texas, to a site in Cook Inlet, Alaska.

SA 4416. Mr. CHAFEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. FOX POINT HURRICANE BARRIER, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''Barrier'' means the Fox Point Hurricane Barrier, Providence, Rhode Island.

(2) The term ''City'' means the city of Providence, Rhode Island.

(3) The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers.

(b) RESPONSIBILITY FOR BARRIER.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall assume responsibility for the annual operation and maintenance of the Barrier.

(c) REQUIRED STRUCTURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The City, in coordination with the Secretary, shall identify any land and structures required for the continued operation and maintenance, repair, replacement, rehabilitation, and structural integrity of the Barrier.

(2) CONVEYANCE.—The City shall convey to the Secretary, by quitclaim deed and without consideration, all rights, title, and interests of the City in and to the land and structures identified under paragraph (1).

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such funds as are necessary for each fiscal year to operate and maintain the Barrier (including repair, replacement, and rehabilitation).

SA 4417. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. OBAMA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 587. IMPROVED ADMINISTRATION OF TRANSITIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) PRESEPARATION COUNSELING.—Section 1142 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) For members of the reserve components who have been serving on active duty continuously for at least 180 days, the Secretary concerned shall require that preseparation counseling under this section be provided to all such members (including officers) before the members are separated.

''(5) The Secretary concerned shall ensure that commanders of members entitled to services under this section authorize the members to obtain such services during duty time.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking ''(4) Information concerning'' and inserting the following:

''(4) Provision of information on civilian occupations and related assistance programs, including information concerning—

''(A) certification and licensure requirements that are applicable to civilian occupations;

''(B) civilian occupations that correspond to military occupational specialties; and

''(C)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(15) Information concerning homelessness, including risk factors, awareness assessment, and contact information for preventative assistance associated with homelessness.'';

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—(1) The Secretary concerned shall ensure that—

''(A) preseparation counseling under this section includes material that is specifically relevant to the needs of—

''(i) persons being separated from active duty by discharge from a regular component of the armed forces; and

''(ii) members of the reserve components being separated from active duty;

''(B) the preseparation counseling under this section is provided to each member of the armed forces eligible for such counseling under this section and includes web-based services, telemedicine, and individual counseling;

''(C) the scope and content of the material presented in preseparation counseling at each location under this section are consistent with the scope and content of the material presented in the preseparation counseling at the other locations under this section; and

''(D) follow up counseling is provided for each member of the reserve components described in subparagraph (A) not later than 180 days after separation from active duty.

''(2) The Secretary concerned shall, on a continuing basis, update the content of the materials used by the National Veterans Training Institute and such officials' other activities that provide direct training support to personnel who provide preseparation counseling under this section.''; and

(4) by amending the heading to read as follows:

''§ 1142. Members separating from active duty: preseparation counseling''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 58 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 1142 and inserting the following:

''1142. Members separating from active duty: preseparation counseling.''.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR TRANSITIONAL SERVICES PROGRAM.—Section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''paragraph (4)(A)'' in the second sentence and inserting ''paragraph (6)(A)'';

(2) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) PARTICIPATION.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall require participation by members of the armed forces eligible

for assistance under the program carried out under this section.

''(2) The Secretary and the Secretary of Homeland Security need not require, but shall encourage and otherwise promote, participation in the program by the following members of the armed forces described in paragraph (1):

''(A) Each member who has previously participated in the program.

''(B) Each member who, upon discharge or release from active duty, is returning to—

''(i) a position of employment; or

''(ii) pursuit of an academic degree or other educational or occupational training objective that the member was pursuing when called or ordered to such active duty.

''(3) The Secretary concerned shall ensure that commanders of members entitled to services under this section authorize the members to obtain such services during duty time.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) MECHANISMS FOR PROVISION OF COUNSELING AND SERVICES.—(1) In providing counseling and other services under the program under this section, the Secretary of Labor—

''(A) may utilize range of methods for providing such counseling and services, including face-to-face workshop, individual counseling, web-based tutorial, videotape workshops, and any combination thereof; and

''(B) shall encourage face-to-face workshops as the optimal method for the provision of such counseling and services.

''(2) The Secretary shall ensure that the scope and content of counseling and services under the program are consistent, regardless of the mechanism utilized under paragraph (1) to provide such counseling and services.

''(f) UPDATED MATERIALS.—The Secretary concerned shall, on a continuing basis, update the content of all materials used by the Department of Labor that provide direct training support to personnel who provide transitional services counseling under this section.''.

SEC. 588. COMPTROLLER GENERAL ASSESSMENT ON ACCESS TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES BEING DISCHARGED, SEPARATED OR RELEASED FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct and provide to Congress within 240 days an assessment of the following:

(1) The current policies and practices of the Department of Defense (including the military departments and the Armed Forces), the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Labor on permitting access by military and veterans' service organizations and State veterans service agencies to members of the Armed Forces who are scheduled, or are in the process of being scheduled, for separation, discharge, release, or retirement from active duty in the Armed Forces for the purposes of providing preseparation counseling, other assistance briefings, and veteran-to-veteran counseling to such members.

(2) Whether such policies and practices are consistently applied throughout the military departments, the regular and reserve components of the Armed Forces, all duty stations of the Armed Forces, and facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(3) The effectiveness of preseparation counseling provided by veterans for members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1).

(4) The effectiveness of preseparation counseling and other assistance briefings by military and veterans' service organizations and State veterans service agencies for members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1).

(5) The effectiveness of veteran-to-veteran counseling to members of the Armed Forces who have been discharged or released, or are retired, from active duty in the Armed Forces.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In conducting the assessment required by subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall develop such recommendations as the Comptroller General considers appropriate on the following:

(1) The extent to which the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Labor should encourage or require veteran preseparation counseling, preseparation counseling, and other assistance briefings by military and veterans' service organizations and State veterans service agencies.

(2) Means by which veterans should learn about and gain access to veteran-to-veteran preseparation counseling, preseparation counseling, and other assistance briefings by military and veterans' service organizations, State and local veterans service agencies, community-based organizations (including faith-based organizations) serving veterans, and other veteran-to-veteran counseling, and where and how access should be made available.

(3) Means by which the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Labor shall ensure consistency in the application of policies and practices on veteran-to-veteran preseparation counseling, preseparation counseling, veteran-to-veteran counseling, and other assistance briefings by military and veterans' service organizations, State and local veterans service agencies, community-based organizations (including faith-based organizations) serving veterans throughout the military departments, the regular and reserve components of the Armed Forces, all duty stations of the Armed Forces, and facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''counseling'', with respect to the members of the Armed Forces described in subsection (a)(1), includes group-level briefings and individual and family meetings with such members in order to provide the following:

(A) The counseling required under section 1142 of title 10, United States Code.

(B) The employment, job training, and other assistance, and information on such assistance, required by section 1144 of title 10, United States Code.

(C) Information on benefits delivery at discharge programs.

(D) Information on the programs and services of the entity or organization providing such counseling.

(2) The term ''benefits delivery at discharge program'' means a program administered jointly by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide information and assistance on available benefits and other transition assistance to obtain any disability benefits for which a member of the Armed Forces.

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(d) PROVISION OF MATERIALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate actions to ensure the provision to all members of the Armed Forces described in subsection (a)(1) from military and veterans' service organizations and State veterans' service agencies of such materials (including materials described in paragraph (2)) on separation from active duty in the Armed Forces and adjustment to civilian life as such organizations and agencies seek to provide to such members. The Secretary may prohibit the provision of any such materials to such members only if such materials are factually inaccurate.

(2) MATERIALS.—The materials described in this paragraph are materials on the following:

(A) The counseling required to be provided under section 1142 of title 10, United States Code.

(B) The employment, job training, and other assistance required to be provided under section 1144 of title 10, United States Code.

(C) Benefits delivery at discharge programs.

(D) Programs and services provided by the organization or agency concerned.

SA 4418. Mr. OBAMA submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2834. REPORT ON AIR NATIONAL GUARD BASES AFFECTED BY 2005 ROUND OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2007, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to Congress a report on planning by the Department of the Air Force for new or additional missions for Guard personnel at the Air National Guard bases that lost aircraft as a result of the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment.

(b) CONTENT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the planning process used by the Air Force to determine future missions at Air National Guard bases that lost aircraft as a result of the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment;

(2) a description of the capabilities, characteristics, and capacity of the facilities, infrastructure, and authorized personnel at each such base;

(3) a description of the missions under consideration for each base and an explanation of the criteria and decision-making process to make final decisions about the new missions for each base; and

(4) a timeline for decisions on assigning new or expanded missions to each base.

SA 4419. Mrs. DOLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 587. ENHANCEMENT OF PRESEPARATION COUNSELING AND TRANSITION SERVICES.

(a) PRESEPARATION COUNSELING AND TRANSITION SERVICES.—Subsection (a) of section 1142 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of paragraph (1), by striking ''shall (except as provided in paragraph (4)) provide for individual preseparation counseling of'' and inserting ''shall (except as provided in paragraph (5)) provide individual preseparation counseling and additional individualized transition services to'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) For a member of a reserve component being separated from service on active duty for a period of more than 180 days, the Secretary concerned shall require that preseparation counseling and transition services under this section be provided to such member as soon as possible within the member's remaining period fo service with completion of the provision of such counseling and services to occur not later than 120 days after the member is so separated.''.

(b) INDIVIDUALIZED TRANSITIONAL SERVICES.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''COUNSELING.—Counseling under'' and inserting ''COUNSELING AND ADDITIONAL INDIVIDUALIZED TRANSITIONAL SERVICES.—Counseling and additional individualized transitional assistance under''; and

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

''(18) In the case of a member who, as determined pursuant to a post deployment health care assessment (PDHA), may be eligible for compensation benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, a referral (to be provided with the assistance of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs) for a medical examination by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs referred to as a compensation and pension examination.

''(19) Information concerning services of the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and community-based organizations pertaining to reemployment rights, transition employment assistance, education benefits, readjustment counseling services, and other benefits for veterans.''.

(c) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(d) CONTENT RELEVANT TO REGULAR AND RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS.—The Secretary concerned shall ensure that preseparation counseling and transition services under this section include material that is specifically relevant to the needs of members being separated from active duty from a regular component, the needs of members of the reserve components being separated from active duty, and the needs of members of the National Guard being separated from full-time National Guard duty.

''(e) CONSISTENCY OF MATERIALS.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the scope and content of the materials presented as part of preseparation counseling and transition services at each location under this section are consistent with minimum Department of Defense standards for the delivery of preseparation counseling for all members of the armed forces eligible to receive such counseling at separation from the armed forces.

''(f) POST-SEPARATION FOLLOW-UP FOR RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS.—The Secretary concerned shall ensure that follow-up counseling is provided for each member of a reserve component separated from active duty not later than 180 days after such separation.

''(g) UPDATED CONTENT OF MATERIALS.—The Secretary concerned shall, on a continuing basis, update the minimum Department of Defense standards for the delivery of preseparation counseling used by activities of the Secretary that provide direct training support to personnel who provide preseparation counseling and other services under this section.

''(h) INTERNET-BASED ACCESS TO MATERIALS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall develop and maintain an Internet website for the Transition Assistance Program (TAP) by not later than October 1, 2008.

''(2) The information available through the website under paragraph (1) shall include comprehensive information on the Transition Assistance Program programs under subsection (b).

''(3) The website under paragraph (1) shall be accessible to all member of the armed forces who are eligible for preseparation counseling and transition services.

''(i) NATIONAL GUARD MEMBERS.—Members of the National Guard being separated from duty to which ordered under section 502(f) of title 32 shall be provided preseparation counseling and services under this section to the same extent that members of a reserve component being discharged or released from active duty are provided preseparation counseling and services under this section.''.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading for section 1142 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1142. Members separating from active duty: preseparation counseling and transition services''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The item relating to section 1142 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 58 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''1142. Members separating from active duty: preseparation counseling and transition services''.

(e) CROSS-REFERENCE AMENDMENT.—Section 1144(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking ''paragraph (4)(A)'' in the second sentence and inserting ''paragraph (5)(A)''.

SA 4420. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XIV, add the following:

SEC. 1414. OUR MILITARY KIDS YOUTH SUPPORT PROGRAM.

(a) ARMY FUNDING FOR EXPANSION OF PROGRAM.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 1405(1) for operation and maintenance for the Army, $1,500,000 may be available for the expansion nationwide of the Our Military Kids youth support program for dependents of elementary and secondary school age of members of the National Guard and Reserve who are severely wounded or injured during deployment.

(b) ARMY NATIONAL GUARD FUNDING FOR EXPANSION OF PROGRAM.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 1405(6) for operation and maintenance for the Army National Guard, $500,000 may be available for the expansion nationwide of the Our Military Kids youth support program.

SA 4421. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 315. READING FOR THE BLIND AND DYSLEXIC PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) DEFENSE DEPENDENTS.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(5) for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities, $500,000 may be available for the Reading for the Blind and Dyslexic program of the Department of Defense for defense dependents of elementary and secondary school age in the continental United States and overseas.

(b) SEVERELY WOUNDED OR INJURED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 1405(5) for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities, $500,000 may be available for the Reading for the Blind and Dyslexic program of the Department of Defense for severely wounded or injured members of the Armed Forces.

SA 4422. Mr. SPECTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF A COMPREHENSIVE, FULLY INTEGRATED SECURITY NETWORK SOLUTION IN IRAQ.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A reliable and integrated telecommunications infrastructure is essential to security, governance, and economic stability in Iraq.

(2) The United States Government, in association with coalition partners, the Government of Iraq, and nongovernmental organizations, has committed funds to improve telecommunications infrastructure in Iraq, particularly with respect to security.

(3) A major effort in this regard includes the deployment of an advanced first responder network (AFRN) throughout Iraq, including in 14 cities that are currently benefitting from these mission-critical public safety communications capabilities.

(4) The broader deployment and connectivity of such disparate emergency communications systems is of critical importance in Iraq, especially in the area of infrastructure security, and a more integrated national common architecture warrants special attention and support.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should—

(1) continue the deployment of critical advanced first responder network capability into selected areas of Iraq, including the Kurdish area in the north of the country; and

(2) in order to ensure enhanced connectivity of the advanced first responder network, build upon the success of the

project to date and implement a comprehensive, fully integrated security network solution in Iraq that will ensure network reliability, secure communications, and a dependable mechanism for the exchange of critical intelligence information, particularly for purposes of supporting and enhancing overall telecommunications services that accommodate command and control of Iraqi security forces, police, and first responders.

SA 4423. Mr. BIDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XIV, add following:

SEC. 1414. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES RELATING TO IRAQ.

No funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for a purpose as follows:

(1) To establish a permanent United States military installation or base in Iraq.

(2) To exercise United States control over the oil resources of Iraq.

SA 4424. Mr. BIDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes: which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 387, line 7, strike ''and aircraft'' and insert ''and, subject to section 484(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291c(a)), aircraft''.

On page 387, line 25, after ''congressional defense committees'' the following: ''and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives''.

On page 388, line 3, strike ''paragraphs (10)'' and insert ''paragraphs (1)''.

SA 4425. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes: which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 146 and insert the following:

SEC. 146. PROHIBITION ON INCREMENTAL FUNDING AND MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT RELATING TO F–22A AIRCRAFT.

(a) PROHIBITION ON INCREMENTAL FUNDING OF F–22A AIRCRAFT.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall not use incremental funding for the procurement of F–22A aircraft.

(b) PROHIBITION ON MULTIYEAR CONTRACT FOR PROCUREMENT OF F–22A AIRCRAFT.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall not enter into a multiyear contract for the procurement of F–22A aircraft in fiscal year 2007.

(c) PROHIBITION ON MULTIYEAR CONTRACT FOR PROCUREMENT OF F–119 ENGINES FOR F–22A AIRCRAFT.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall not enter into a multiyear contract for the procurement of F–119 engines for F–22A aircraft in fiscal year 2007.

SA 4426. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes: which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 730. ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED OPTION PERIODS FOR EXTENSION OF CONTRACTS UNDER TRICARE.

(a) ADDITIONAL NUMBER OF AUTHORIZED PERIODS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1097 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED OPTION PERIODS.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense, after consulting with the other administering Secretaries, may extend any contract for the delivery of health care entered into under this section by one year if the Secretary determines that such extension—

''(A) is in the best interests of the United States; and

''(B) will—

''(i) facilitate the effective administration of the TRICARE program; or

''(ii) ensure continuity in the delivery of health care under the TRICARE program.

''(2) The total number of extensions of a particular contract that may be granted under paragraph (1) may not exceed 2 extensions.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and, subject to subsection (b), shall apply with respect to any contract described in subsection (f) of section 1097 of title 10, United States Code (as so added), that is in force or entered into on or after that date.

(b) NOTICE AND WAIT.—The Secretary of Defense may not commence the exercise of the authority in subsection (f) of section 1097 of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a) of this section) until 30 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the minimum level of performance by an incumbent contractor under a contract covered by such subsection (f) that will be required by the Secretary in order to be eligible for an extension authorized by such subsection (f).

(c) REPORT ON CONTRACTING MECHANISMS FOR HEALTH CARE SERVICE SUPPORT CONTRACTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on contracting mechanisms under consideration for future contracts for health care service support under section 1097 of title 10, United States Code. The report shall include an assessment of the advantages and disadvantages for the Department of Defense (including the potential for stimulating competition and the effect on health care beneficiaries of the Department) of providing in such contracts for a single term of 5 years with a single optional period of extension of an additional 5 years.

SA 4427. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes: which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the folling:

SEC. 1084. EXTENSION OF RETURNING WORKER EXEMPTION.

Section 402(b)(1) of the Save Our Small and Seasonal Businesses Act of 2005 (title IV of division B of Public Law 109–13; 8 U.S.C. 1184 note) is amended by striking ''2006'' and inserting ''2008''.

SA 4428. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes: which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part I of subtitle A of title V, add the following:

SEC. 509. MODIFICATION OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR LEADERSHIP OF THE NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL.

Section 7042(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) by inserting ''active-duty or retired'' after ''An'';

(B) by inserting ''or Marine Corps'' after ''Navy'';

(C) by inserting ''or colonel, respectively'' after ''captain''; and

(D) by inserting ''or assigned'' after ''detailed'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''and the Commandant of the Marine Corps'' after ''Operations''; and

(3) in paragraph (4)(A)—

(A) by inserting ''(unless such individual is a retired officer of the Navy or Marine Corps in a grade not below the grade of captain or colonel, respectively)'' after ''in the case of a civilian'';

(B) by inserting ''active-duty or retired'' after ''in the case of an''; and

(C) by inserting ''or Marine Corps'' after ''Navy''.

SA 4429. Mr. CHAFEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes: which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1013. AUTHORITY TO DONATE SS ARTHUR M. HUDDELL TO THE GOVERNMENT OF GREECE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) It is in the economic and environmental interests of the United States to promote the disposal of vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet that are of insufficient value to warrant further preservation.

(2) The Maritime Administration of the Department of Transportation has been authorized to make such disposals, including the sale and recycling of such vessels and the donation of such vessels to any State, commonwealth, or possession of the United States, and to nonprofit organizations.

(3) The government of Greece has expressed an interest in obtaining and using the ex-Liberty ship, SS ARTHUR M. HUDDELL, for purposes of a museum exhibit.

(4) It is in the interest of the United States to authorize the Maritime Administration to donate SS ARTHUR M. HUDDELL to Greece.

(b) DONATION OF SS ARTHUR M. HUDDELL TO GOVERNMENT OF GREECE.—Notwithstanding Section 510(j) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1158), the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to transfer SS ARTHUR M. HUDDELL, by gift, to the Government of Greece, in accordance with terms and conditions determined by the Secretary.

(c) ADDITIONAL EQUIPMENT.—The Secretary may convey additional equipment from other obsolete vessels of the National Defense Reserve Fleet to assist the Government of Greece under this section for purposes of the museum exhibit referred to in subsection (a)(3).

SA 4430. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS EXTENDED TO EMPLOYEES OF NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCIES AND FEDERAL CONTRACTORS.

Section 2302 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(ii) by striking ''; and'' and inserting the following: '', in which case the President shall submit a report to Congress, that may be classified if necessary—

''(I) detailing any position the President has excluded from the coverage of this section; and

''(II) including the reasons why the President determined that excluding a position from the coverage of this section is necessary and warranted by the conditions of good administration;'';

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''subsection (b)(8)'' and inserting ''paragraph (8) or (9) of subsection (b)'';

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking ''the Federal Bureau of Investigation,''; and

(iii) in clause (iii), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) 'intelligence agency' means any agency described in subparagraph (C)(ii).'';

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(f)(1)(A) In this paragraph—

''(i) the term 'executive agency' has the meaning given under section 4(1) of the Office of the Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(1)); and

''(ii) the term 'Federal contractor' means any person that has entered into a contract with an executive agency, or any person who has entered into a contract with such a person pursuant to the contract with that executive agency.

''(B) For the purposes of paragraphs (8) and (9) of subsection (b), any employment position at a Federal contractor that is funded in whole or in part by appropriated funds shall be considered to be a covered position under subsection (a)(2)(B).

''(C) For purposes of this paragraph, an employment position at a Federal contractor is funded in whole or in part by appropriated funds if the responsibilities of the position include engaging in any activity with respect to such contract, including providing services or manufacturing goods procured under the contract, or providing incidental or support services related to such a contract, including accounting, human resources, secretarial services, and any other incidental or support services.

''(2) For the purposes of paragraph (8)(A) and paragraph (9) of subsection (b), any position at an agency described under subsection (a)(2)(C)(ii) shall be considered to be a covered position under subsection (a)(2)(B).

''(g) Any person that violates this section shall be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed $50,000.''.

SA 4431. Mr. BROWNBACK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. ELIMINATION OF SANCTIONS ON LIBYA AND EXTENSION OF SANCTIONS ON IRAN.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking ''and Libya''.

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any other provision of law, regulation, document, or other record of the United States to the ''Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996'' shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Iran Sanctions Act of 1996''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Section 2 of such Act is amended by striking paragraph (4).

(c) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—Section 3 of such Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''(a) POLICY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN.—''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

(d) MANDATORY SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO LIBYA.—Section 5 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b); and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''subsections (a) and (b)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)''; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or (b)''; and

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''or (b)''; and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively.

(e) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—Section 8 of such Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''(a) **IRAN**.—''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

(f) REPORTS REQUIRED.—Section 10(b)(1) of such Act is amended by striking ''and Libya'' each place it appears.

(g) SUNSET DATE.—Section 13(b) of such Act is amended by striking ''10 years'' and inserting ''15 years''.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—Section 14 of such Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''nongovenmental entity in Iran, or with the Government of Libya or a nongovernmental entity in Libya,'' and inserting ''nongovernmental entity in Iran''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or Libya (as the case may be)'';

(2) by striking paragraph (12); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (13), (14), (15), (16), and (17) as paragraphs (12), (13), (14), (15), and (16), respectively.

SA 4432. Mr. JEFFORDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CHAMPLAIN VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE PARTNERSHIP.

(a) FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the Champlain Valley and its extensive cultural and natural resources have played a significant role in the history of the United States and the individual States of Vermont and New York;

(B) archaeological evidence indicates that the Champlain Valley has been inhabited by humans since the last retreat of the glaciers, with the Native Americans living in the area at the time of European discovery being primarily of Iroquois and Algonquin descent;

(C) the linked waterways of the Champlain Valley, including the Richelieu River in Canada, played a unique and significant role in the establishment and development of the United States and Canada through several distinct eras, including—

(i) the era of European exploration, during which Samuel de Champlain and other explorers used the waterways as a means of access through the wilderness;

(ii) the era of military campaigns, including highly significant military campaigns of the French and Indian War, the American Revolution, and the War of 1812; and

(iii) the era of maritime commerce, during which canals boats, schooners, and steamships formed the backbone of commercial transportation for the region;

(D) those unique and significant eras are best described by the theme ''The Making of Nations and Corridors of Commerce'';

(E) the artifacts and structures associated with those eras are unusually well-preserved;

(F) the Champlain Valley is recognized as having one of the richest collections of historical resources in North America;

(G) the history and cultural heritage of the Champlain Valley are shared with Canada and the Province of Quebec;

(H) there are benefits in celebrating and promoting this mutual heritage;

(I) tourism is among the most important industries in the Champlain Valley, and heritage tourism in particular plays a significant role in the economy of the Champlain Valley;

(J) it is important to enhance heritage tourism in the Champlain Valley while ensuring that increased visitation will not impair the historical and cultural resources of the region;

(K) according to the 1999 report of the National Park Service entitled ''Champlain Valley Heritage Corridor Project'', ''the Champlain Valley contains resources and represents a theme 'The Making of Nations and Corridors of Commerce', that is of outstanding importance in U.S. history''; and

(L) it is in the interest of the United States to preserve and interpret the historical and cultural resources of the Champlain Valley for the education and benefit of present and future generations.

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(A) to establish the Champlain Valley National Heritage Partnership in the States of Vermont and New York to recognize the importance of the historical, cultural, and recreational resources of the Champlain Valley region to the United States;

(B) to assist the State of Vermont and New York, including units of local government and nongovernmental organizations in the States, in preserving, protecting, and interpreting those resources for the benefit of the people of the United States;

(C) to use those resources and the theme ''The Making of Nations and Corridors of Commerce'' to—

(i) revitalize the economy of communities in the Champlain Valley; and

(ii) generate and sustain increased levels of tourism in the Champlain Valley;

(D) to encourage—

(i) partnerships among State and local governments and nongovernmental organizations in the United States; and

(ii) collaboration with Canada and the Province of Quebec to—

(I) interpret and promote the history of the waterways of the Champlain Valley region;

(II) form stronger bonds between the United States and Canada; and

(III) promote the international aspects of the Champlain Valley region; and

(E) to provide financial and technical assistance for the purposes described in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HERITAGE PARTNERSHIP.—The term ''Heritage Partnership'' means the Champlain Valley National Heritage Partnership established by subsection (c)(1).

(2) MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The term ''management entity'' means the Lake Champlain Basin Program.

(3) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term ''management plan'' means the management plan developed under subsection (c)(2)(A)(ii)(I).

(4) REGION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''region'' means any area or community in 1 of the States in which a physical, cultural, or historical resource that represents the theme is located.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''region'' includes

(i) the linked navigable waterways of—

(I) Lake Champlain;

(II) Lake George;

(III) the Champlain Canal; and

(IV) the portion of the Upper Hudson River extending south to Saratoga;

(ii) portions of Grand Isle, Franklin, Chittenden, Addison, Rutland, and Bennington Counties in the State of Vermont; and

(iii) portions of Clinton, Essex, Warren, Saratoga and Washington Counties in the State of New York.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) STATE.—the term ''State'' means—

(A) the State of Vermont; and

(B) the State of New York.

(7) THEME.—The term ''theme'' means the theme ''The Making of Nations and Corridors of Commerce'', as the term is used in the 1999 report of the National Park Service entitled ''Champlain Valley Heritage Corridor Project'', that describes the periods of international conflict and maritime commerce during which the region played a unique and significant role in the development of the United States and Canada.

(c) HERITAGE PARTNERSHIP.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the regional the Champlain Valley National Heritage Partnership.

(2) MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—

(A) DUTIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The management entity shall implement this section.

(ii) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the management entity shall develop a management plan for the Heritage Partnership.

(II) EXISTING PLAN.—Pending the completion and approval of the management plan, the management entity may implement this section based on the federally authorized plan of the management entity entitled ''Opportunities for Action, an Evolving Plan For Lake Champlain''.

(III) CONTENTS.—The management plan shall include—

(aa) recommendations for funding, managing, and developing the Heritage Partnership;

(bb) a description of activities to be carried out by public and private organizations to protect the resources of the Heritage Partnership;

(cc) a list of specific, potential sources of funding for the protection, management, and development of the Heritage Partnership;

(dd) an assessment of the organizational capacity of the management entity to achieve the goals for implementation; and

(ee) recommendations of ways in which to encourage collaboration with Canada and the Province of Quebec in implementing this section.

(IV) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing the management plan under subclause (I), the management entity shall take into consideration existing Federal, State, and local plans relating to the region.

(V) SUBMISSION TO SECRETARY FOR APPROVAL.—

(aa) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the management entity shall submit the management plan to the Secretary for approval.

(bb) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO SUBMIT.—If a management plan is not submitted to the Secretary by the date specified in item (aa), the Secretary shall not provide any additional funding under this section until a management plan for the Heritage Partnership is submitted to the Secretary.

(VI) APPROVAL.—Not later than 90 days after receiving the management plan submitted under subclause (V)(aa), the Secretary, in consultation with the States, shall approve or disapprove the management plan.

(VII) ACTION FOLLOWING DISAPPROVAL.—

(aa) GENERAL.—If the Secretary disapproves a management plan under subclause (VI), the Secretary shall—

(AA) advise the management entity in writing of the reasons for the disapproval;

(BB) make recommendations for revisions to the management plan; and

(CC) allow the management entity to submit to the Secretary revisions to the management plan.

(bb) DEADLINE FOR APPROVAL OF REVISION.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which a revision is submitted under item (aa)(CC), the Secretary shall approve or disapprove the revision.

(VIII) AMENDMENT.—

(aa) IN GENERAL.—After approval by the Secretary of the management plan, the management entity shall periodically—

(AA) review the management plan; and

(BB) submit to the Secretary, for review and approval by the Secretary, the recommendations of the management entity for any amendments to the management plan that the management entity considers to be appropriate.

(bb) EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS.—No funds made available under this section shall be used to implement any amendment proposed by the management entity under item (aa) until the Secretary approves the amendments.

(B) PARTNERSHIPS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this section, the management entity may enter into partnerships with—

(I) the States, including units of local governments in the States;

(II) nongovernmental organizations;

(III) Indian Tribes; and

(IV) other persons in the Heritage Partnership.

(ii) GRANTS.—Subject to the availability of funds, the management entity may provide grants to partners under clause (i) to assist in implementing this section.

(C) PROHIBITION ON THE ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The management entity shall not use Federal funds made available under this section to acquire real property or any interest in real property.

(3) ASSISTANCE FROM SECRETARY.—To carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary may provide technical and financial assistance to the management entity.

(d) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section—

(1) grants powers of zoning or land use to the management entity;

(2) modifies, enlarges, or diminishes the authority of the Federal Government or a State or local government to manage or regulate any use of land under any law (including regulations); or

(3) obstructs or limits private business development activities or resource development activities.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not more than a total of $10,000,000, of which not more than $1,000,000 may be made available for any fiscal year.

(2) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of any activities carried out using Federal funds made available under paragraph (1) shall be not be less than 50 percent.

(f) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Secretary to provide assistance under this section terminates on the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 4433. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other

purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. USE OF GEOGRAPHIC PREFERENCE FOR PURCHASE OF LOCALLY PRODUCED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES.

(a) GEOGRAPHIC PREFERENCE AUTHORIZED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department of Defense may use a geographic preference to purchase locally produced fruits and vegetables for the Defense Supply Center Philadelphia, the Department of Defense Farm to School Program, and the Department of Defense Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program for a purpose described in subsection (b). This authority applies to the purchase of fruits and vegetables for both Department of Defense and non-Department of Defense uses.

(b) PURPOSES FOR PREFERENCE.—The purposes referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) Procuring certain fruits and vegetables that have higher nutritional quality if they are harvested closer to full ripeness.

(2) Improving ripeness, taste, or the associated consumption rates of fruits and vegetables.

(3) Improving the efficiency of storage or distribution or to make other logistical improvements.

(4) Reducing dependence upon foreign oil by reducing fuel consumption rates associated with the transportation of fruits and vegetables.

(5) Improving the ability of those using the procurement system to provide education on nutrition, farming, sustainability, energy efficiency, or the importance of local purchases to the local economy.

(6) Maintaining a robust logistics network for agricultural product procurement.

(7) Promoting farm, business and economic development by accessing local markets.

SA 4434. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 730. EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND SUPERVISION OF PERSONNEL PROVIDING SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES UNDER EXTENDED BENEFITS UNDER TRICARE.

Section 1079(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The regulations shall include the following:

''(A) Requirements for education, training, and supervision of individuals providing special education services known as Applied Behavioral Analysis under this subsection that are in addition to any other education, training, and supervision requirements applicable to Board Certified Behavior Analysts or Board Certified Associate Behavior Analysts or are otherwise applicable to personnel providing such services under applicable State law.

''(B) Metrics to identify and measure the availability and distribution of individuals of various expertise in Applied Behavioral Analysis in order to evaluate and assure the availability of qualified personnel to meet needs for Applied Behavioral Analysis under this subsection.''.

SA 4435. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 702.

SA 4436. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 236, line 9, add at the end the following: ''In addition, clause (i) shall not apply to diabetes supplies or insulin.''.

SA 4437. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 725. STUDY ON COMPETITION-BASED MODEL OF REIMBURSEMENT OF HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS UNDER TRICARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall require the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs to conduct a study to assess the feasibility and advisability of utilizing value-based competition between providers of health care services under the TRICARE program.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the study is to determine whether or not the reimbursement model under the TRICARE program should be modified to encourage and enhance competition among health care providers under the TRICARE program in order to ensure that the delivery of care by such providers under the TRICARE program is more transparent and outcome-based.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The study shall include an assessment of the viability of—

(1) establishing a results-based system that tracks provider outcomes in order to assist covered adult and pediatric beneficiaries and physicians under the TRICARE program in identifying high quality care;

(2) improving price transparency; and

(3) establishing single price models for the delivery of episodes of health care.

(d) TRICARE PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''TRICARE program'' has the meaning given that term in section 1072(7) of title 10, United States Code,

---

SA 4438. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. LEVIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY FOR SOMALIA.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) support the development of transitional federal institutions in Somalia into a unified national government, support aid to the people of Somalia and efforts to prevent terrorist activities, and support regional stability;

(2) broaden and integrate its strategic approach toward Somalia within the context of United States activities in countries of the Horn of Africa, including Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Eritrea, and in Yemen on the Arabian Peninsula; and

(3) carry out all diplomatic, humanitarian, counter-terrorism, and security-related activities in Somalia within the context of a comprehensive strategy developed through an interagency process.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY FOR SOMALIA.—

(1) REQUIREMENT FOR STRATEGY.—Not later then 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall develop and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a comprehensive strategy toward Somalia within the context of United States activities in the countries of the Horn of Africa.

(2) CONTENT OF STRATEGY.—The strategy should include the following:

(A) A clearly stated policy towards Somalia that will help establish a functional, legitimate, unified national government in Somalia that is capable of maintaining the rule of law and preventing Somalia from becoming a safe haven for terrorists.

(B) An integrated political, humanitarian, intelligence, and military approach to counter transnational security threats in Somalia within the context of United States activities in the countries of the Horn of Africa.

(C) An interagency framework to plan, coordinate, and execute United States policy in Somalia within the context of other activities in the countries of the Horn of Africa among the agencies and departments of the United States to oversee policy and program implementation.

(D) A description of the type and form of diplomatic engagement to coordinate the implementation of the United States policy in Somalia.

(E) A description of bilateral, regional, and multilateral efforts to strengthen and promote diplomatic engagement in Somalia.

(F) A description of appropriate metrics to measure the progress and effectiveness of the United States policy towards Somalia and throughout the countries of the Horn of Africa.

(G) Guidance on the manner in which the strategy will be implemented.

(c) REPORTS.—Not later than April 1, 2007, and annually thereafter, the President shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the status of the implementation of the strategy.

(d) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committees on International Relations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SA 4439. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1223. REPORTS ON THE DARFUR PEACE AGREEMENT.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a detailed report on the Department of Defense's role in assisting the parties to the Darfur Peace Agreement of May 5, 2006 with implementing that Agreement. Each such report shall include a description of—

(1) the assets that the United States military, in concert with the United States North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) allies, are able to offer the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) and any United Nations peacekeeping mission authorized for Darfur;

(2) any plans of the Secretary of Defense to support the AMIS by providing information regarding the location of belligerents and potential violations of the Darfur Peace Agreement and assistance to improve the AMIS use of intelligence and tactical mobility;

(3) the resources that will be used during the current fiscal year to provide the support described in paragraph (2) and the resources that will be needed during the next two fiscal years to provide such support;

(4) the efforts of the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State to leverage troop contributions from other countries to serve in the proposed United Nation peacekeeping mission for Darfur;

(5) any plans of the Secretary of Defense to participate in the deployment of any NATO mentoring or technical assistance teams to Darfur to assist the AMIS; and

(6) any actions carried out by the Secretary of Defense to address deficiencies in the AMIS communications systems, particularly the interoperability of communications equipment.

SA 4440. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 846. PROHIBITION ON DEFENSE CONTRACTORS REQUIRING LICENSES OR FEES FOR USE OF MILITARY LIKENESSES AND DESIGNATIONS IN TOYS OR MODELS.

The Secretary of Defense shall require that any contract entered into or renewed by the Department of Defense includes a provision prohibiting the contractor from requiring toy and hobby manufacturers, distributors, or merchants to obtain licenses from or pay fees to the contractor for the use of military likenesses or designations on items provided under the contract.

SA 4441. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. DODD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. PLAN TO REPLACE EQUIPMENT WITHDRAWN OR DIVERTED FROM THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES FOR OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM OR OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan to replace equipment withdrawn or diverted from units of the reserve components of the Armed Forces for use in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall—

(1) identify the equipment to be recapitalized or acquired to replace the equipment described in subsection (a);

(2) specify a schedule for recapitalizing or acquiring the equipment identified under paragraph (1), which schedule shall take into account applicable depot workload and acquisition considerations, including production capacity and current production schedules; and

(3) specify the funding to be required to recapitalize or acquire the equipment identified under paragraph (1)

SA 4442. Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 437, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 1084. UNITED STATES POLICY ON IRAQ.

(a) REDEPLOYMENT OF TROOPS FROM IRAQ.—

(1) SCHEDULE FOR REDEPLOYMENT.—For purposes of strengthening the national security of the United States, the President shall redeploy, commencing in 2006, United States forces from Iraq by July 1, 2007, in accordance with a schedule coordinated with the Government of Iraq, leaving only the minimal number of forces that are critical to completing the mission of standing up Iraqi security forces, conducting targeted and specialized counterterrorism operations, and protecting United States facilities and personnel.

(2) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS REQUIRED.—The President shall consult with Congress regarding the schedule for redeployment and shall submit such schedule to Congress as part of the report required under subsection (c).

(3) MAINTENANCE OF OVER-THE-HORIZON TROOP PRESENCE.—The President should maintain an over-the-horizon troop presence to prosecute the war on terror and protect regional security interests.

(b) IRAQ SUMMIT.—The President should work with the leaders of the Government of Iraq to convene a summit as soon as possible that includes those leaders, leaders of the governments of each country bordering Iraq, representatives of the Arab League, the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, representatives of the European Union, and leaders of the governments of each permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, for the purpose of reaching a comprehensive political agreement for Iraq that engenders the support of Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds by ensuring the equitable distribution of oil revenues, disbanding the militias, strengthening internal security, reviving reconstruction efforts and fulfilling related international economic aid commitments, securing Iraq's borders, and providing for a sustainable federalist structure in Iraq.

(c) REPORT ON REDEPLOYMENT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State, submit to Congress a report that sets forth the strategy for the redeployment of United States forces from Iraq by July 1, 2007.

(2) STRATEGY ELEMENTS.—The strategy required in the report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The schedule for redeploying United States forces from Iraq by July 1, 2007, developed pursuant to subsection (a)(1).

(B) A schedule for returning the majority of such redeployed forces home to the United States.

(C) The number, size, and character of United States military units needed in Iraq after July 1, 2007, for purposes of counterterrorism activities, training Iraqi security forces, and protecting United States infrastructure and personnel.

(D) A strategy for addressing the regional implications for diplomacy, politics, and development of redeploying United States forces from Iraq by July 1, 2007.

(E) A strategy for ensuring the safety and security of United States forces in Iraq during and after the July 1, 2007, redeployment, and a contingency plan for addressing dramatic changes in security conditions that may require a limited number of United States forces to remain in Iraq after that date.

(F) A strategy for redeploying United States forces to effectively engage and defeat global terrorist networks that threaten the United States.

SA 4443. Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mrs. LINCOLN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for

such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 193, strike line 4 and all that follows through page 198 and insert the following:

by 2.7 percent

(c) TARGETED INCREASE IN BASIC PAY RATES.—Effective on April 1, 2007, the rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services within each pay grade are as follows:

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS [1]

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
0–10 [2]	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
0–9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0–8	8,494.20	8,772.60	8,957.10	9,008.70	9,239.10
0–7	7,058.40	7,386.00	7,538.10	7,658.40	7,876.80
0–6	5,231.40	5,747.40	6,124.50	6,124.50	6,147.60
0–5	4,361.10	4,912.80	5,253.00	5,316.90	5,529.00
0–4	3,762.90	4,356.00	4,646.40	4,711.50	4,981.20
0–3 [3]	3,308.40	3,750.60	4,048.20	4,413.60	4,624.50
0–2 [3]	2,858.10	3,255.60	3,749.70	3,876.30	3,956.10
0–1 [3]	2,481.30	2,582.40	3,121.80	3,121.80	3,121.80
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
0–10 [2]	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
0–9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0–8	9,624.00	9,713.40	10,079.10	10,183.80	10,498.80
0–7	8,092.20	8,341.80	8,590.80	8,840.40	9,624.00
0–6	6,411.30	6,446.10	6,446.10	6,812.40	7,460.10
0–5	5,656.20	5,935.20	6,140.10	6,404.40	6,809.70
0–4	5,270.40	5,630.10	5,911.20	6,105.90	6,217.80
0–3 [3]	4,856.70	5,007.00	5,253.90	5,382.30	5,382.30
0–2 [3]	3,956.10	3,956.10	3,956.10	3,956.10	3,956.10
0–1 [3]	3,121.80	3,121.80	3,121.80	3,121.80	3,121.80
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 24	Over 26
0–10 [2]	$0.00	$13,725.90	$13,793.10	$14,079.90	$14,579.70
0–9	0.00	12,005.10	12,177.60	12,427.80	12,863.70
0–8	10,954.20	11,374.50	11,655.00	11,655.00	11,655.00
0–7	10,286.10	10,286.10	10,286.10	10,286.10	10,338.30
0–6	7,840.20	8,220.00	8,436.30	8,655.00	9,080.10
0–5	7,002.30	7,192.80	7,409.10	7,409.10	7,409.10
0–4	6,282.90	6,282.90	6,282.90	6,282.90	6,282.90
0–3 [3]	5,382.30	5,382.30	5,382.30	5,382.30	5,382.30
0–2 [3]	3,956.10	3,956.10	3,956.10	3,956.10	3,956.10
0–1 [3]	3,121.80	3,121.80	3,121.80	3,121.80	3,121.80

[1] Notwithstanding the pay rates specified in this table, the actual basic pay for commissioned officers in grades O–7 through O–10 may not exceed the rate of pay for level II of the Executive Schedule and the actual basic pay for all other officers, including warrant officers, may not exceed the rate of pay for level V of the Executive Schedule.

[2] Subject to the preceding footnote, while serving as Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Commandant of the Coast Guard, or commander of a unified or specified combatant command (as defined in section 161(c) of title 10, United States Code), basic pay for this grade is calculated to be $16,037.40, regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code.

[3] This table does not apply to commissioned officers in the grade O–1, O–2, or O–3 who have been credited with over 4 years of active duty service as an enlisted member or warrant officer.

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS WITH OVER 4 YEARS OF ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE AS AN ENLISTED MEMBER OR WARRANT OFFICER

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
0–3E	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$4,413.60	$4,624.50
0–2E	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,876.30	3,956.10
0–1E	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,121.80	3,333.90
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
0–3E	$4,856.70	$5,007.00	$5,253.90	$5,462.10	$5,581.20
0–2E	4,082.10	4,294.20	4,458.90	4,581.00	4,581.00
0–1E	3,456.90	3,582.90	3,706.80	3,876.30	3,876.30
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 24	Over 26
0–3E	$5,743.80	$5,743.80	$5,743.80	$5,743.80	$5,743.80
0–2E	4,581.00	4,581.00	4,581.00	4,581.00	4,581.00
0–1E	3,876.30	3,876.30	3,876.30	3,876.30	3,876.30

WARRANT OFFICERS

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
W–5	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
W–4	3,418.80	3,677.70	3,783.60	3,887.40	4,066.20
W–3	3,122.10	3,252.30	3,385.50	3,429.60	3,569.40
W–2	2,762.70	3,023.40	3,104.40	3,159.90	3,338.70
W–1	2,425.20	2,685.00	2,756.40	2,904.30	3,080.10
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
W–5	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
W–4	4,242.90	4,422.30	4,691.40	4,927.80	5,152.80
W–3	3,843.90	4,130.10	4,265.40	4,421.40	4,582.20
W–2	3,616.80	3,754.80	3,890.70	4,056.60	4,186.20
W–1	3,337.80	3,458.40	3,627.00	3,792.90	3,922.80
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 24	Over 26
W–5	$0.00	$6,078.30	$6,386.10	$6,615.60	$6,869.70
W–4	5,336.40	5,516.10	5,779.50	5,995.80	6,242.70
W–3	4,870.50	5,065.80	5,181.90	5,306.40	5,475.30
W–2	4,303.80	4,444.20	4,536.90	4,611.30	4,611.30
W–1	4,042.80	4,188.90	4,188.90	4,188.90	4,188.90

ENLISTED MEMBERS [1]

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
E–9 [2]	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
E–8	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
E–7	2,350.50	2,565.60	2,663.70	2,794.20	2,895.60
E–6	2,033.10	2,236.80	2,335.80	2,431.50	2,531.70
E–5	1,863.00	1,987.50	2,083.50	2,181.90	2,335.20
E–4	1,707.90	1,795.20	1,892.40	1,988.10	2,073.00
E–3	1,541.70	1,638.90	1,737.60	1,737.60	1,737.60
E–2	1,465.80	1,465.80	1,465.80	1,465.80	1,465.80
E–1 [3]	1,308.00	1,308.00	1,308.00	1,308.00	1,308.00
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
E–9 [2]	$0.00	$4,130.70	$4,224.30	$4,342.50	$4,481.40
E–8	3,381.30	3,531.00	3,623.70	3,734.40	3,854.70
E–7	3,070.20	3,168.30	3,326.70	3,471.00	3,569.70
E–6	2,757.60	2,845.20	3,000.00	3,051.90	3,089.70
E–5	2,483.70	2,613.90	2,630.10	2,630.10	2,630.10
E–4	2,073.00	2,073.00	2,073.00	2,073.00	2,073.00
E–3	1,737.60	1,737.60	1,737.60	1,737.60	1,737.60
E–2	1,465.80	1,465.80	1,465.80	1,465.80	1,465.80
E–1	1,308.00	1,308.00	1,308.00	1,308.00	1,308.00
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 24	Over 26
E–9 [2]	$4,620.90	$4,845.30	$5,034.60	$5,234.70	$5,539.50
E–8	4,071.60	4,181.40	4,368.60	4,472.40	4,727.70
E–7	3,674.40	3,715.50	3,852.00	3,944.40	4,224.60
E–6	3,133.50	3,133.50	3,133.50	3,133.50	3,133.50
E–5	2,630.10	2,630.10	2,630.10	2,630.10	2,630.10
E–4	2,073.00	2,073.00	2,073.00	2,073.00	2,073.00
E–3	1,737.60	1,737.60	1,737.60	1,737.60	1,737.60
E–2	1,465.80	1,465.80	1,465.80	1,465.80	1,465.80
E–1	1,308.00	1,308.00	1,308.00	1,308.00	1,308.00

[1] Notwithstanding the pay rates specified in this table, the actual basic pay for enlisted members may not exceed the rate of pay for level V of the Executive Schedule.

[2] Subject to the preceding footnote, while serving as Sergeant Major of the Army, Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy, Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard, or Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, basic pay for this grade is $6,675, regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code.

[3] In the case of members in the grade E–1 who have served less than 4 months on active duty, basic pay is $1,209.90.

(d) OFFSET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts payable under this section as monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services as a result of the difference between an increase in rates of such pay of 2.2 percent and the increase in rates of such pay provided for under subsection (b) shall be derived during fiscal year 2007 from amounts available for that fiscal year for the travel of personnel employed in or assigned to the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

(2) TRANSFER.—Amounts specified in paragraph (1) as available for payment as provided in that paragraph shall be transferred to the accounts of the Department of Defense for the payment of pay and allowances of members of the Armed Forces.

(3) EXCEPTION FROM TRANSFER LIMITATION.—The transfer of amounts under paragraph (2) shall not be subject to any limitations on the transfer of funds of the Department of Defense under section 1001 or under any other provision of law.

SA 4444. Mr. KERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strength for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 7, strike ''with'' and all that follows through page 3, line 2 and insert the following: '' or contracts with an appropriate entity or entities, under which such entity shall provide appropriate credit or identity protection monitoring services to veterans, spouses and former spouses of veterans, and members of the Armed Forces (including members of the National Guard and Reserve) affected by the theft of personal information from the Department of Veterans Affairs on May 3, 2006.

(b) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that any contract under subsection (a) permits only those veterans, spouses or former spouses of veterans, and members of the Armed Forces (including members of the National Guard and Reserve) who choose to receive monitoring services under such contract to elect to have personal information monitored by the contractor under such contract.

(c) FIXED PRICE FOR SERVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any contract under subsection (a) shall provide services at a fixed price, paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs, for a period of 12 months, beginning on the date of the commencement of the provision of services.

(2) TERMINATION OF SERVICES AFTER 12 MONTHS UNLESS NOTIFIED IN WRITING.—A contractor described in subsection (a) shall not continue services to affected individuals for more than the 12-month period referred to in paragraph (1), unless the contractor receives written notice of the willingness of the affected individual to assume the cost of service delivery.

(d) SECURITY FREEZES FOR VETERANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 605B the following:

''SEC. 605C. SECURITY FREEZES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS.

''(a) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply with respect to—

''(1) any veteran, as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code, who may be a victim of identity theft as a result of the security breach at the Department of Veterans Affairs on May 3, 2006;

''(2) any spouse (or former spouse) of such veteran who the Secretary of Veterans Affairs has conclusively identified as being at risk of identity theft as a result of that security breach; and

''(3) any other person who the Secretary of Veterans Affairs has identified as being at risk of identity theft as a result of that security breach.

''(b) SECURITY FREEZES.—

''(1) EMPLACEMENT.—A veteran, spouse, or other person described in subsection (a) may include a security freeze in the file of that veteran, spouse, or other person maintained by a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p)(1), by making a request to the consumer reporting agency in writing, by telephone, or through a secure electronic connection made available by the consumer reporting agency.

''(2) CONSUMER DISCLOSURE.—If a veteran, spouse, or other person described in subsection (a) requests a security freeze under this section, the consumer reporting agency shall disclose to that individual the process of placing and removing the security freeze and explain to that individual the potential consequences of the security freeze. A consumer reporting agency may not imply or inform a veteran, spouse, or other person described in subsection (a) that the placement or presence of a security freeze on the file of that individual may negatively affect their credit score.

''(c) EFFECT OF SECURITY FREEZE.—

''(1) RELEASE OF INFORMATION BLOCKED.—If a security freeze is in place in the file of a veteran, spouse, or other person described in subsection (a), a consumer reporting agency may not release information from the file of that individual to a third party without prior express written authorization from that individual.

''(2) INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THIRD PARTIES.—Paragraph (2) does not prevent a consumer reporting agency from advising a third party that a security freeze is in effect with respect to the file of a veteran, spouse, or other person described in subsection (a). If a third party, in connection with an application for credit, requests access to a consumer file on which a security freeze is in place under this section, the third party may treat the application as incomplete.

''(3) CREDIT SCORE NOT AFFECTED.—The placement of a security freeze under this section may not be taken into account for any purpose in determining the credit score of the veteran, spouse, or other person to whom the security freeze relates.

''(d) REMOVAL; TEMPORARY SUSPENSION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), a security freeze under this section shall remain in place until the veteran, spouse, or other person to whom it relates requests that the security freeze be removed. The veteran, spouse, or other person may remove a security freeze on his or her file by making a request to the consumer reporting agency in writing, by telephone, or through a secure electronic connection made available by the consumer reporting agency.

''(2) CONDITIONS.—A consumer reporting agency may remove a security freeze placed in the file of a veteran, spouse, or other person under this section only—

''(A) upon request of the veteran, spouse, or other person, pursuant to paragraph (1); or

''(B) if the agency determines that the file of that veteran, spouse, or other person was frozen due to a material misrepresentation of fact by that veteran, spouse, or other person.

''(3) NOTIFICATION TO CONSUMER.—If a consumer reporting agency intends to remove a security freeze pursuant to paragraph (2)(B), the consumer reporting agency shall notify the veteran, spouse, or other person to whom the security freeze relates in writing prior to removing the freeze.

''(4) TEMPORARY SUSPENSION.—A veteran, spouse, or other person described in subsection (a) may have a security freeze under this section temporarily suspended by making a request to the consumer reporting agency in writing or by telephone and specifying beginning and ending dates for the period during which the security freeze is not to apply.

''(e) RESPONSE TIMES; NOTIFICATION OF OTHER ENTITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency shall—

''(A) place a security freeze in the file of a veteran, spouse, or other person under subsection (b) not later than 5 business days after receiving a request from the veteran, spouse, or other person under subsection (b)(1); and

''(B) remove or temporarily suspend a security freeze not later than 3 business days after receiving a request for removal or temporary suspension from the veteran, spouse, or other person under subsection (d).

''(2) NOTIFICATION OF OTHER AGENCIES.—A consumer reporting agency shall notify all other consumer reporting agencies described in section 603(p)(1) of a request under this section not later than 3 days after placing, removing, or temporarily suspending a security freeze in the file of the veteran, spouse, or other person under subsection (b), (d)(2)(A), or (d)(4).

''(3) IMPLEMENTATION BY OTHER AGENCIES.—A consumer reporting agency that is notified of a request under paragraph (2) to place, remove, or temporarily suspend a security freeze in the file of a veteran, spouse, or other person shall—

''(A) request proper identification from the veteran, spouse, or other person, in accordance with subsection (g), not later than 3 business days after receiving the notification; and

''(B) place, remove, or temporarily suspend the security freeze on that credit report not later than 3 business days after receiving proper identification.

''(f) CONFIRMATION.—Except as provided in subsection (c)(3), whenever a consumer reporting agency places, removes, or temporarily suspends a security freeze at the request of a veteran, spouse, or other person under subsection (b) or (d), respectively, it shall send a written confirmation thereof to the veteran, spouse, or other person not later than 10 business days after placing, removing, or temporarily suspending the security freeze. This subsection does not apply to the placement, removal, or temporary suspension of a security freeze by a consumer reporting agency because of a notification received under subsection (e)(2).

''(g) ID REQUIRED.—A consumer reporting agency may not place, remove, or temporarily suspend a security freeze in the file of a veteran, spouse, or other person described in subsection (a) at the request of the veteran, spouse, or other person, unless the veteran, spouse, or other person provides proper identification (within the meaning of section 610(a)(1)) and the regulations thereunder.

''(h) EXCEPTIONS.—This section does not apply to the use of the file of a veteran, spouse, or other person described in subsection (a) maintained by a consumer reporting agency by any of the following:

''(1) A person or entity, or a subsidiary, affiliate, or agent of that person or entity, or an assignee of a financial obligation owing by the veteran, spouse, or other person to that person or entity, or a prospective assignee of a financial obligation owing by the veteran, spouse, or other person to that person or entity in conjunction with the proposed purchase of the financial obligation, with which the veteran, spouse, or other person has or had prior to assignment an account or contract, including a demand deposit account, or to whom the veteran, spouse, or other person issued a negotiable instrument, for the purposes of reviewing the account or collecting the financial obligation owing for the account, contract, or negotiable instrument.

''(2) Any Federal, State, or local agency, law enforcement agency, trial court, or private collection agency acting pursuant to a court order, warrant, subpoena, or other compulsory process.

''(3) A child support agency or its agents or assigns acting pursuant to subtitle D of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. et seq.) or similar State law.

''(4) The Department of Health and Human Services, a similar State agency, or the agents or assigns of the Federal or State agency acting to investigate medicare or medicaid fraud.

''(5) The Internal Revenue Service or a State or municipal taxing authority, or a State department of motor vehicles, or any of the agents or assigns of these Federal, State, or municipal agencies acting to investigate or collect delinquent taxes or unpaid court orders or to fulfill any of their other statutory responsibilities.

''(6) The use of consumer credit information for the purposes of prescreening, as provided for under this title.

''(7) Any person or entity administering a credit file monitoring subscription to which the veteran, spouse, or other person has subscribed.

''(8) Any person or entity for the purpose of providing a veteran, spouse, or other person with a copy of his or her credit report or credit score upon request of the veteran, spouse, or other person.

''(i) FEES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a consumer reporting agency may charge a reasonable fee, for placing, removing, or temporarily suspending a security freeze in the file of the veteran, spouse, or other person described in subsection (a), which cost shall be submitted to and paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs, pursuant to procedures established by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

''(2) ID THEFT VICTIMS.—A consumer reporting agency may not charge a fee for placing, removing, or temporarily suspending a security freeze in the file of a veteran, spouse, or other person described in subsection (a), if—

''(A) the veteran, spouse, or other person is a victim of identity theft;

''(B) the veteran, spouse, or other person requests the security freeze in writing;

''(C) the veteran, spouse, or other person has filed a police report with respect to the theft, or an identity theft report (as defined in section 603(q)(4), within 90 days after the date on which the theft occurred or was discovered by the veteran, spouse, or other person; and

''(D) the veteran, spouse, or other person provides a copy of the report to the reporting agency.

''(j) LIMITATION ON INFORMATION CHANGES IN FROZEN REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a security freeze is in place in the file of a veteran, spouse, or other person described in subsection (a), the consumer reporting agency may not change any of the following official information in that file without sending a written confirmation of the change to the veteran, spouse, or other person within 30 days after the date on which the change is made:

''(A) Name.

''(B) Date of birth.

''(C) Social Security number.

''(D) Address.

''(2) CONFIRMATION.—Paragraph (1) does not require written confirmation for technical modifications of the official information of a veteran, spouse, or other person, including name and street abbreviations, complete spellings, or transposition of numbers or letters. In the case of an address change, the written confirmation shall be sent to both the new address and to the former address of the veteran, spouse, or other person.

''(k) CERTAIN ENTITY EXEMPTIONS.—

''(1) AGGREGATORS AND OTHER AGENCIES.—The provisions of this section do not apply to a consumer reporting agency that acts only as a reseller of credit information by assembling and merging information contained in the data base of another consumer reporting agency or multiple consumer reporting agencies, and does not maintain a permanent data base of credit information from which new consumer credit reports are produced.

''(2) OTHER EXEMPTED ENTITIES.—The following entities are not required to place a security freeze in the file of a veteran, spouse, or other person described in subsection (a) in accordance with this section:

''(A) A check services or fraud prevention services company, which issues reports on incidents of fraud or authorizations for the purpose of approving or processing negotiable instruments, electronic fund transfers, or similar methods of payments.

''(B) A deposit account information service company, which issues reports regarding account closures due to fraud, substantial overdrafts, ATM abuse, or similar negative information regarding such veteran, spouse, or other person, to inquiring banks or other financial institutions for use only in reviewing the request of such veteran, spouse, or other person for a deposit account at the inquiring bank or financial institution.''.

(2) FEES.—Any fee associated with an extended fraud alert or security freeze required by the amendments made by this section that would otherwise be required to be paid by the consumer shall be paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall submit a report to Congress detailing the expected costs of services provided under this section.

(f) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budget of the Department of Veterans Affairs is stretched to the limit, and that the President should submit a request for supplemental appropriations to pay for the services required by this section to protect the identity security of those affected by the loss of personal data by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SA 4445. Mr. BURNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title IX, add the following:

SEC. 924. REPORT ON INCORPORATION OF ELEMENTS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS INTO THE SPECIAL FORCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Quadrennial Defense Review recommends an increase in the size of the Special Operations Command and the Special Forces as a fundamental part of our efforts to fight the war on terror.

(2) The Special Forces play a crucial role in the war on terror, and the expansion of their force structure as outlined in the Quadrennial Defense Review should be fully funded.

(3) Expansion of the Special Forces should be consistent with the Total Force Policy, and an appropriate portion of new Special Forces force structure should consist of units within the reserve components of the Armed Forces or associate active duty and National Guard units.

(4) The Secretary of Defense should consider the establishment of additional reserve component and National Guard Special Forces units and associated units.

(5) Training areas in the State of Montana are a national asset for preparing our Special Forces operators for duty in the mountainous regions of Central Asia.

(b) REPORT ON INCORPORATION OF ELEMENTS INTO SPECIAL FORCES.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan to incorporate members and units of the reserve components of the Armed Forces into the Special Forces in the expansion of the Special Forces.

(c) REPORT ON SPECIAL FORCES TRAINING.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on actions to be taken to streamline Special Forces training in the State of Montana through the establishment of a permanent exercise support detachment to facilitate such training.

SA 4446. Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mrs. LINCOLN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

SEC. 215. MOBILE MEDICAL SHELTER SYSTEMS FOR THE ARMY.

(a) FUNDING.—

(1) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army is hereby increased by $15,000,000.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army, as increased by paragraph (1), $15,000,000 may be available Medical Systems, Advanced Development (PE #0603807A) for the development, acquisition, and deployment of mobile medical shelter systems to improve the forward deployed transitional medical capabilities of the Army.

(3) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(2) for operation and maintenance for the Navy is hereby reduced by $15,000,000.

(b) EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES.—The Army Medical Research and Materiel Command (MRMC) shall conduct an ongoing evaluation of alternatives for mobile medical shelter systems for the Army, including an evaluation to secure reductions in weight, cube, and sustainment requirements, in order to ensure that the Army obtain best value in procuring such systems.

(c) PLAN FOR ACQUISITION.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth a plan for the design, development, test, and acquisition of mobile medical shelter systems for the Army.

(d) BUDGET MATTER.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each budget of the Department of Defense submitted to Congress for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2006,

as submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, includes a separate program element for the Mobile Medical Investment Fund.

SA 4447. Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. REED, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. LOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. EXTENSION OF DATE OF APPLICATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY PERSONNEL SYSTEM TO DEFENSE LABORATORIES.

Section 9902(c)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''October 1, 2008'' each place such term appears and inserting ''October 1, 2011'' in each such place.

SA 4448. Mr. COLEMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII add the following:

SEC. 1209. WITHHOLDING OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A consensus existed in September 2005 that the United Nations was in dire need of reform in order to restore its credibility. An agenda for reform was outlined in the United Nations Summit Declaration of September 2005 that was endorsed by the members of the General Assembly of the United Nations. These reforms were subsequently included in a proposal set forth by the Secretary General of the United Nations to the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly in April 2006.

(2) The United States Ambassador to the United Nations has continuously worked in good faith with fellow member states of the United Nations to achieve a consensus agenda for United Nations reform.

(3) A group of members of the General Assembly, embodied in the G–77, has obstructed progress on reform of the United Nations, specifically by rejecting those set proposals forth by the Secretary General to the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly in April 2006. These proposals stemmed directly from the Summit Outcome document endorsed by the members of the G–77 in September 2005.

(4) The spending cap for the United Nations agreed to in December of 2005 was premised on the need for the United Nations to demonstrate meaningful progress on reform in order to justify funding by member states of the 2006–2007 biannual budget of the United Nations.

(5) The G–77 has reinforced its obstructionist approach to United Nations reform by insisting that the lifting of the spending cap for the United Nations not be linked to progress on management reform issues, contrary to the position of the United States.

(6) The United Nations has failed to show meaningful progress in a number of areas for reform, including human rights, budget, management, and oversight.

(7) Congress should not authorize the remaining United Nations budget until the General Assembly approves the reform measure for the United Nations proposed by the Secretary-General.

(b) WITHHOLDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event the United Nations 2006-2007 biennium budget is adopted by the General Assembly without being accompanied by a commitment to reform measures, the United States shall withhold the remaining portion of its assessed dues that formulate its obligations within the budget that are not allocated toward humanitarian, educational, and development programs and other non-political programs considered to be high priority for the United States.

(2) DETERMINATION OF PORTION OF DUES.—The Secretary of State shall determine the portion of the assessed dues referred to in paragraph (1) that are allocated toward humanitarian, educational, and development programs and other non-political programs considered to be high priority for the United States.

(3) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS.—Voluntary contributions made by the United States to United Nations agencies over and above the assessed dues of the United States, including contributions to United Nations Peacekeeping Operations and the World Health Organization, shall not be subject to withholding under paragraph (1).

(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive the requirement in subsection (b) upon a determination and certification to Congress that the General Assembly has made a good faith effort on reform of the United Nations, which may include progress in areas such as rationalization of United Nations mandates and a strengthening of United Nations oversight mechanisms.

SA 4449. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 313. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION FOR BEDDOWN OF F-22A AIRCRAFT AT HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO.

The Secretary of the Air Force shall prepare environmental documentation per the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) for the beddown of F-22A aircraft at Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, as replacements for the retiring F-117A aircraft.

SA 4450. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

SEC. 215. HIGH ENERGY LASER-LOW ASPECT TARGET TRACKING.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army is hereby increased by $5,000,000.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army, as increased by subsection (a), $5,000,000 may be available for the Department of Defense High Energy Laser Test Facility for High Energy Laser Low Aspect Target Tracking (HEL–LATT) test series done jointly with the Navy.

(2) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER AMOUNTS.—The amount available under paragraph (1) for the purpose set forth in that paragraph is in addition to any amounts available under this Act for that purpose.

(c) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(1) for operation and maintenance for Army is hereby reduced by $5,000,000.

SA 4451. Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1066. ANNUAL REPORTS ON EXPANDED USE OF UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES IN THE NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) serve Department of Defense intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, and combat missions.

(2) Technological advances in command and control and sense-and-avoid capabilities have improved the operational reliability and safety of unmanned aerial vehicles.

(3) Unmanned aerial vehicles have the potential to support the Nation's homeland defense mission, border security mission, and natural disaster recovery efforts.

(4) Accelerated development and testing of policies for the integration of unmanned aerial vehicles in the National Airspace System would further the increased safe use of such vehicles for border security, homeland defense, and natural disaster recovery efforts.

(b) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter until the Federal Aviation Administration promulgates such policy, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the actions of the Department of Defense to support the development by the Federal Aviation Administration of a policy on the testing and operation of unmanned aerial vehicles in the National Airspace System.

SA 4452. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 375. PREPOSITIONING OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ASSETS TO IMPROVE SUPPORT TO CIVILIAN AUTHORITIES.

(a) PREPOSITIONING AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may provide for the prepositioning of prepackaged or preidentified basic response assets, such as medical supplies, food and water, and communications equipment, in order to improve Department of Defense support to civilian authorities.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT.—To the extent required by section 1535 of title 31, United States Code (popularly known as the ''Economy Act''), or other applicable law, the Secretary shall require reimbursement of the Department of Defense for costs incurred in the prepositioning of basic response assets under subsection (a).

(c) LIMITATION.—Basic response assets may not be prepositioned under subsection (a) if the prepositioning of such assets will adversely affect the military preparedness of the United States.

(d) PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES.—The Secretary may develop procedures and guidelines applicable to the prepositioning of basic response assets under this section.

SA 4453. Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1008. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS.

No provision of this Act may be construed as authorizing the appropriation, or the obligation or expenditure, of funds for a classified program as described on page 34 of Volume VII (Compartmented Annex) of the Fiscal Year 2007 Military Intelligence Program justification book.

SA 4454. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert at the appropriate place:

PAY-FOR-PERFORMANCE SYSTEM FOR THE DEFENSE TRAVEL SYSTEM

The Department shall transform the contract for the Defense Travel System into a pay-for-performance based system.

SA 4455. Mr. SHELBY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 603.

SA 4456. Mr. SHELBY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle A of title V, add the following:

SEC. 521. ELIGIBILITY FOR CONSIDERATION FOR PROMOTION OF RETIRED, RECALLED COMMISSIONED OFFICERS AND WARRANT OFFICERS ON ACTIVE DUTY.

(a) COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.—

(1) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 641 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (4); and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4).

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as of September 12, 2001.

(3) EXCLUSION FROM OFFICER STRENGTH LIMITATIONS.—Chapter 32 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 529. Authorized strength: commissioned officers on active duty; exclusion

''A retired commissioned officer on active duty may not be counted for the purpose of any limitation on the total number of commissioned officers in a certain grade that may be serving on active duty in the retired commissioned officer's armed force.''.

(b) WARRANT OFFICERS.—

(1) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 582 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as of September 12, 2001.

(3) EXCLUSION FROM OFFICER STRENGTH LIMITATIONS.—Chapter 32 of such title, as amended by subsection (a)(3) of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 530. Authorized strength: warrant officers on active duty; exclusion

''A retired warrant officer on active duty may not be counted for the purpose of any limitation on the total number of warrant officers in a certain grade that may be serving on active duty in the retired warrant officer's armed force.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 32 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new items

''529. Authorized strength: commissioned officers on active duty; exclusion.

''530. Authorized strength: warrant officers on active duty; exclusion.''.

SA 4457. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1084. SENSE OF SENATE ON CLIMATE CHANGE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) greenhouse gases concentrating in the atmosphere are causing average temperatures to rise at a rate outside the range of natural variability and pose a substantial risk of rising sea-levels, altered patterns of atmospheric and oceanic circulation, and increased frequency and severity of floods, droughts, hurricanes and other serious weather events;

(2) the most recent annual report under section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404a) states that the United States now faces new security challenges, including ''Environmental destruction, whether caused by human behavior or cataclysmic mega-disasters such as floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, or tsunamis. Problems of this scope may overwhelm the capacity of local authorities to respond, and may even overtax national militaries, requiring a larger international response. These challenges are not traditional national security concerns, such as the conflict of arms or ideologies. But if left unaddressed they can threaten national security.'';

(3) environmental changes are likely to increase instability in many countries as changing weather patterns may exacerbate conflicts and competition over land and water resources;

(4) the strategic, social, political, and economic consequences of global warming are likely to have a greater adverse effect on less developed countries with fewer resources and infrastructures less able to adjust to economic and social changes;

(5) the economy of the United States is not immune from the potential for dislocations due to global warming; and

(6) a failure to reverse the buildup of greenhouse gas emissions in the atmosphere will increase security and economic threats that will face the United States and the world.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) it is the obligation of the United States to help secure for present and future generations the prosperity and sustainability of life on the planet;

(2) global warming is a clear and present danger to the security and the economy of the United States and the world;

(3) this danger cannot be ignored;

(4) international cooperation will be needed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and mitigate the adverse effects of increasing levels of greenhouse gases and to develop sustainable energy policies and practices; and

(5) the President and Congress should work together to take timely measures, in the United States and in concert with nations

around the world, to reduce the threat of global warming.

SA 4458. Mr. BIDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. LIMITATION ON THE UNITED STATES SHARE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 404(b)(2)(B) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 287e note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(v) For assessments made during calendar years 2005, 2006, and 2007, 27.10 percent.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 411 of the Department of State and Related Agency Appropriations Act, 2005 (title IV of division B of Public Law 108–447; 22 U.S.C. 287e note) is repealed.

SA 4459. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. COMPLIANCE REVIEWS.

Each fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall conduct compliance reviews of not less than 3 educational institutions that receive grants from the Department of Defense for such year and that are subject to the requirements of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.), in order to monitor and effectuate the compliance of each educational institution with such title.

SA 4460. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 437, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 1084. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CONTINUED PRESENCE OF UNITED STATES TROOPS IN IRAQ.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the members of the Armed Forces deserve the enormous respect and support of Congress and the American people for the sacrifices that they are making on behalf of our country; and

(2) the President's intention, as stated on March 21, 2006, that ''future Presidents'' will determine whether to keep members of the Armed Forces in Iraq undermines the preparedness of the United States military to respond to other crises; and

(3) keeping members of the Armed Forces in Iraq at or near current levels at least until 2009 should not be supported.

SA 4461. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. CONTRACTING INCENTIVES FOR SMALL AND RENEWABLE POWER PLANTS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Administrator of the General Services Administration and the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency may stimulate the production and generation of electricity services by extending contracting incentives for public utility services generated by eligible small power plants.

(b) CONTRACTING INCENTIVES.—Notwithstanding section 501(b)(1)(B) of title 40, United States Code—

(1) a contract may be awarded to an eligible small power plant for a period of not more than 20 years; and

(2) upon a written determination by the Administrator of the General Services Administration or the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency, based on market research, that a fair and reasonable price will be obtained, a contract for not more than 4,000,000 megawatt hours per year may be awarded to an eligible small power plant on the basis of limited competition or on a sole-source basis.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF COST CONTROL AND OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.—A contract entered into under this section shall be subject to cost control and all other provisions of law applicable to contracting for public utility services.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''base closure area'' has the same meaning as in section 3(p)(4)(D) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(4)(D));

(2) the term ''public utility services'', with respect to electricity services, includes electricity supplies and services, including transmission, generation, distribution, and other services directly used in providing electricity; and

(3) the term ''eligible small power plant'' means any power facility or project with an electrical output of not more than 70 megawatts that—

(A) is located in a base closure area; or

(B) generates, for delivery to the Government, such electricity as is deemed renewable according to standards and criteria established in Executive Order 13101 (63 Fed. Reg. 49643; entitled ''Greening the Government Through Waste Prevention, Recycling, and Federal Acquisition'') and Executive Order 13123 (64 Fed. Reg. 30851; entitled ''Greening the Government Through Efficient Energy Management'') or section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (119 Stat. 652).

SA 4462. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. KERRY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIONS.

(a) SBIR AND STTR MENTOR-PROTEGE AGREEMENTS.—Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(x) SBIR AND STTR MENTOR-PROTEGE AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) CLARIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY.—It is the intent of Congress that the prohibition on conditioning, negotiating, transferring, or diminishing SBIR and STTR data rights in the making or administration of phase III awards (including prime contracts and subcontracts) that are federally funded or intended for use by the Federal Government that is contained in section 8 of the SBIR Policy Directive and in section 3 of the STTR Policy Directive (as in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection, and any successor thereto) apply to mentor-protege agreements established for the purpose of assisting SBIR and STTR small business concerns.

''(2) DATA RIGHTS PROTECTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no mentor-protege agreement with an SBIR or STTR small business concern may be approved by any Federal agency, unless it contains phase III data rights protection clauses prescribed by the SBIR and STTR Policy Directives.

''(3) APPROVAL OF AGREEMENTS.—The SBIR program manager and the STTR program manager at a Federal agency shall each ensure that Federal reimbursement funding for mentor-protege assistance to SBIR and STTR small business concerns is directed towards development, testing, evaluation, and commercialization of SBIR and STTR technologies, respectively.

''(4) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Any mentor-protege agreement established for the purpose of assisting an SBIR or STTR small business concern shall require reporting of the dollar value of phase III awards made as a result of the mentor-protege assistance.''.

SA 4463. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 826. COMPETITION FOR IRAQI ARMY PISTOLS.

With regard to the procurement of pistols for assistance to the Army or police of Iraq, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure, consistent with the provisions of section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, that—

(1) a full and open competition is obtained to the maximum extent practicable; and

(2) no responsible United States supplier is excluded from bidding for such procurements.

SA 4464. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. KERRY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the

bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 1084. TERMINATION OF PROGRAM.

Section 711(c) of the Small Business Competitive Demonstration Program Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 644 note) is amended by inserting after ''January 1, 1989'' the following: '', and shall terminate on the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007''.

SA 4465. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BURNS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. DEWINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Purple Heart is the oldest military decoration in the world in present use;

(2) The Purple Heart was established on August 7, 1782, during the Revolutionary War, when General George Washington issued an order establishing the Honorary Badge of Distinction, otherwise known as the Badge of Military Merit;

(3) The award of the Purple Heart ceased with the end of the Revolutionary War, but was revived in 1932, the 200th anniversary of George Washington's birth, out of respect for his memory and military achievements by War Department General Orders No. 3, dated February 22, 1932.

(4) The criteria for the award was originally announced in War Department Circular dated February 22, 1932, and revised by Presidential Executive Order 9277, dated December 3, 1942; Executive Order 10409, dated February 12, 1952, Executive Order 11016, dated April 25, 1962, and Executive Order 12464, dated February 23, 1984.

(5) The Purple Heart is awarded in the name of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief to members of the Armed Forces who qualify under criteria set forth by Presidential Executive Order.

(b) DETERMINATION.—As part of the review and report required in subsection (d), the President shall make a determination on expanding eligibility to all deceased servicemembers held as a prisoner of war after December 7, 1941 and who meet the criteria establishing eligibility for the prisoner-of-war medal under section 1128 of Title 10 but who do not meet the criteria establishing eligibility for the Purple Heart.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—In making the determination described in subsection (b), the President shall take into consideration—

(1) the brutal treatment endured by thousands of POWs incarcerated by enemy forces;

(2) that many service members died due to starvation, abuse, the deliberate withholding of medical treatment for injury or disease, or other causes which do not currently meet the criteria for award of the Purple Heart;

(3) the views of veteran organizations, including the Military Order of the Purple Heart;

(4) the importance and gravity that has been assigned to determining all available facts prior to a decision to award the Purple Heart, and

(5) the views of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2007, the President shall provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the advisability of modifying the criteria for the award of the Purple Heart to authorize the award of the Purple Heart to military members who die in captivity under unknown circumstances or as a result of conditions and treatment which currently do not qualify the decedent for award of the Purple Heart; and for military members who survive captivity as prisoners of war, but die thereafter as a result of disease or disability incurred during captivity.

SA 4466. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 730. ENHANCED MENTAL HEALTH SCREENING AND SERVICES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF ASSESSMENTS.—Each pre-deployment mental health assessment of a member of the Armed Forces, shall include the following:

(1) A mental health history of the member, with emphasis on mental health status during the 12-month period ending on the date of the assessment and a review of military service during that period.

(2) An assessment of the current treatment of the member, and any use of psychotropic medications by the member, for a mental health condition or disorder.

(3) An assessment of any behavior of the member identified by the member's commanding officer that could indicate the presence of a mental health condition.

(4) Information provided by the member (through a checklist or other means) on the presence of any serious mental illness or any symptoms indicating a mental health condition or disorder.

(b) REFERRAL FOR FURTHER EVALUATION.—Each member of the Armed Forces who is determined during a pre-deployment or post-deployment mental health assessment to have, or have symptoms or indicators for, a mental health condition or disorder shall be referred to a qualified health care professional with experience in the evaluation and diagnosis of mental health conditions.

(c) REFERRAL OF MEMBERS DEPLOYED IN CONTINGENCY OR COMBAT OPERATIONS.—any member of the Armed Forces called or ordered to active duty in support of contingency or combat operations who requests access to mental health care services any time before, during, or after deployment shall be provided access to such services—

(1) not later than 72 hours after the making of such request; or

(2) at the earliest practicable time thereafter.

(d) MINIMUM MENTAL HEALTH STANDARDS FOR DEPLOYMENT.—

(1) STANDARDS REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe in regulations minimum standards for mental health for the eligibility of a member of the Armed Forces for deployment to a combat operation or contingency operation.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The standards required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A specification of the mental health conditions, treatment for such conditions, and receipt of psychotropic medications for such conditions that preclude deployment of a member of the Armed Forces to a combat operation or contingency operation, or to a specified type of such operation.

(B) Guidelines for the deployability and treatment of members of the Armed Forces diagnosed with a severe mental illness or Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

(3) UTILIZATION.—The Secretary shall take appropriate actions to ensure the utilization of the standards prescribed under paragraph (1) in the making of determinations regarding the deployability of members of the Armed Forces to a combat operation or contingency operation.

(e) MONITORING OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop a plan, to be implemented throughout the Department of Defense, for monitoring the mental health of each member of the Armed Forces who, after deployment to a combat operation or contingency operation, is known—

(1) to have a mental health condition or disorder; or

(2) to be receiving treatment, including psychotropic medications, for a mental health condition or disorder.

(f) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House or Representatives a report on the actions taken to implement the requirements of this section.

SA 4467. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 587. PROHIBITION ON COLLECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS UNDER THE JOINT ADVERTISING, MARKET RESEARCH AND STUDIES PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Defense may not collect or maintain the Social Security Number (SSN) of any individual for purposes of the Joint Advertising. Market Research and Studies (JAMRS) program of the Department of Defense.

SA 4468. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year

for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 587. LIMITATIONS ON THE JOINT ADVERTISING, MARKET RESEARCH AND STUDIES PROGRAM.

(a) LIMITATION ON DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION IN DATABASE.—The Secretary of Defense may not disseminate or disclose any information collected or maintained for purposes of the Joint Advertising, Market Research and Studies (JAMRS) program to any individual who is not engaged in military recruitment activities.

(b) ENHANCEMENT OF OPT-OUT MECHANISMS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF ADDITIONAL MECHANISMS.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish mechanisms (commonly referred to as ''opt-out'' mechanisms) for submitting notice to the Department of Defense of an intent not to be included in the Joint Advertising, Market Research and Studies program:

(A) A toll-free telephone number (commonly referred to as an ''800 number'') for the submittal and receipt of such notices.

(B) An Internet link from the Internet homepage of the Department of Defense to an Internet webpage for the submittal and receipt of such notices.

(C) Any other mechanism that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) LIMITATION.—The mechanisms established under paragraph (1) shall not require the disclosure of a Social Security Number (SSN).

(3) PRESERVATION OF EXISTING MECHANISM.—In establishing mechanisms under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall preserve the current mechanism for submitting a notice referred to in that paragraph to the Department, namely a physical address to which such notice may be sent and will be received.

(c) PLAN FOR NOTICE REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall develop and implement by regulation a plan that will result in the notification of individuals whose information is held by the Joint Advertising, Market Research and Studies program of the mechanisms established under subsection (b).

SA 4469. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

SEC. 215. WIDEBAND DIGITAL AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC SENSING ARRAY.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(3) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Air Force is hereby increased by $3,000,000.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(3) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Air Force, as increased by subsection (a), $3,000,000 may be available for Wideband Digital Airborne Electronic Sensing Array (PE #0602204F).

(c) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 102(a)(2) for weapons procurement for the Navy is hereby reduced by $1,000,000, with the amount of the reduction to be allocated to Conventional Trident Modification Program.

SA 4470. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

The Comptroller General shall conduct a review of the Army's ''Cost-Benefit Analysis of Off-Site Versus On-Site Treatment and Disposal of Newport Caustic Hydrolysate,'' dated April 24, 2006, and provide a report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on the results of that review by December 1, 2006.

The review shall consider and assess the following matters as a minimum:

(1) The adequacy of analysis asserted in dismissing five of the eight technologies directed for consideration by House Report 109–89, dated May 20, 2005.

(2) The rationale for the failure to consider other technical solutions, such as constructing a wastewater disposal system on site.

(3) The adequacy of the cost—benefit analysis presented for the three technologies considered.

The Secretary of the Army shall not to proceed with any action to transport or relocate neutralized bulk nerve agent (other than those small quantities necessary for laboratory evaluation of the disposal process) from the Newport Chemical Depot until 60 days after the Comptroller General has submitted his report.

SA 4471. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. 236. TESTING AND OPERATIONS FOR MISSILE DEFENSE.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities, the amount that is available for the Missile Defense Agency is hereby increased by $45,000,000.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities and available for the Missile Defense Agency, as increased by subsection (a), $45,000,000 may be available for Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Defense Segment (PE #63882C)—

(1) to accelerate the ability to conduct concurrent test and missile defense operations; and

(2) to increase the pace of realistic flight testing of the ground-based midcourse defense system.

(c) SUPPLEMENT.—Amounts available under subsection (b) for the program element referred to in that subsection are in addition to any other amounts available in this Act for that program element.

(d) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities that is available for any purpose other than the Missile Defense Agency is hereby reduced by $45,000,000.

SA 4472. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. 236. TESTING AND OPERATIONS FOR MISSILE DEFENSE.

(a) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities, the amount that is available for the Missile Defense Agency is hereby increased by $45,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities that is available for any purpose other than the Missile Defense Agency is hereby reduced by $45,000,000.

SA 4473. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEFINITIONS

Service on active duty: Service on active duty means active duty pursuant to a call or active duty under a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(B) of 10 U.S.C. or under section 12301(d) of 10 U.S.C. Further, active duty means that the reserve component military member must have served in an area where they are eligible for imminent danger or combat pay during the call of active duty.

For the purpose of this amendment, the call to active duty means active duty for a minimum of six months (6).

ANNUAL LEAVE CREDIT

Upon a reserve component military member's call to active duty, fifteen (15) days of Title 10 active duty annual leave days will immediately be credited to their annual leave account.

These fifteen (15) days are for leave use only and may not be transferred by the member at the completion of the active duty tour.

SA 4474. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. 236. TESTING AND OPERATIONS FOR MISSILE DEFENSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) According to assessments by the intelligence community, North Korea continues to maintain an ambitious ballistic missile development program and has exported missiles and missile technology to other countries, including Iran.

(2) North Korea has made preparations to launch a long-range ballistic missile that could reach the United States. The launch of such a missile by North Korea would end the moratorium on long-range missile testing declared by North Korea in 1999.

(3) Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice has warned North Korea that the launch of a long-range ballistic missile would be an ''abrogation of obligations'' of its missile test moratorium and ''would once again show North Korea determined to deepen its isolation, determined not to take a path that is a path of compromise and a path of peace, but rather instead to once again saber-rattle''.

(4) According to assessments by the intelligence community, Iran has a very active ballistic missile development program, which includes recent improvements to the Shahab-3 medium-range ballistic missile to extend its range beyond the Middle East. The danger that Iran will acquire a nuclear weapon and the ability to integrate it with the ballistic missiles Iran already possesses is a reason for immediate concern. With continued assistance, Iran could have an intercontinental ballistic missile capable of reaching the United States before 2015.

(5) According to assessments by the intelligence community, North Korea continues to produce plutonium for its nuclear weapons program, while Iran remains committed to acquiring a nuclear weapon and is currently developing its nuclear infrastructure.

(6) The Department of Defense has fielded interceptors and other initial components of a missile defense system capable of providing limited protection for the United States against ballistic missile attack. In view of the immediate threat of a test launch by North Korea of a long-range ballistic missile in the direction of the United States and the continuing efforts of Iran to develop longer-range ballistic missiles, the Department of Defense should expand the size and effectiveness of the current missile defense capabilities of the United States as the threat from these countries continues to grow.

(b) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—

(1) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities, the amount that is available for the Missile Defense Agency is hereby increased by $45,000,000.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities and available for the Missile Defense Agency, as increased by paragraph (1), $45,000,000 may be available for Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Defense Segment (PE #63882C)—

(A) to accelerate the ability to conduct concurrent test and missile defense operations; and

(B) to increase the pace of realistic flight testing of the ground-based midcourse defense system.

(3) SUPPLEMENT.—Amounts available under paragraph (2) for the program element referred to in that paragraph are in addition to any other amounts available in this Act for that program element.

(4) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities that is available for any purpose other than the Missile Defense Agency is hereby reduced by $45,000,000.

SA 4475. Mr. AKAKA submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title II, add the following:

SEC. 203. AMOUNT FOR DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF WARFIGHTER RAPID AWARENESS PROCESSING TECHNOLOGY.

(a) INCREASE IN AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR THE NAVY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(2) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Navy is hereby increased by $4,000,000.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(2) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Navy, as increased by subsection (a), $4,000,000 may be available for the development, validation, and demonstration of warfighter rapid awareness processing technology for distributed operations within the Marine Corps Landing Force Technology program.

(c) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 102(a)(2) for weapons procurement for the Navy and available for the Conventional Trident Modification Program is hereby decreased by $4,000,000.

SA 4476. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate location in the bill, insert the following:

1. United States and Coalition Forces in Iraq shall secure and properly dispose of all
2. weapons of mass destruction materiel uncovered in Iraq.

SA 4477. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. DOLE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. VOINOVICH, and Mr. SARBANES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

SEC. 215. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.

(a) ARMY SUPPORT FOR UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.—

(1) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army is hereby increased by $10,000,000.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army, as increased by paragraph (1), $10,000,000 may be available for program element PE 0601103A for University Research Initiatives.

(b) NAVY SUPPORT FOR UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.—

(1) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(2) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Navy is hereby increased by $10,000,000.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(2) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Navy, as increased by paragraph (1), $10,000,000 may be available for program element PE 0601103N for University Research Initiatives.

(c) AIR FORCE SUPPORT FOR UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.—

(1) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(3) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Air Force is hereby increased by $10,000,000.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(3) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Air Force, as increased by paragraph (1), $10,000,000 may be available for program element PE 0601103F for University Research Initiatives.

(d) COMPUTER SCIENCE AND CYBERSECURITY.—

(1) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities is hereby increased by $10,000,000.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities, as increased by paragraph (1), $10,000,000 may be available for program element PE 0601101E for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency University Research Program in Computer Science and Cybersecurity.

(e) SMART NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM.—

(1) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities is hereby increased by $5,000,000.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by

section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities, as increased by paragraph (1), $5,000,000 may be available for program element PE 0601120D8Z for the SMART National Defense Education Program.

(f) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(5) for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities is hereby reduced by $45,000,000.

SA 4478. Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. IRAQ.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress hereby—

(1) commends the Armed Forces of the United States serving in Iraq; and

(2) affirms that it is the policy of Congress that United States military forces in Iraq, having completed the mission of removing Saddam Hussein from power and paving the way for the establishment of a democratically elected government in Iraq, should be returned home at the earliest possible opportunity.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Armed Forces of the United States in Iraq have served honorably and with great bravery and should be commended for their service to their country.

(2) The democratically elected Government of Iraq should assume full responsibility for the security and stability of Iraq so that United States military forces in Iraq can be replaced with Iraqi security forces or other multinational peacekeeping forces.

(3) The President should develop and implement a strategy for the orderly draw down of United States military forces from Iraq in a manner consistent with United States national security interests.

(c) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ.—Section 3 of the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243; 116 Stat. 1501; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) EXPIRATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The authorization in subsection (a) shall expire upon the occurrence of any one of the following:

''(A) The assumption by the Government of Iraq of responsibility for security in Iraq.

''(B) The implementation of other effective security arrangements in Iraq, including the establishment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation.

''(C) A certification by the President that the United States has achieved its objectives in Iraq.

''(D) The enactment of a joint resolution to otherwise provide for expiration of the authorization.

''(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall preclude the President from withdrawing the Armed Forces from Iraq at any time if circumstances warrant. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as precluding Congress by joint resolution from directing such a withdrawal.''.

(d) REPORTS ON SECURITY SITUATION IN IRAQ.—

(1) QUARTERLY REPORTS REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the security situation in Iraq.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report under this subsection shall describe in detail—

(A) the numbers, units, and capabilities of Iraqi security forces in Iraq;

(B) the results of efforts to reduce the presence of United States military forces in Iraq;

(C) the contribution of the continued presence of United States military forces in Iraq to—

(i) the national security of the United States; and

(ii) United States foreign policy interests in the Middle East; and

(D) progress toward national political reconciliation among all Iraqi political and ethnic entities.

SA 4479. Mr. NELSON of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

SEC. 215. ADVANCED REMOTE SENSING.

Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(2) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Navy, $8,500,000 may be available for Advanced Remote Sensing.

SA 4480. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. 587. ADDITIONAL LEAVE FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS CALLED OR ORDERED TO ACTIVE DUTY FOR A CONTINGENCY OPERATION AND OTHER PURPOSES.

Section 701 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''subsection (f) and subsection (g)'' and inserting ''subsections (f), (g), and (j)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j)(1) A member of a reserve component of the armed forces called or ordered to active duty under a provision of law specified in section 101(a)(13)(B) of this title, or under section 12301(d) of this title, under a call or order that specifies a period of active duty of more than 180 days is entitled to 15 days leave if the member serves, while on active duty pursuant to such call or order—

''(A) in a combat operation or combat zone designated by the Secretary of Defense for purposes of this subsection; or

''(B) in an area for which hostile fire or imminent danger special pay is authorized under section 310 of title 37.

''(2) Leave under paragraph (1) is in addition to any other leave accumulated by a member under this section or to which the member may be entitled under this section or any other provision of law.

''(3) Leave to which a member is entitled under this subsection may not be taken before the completion by the member of the period of active duty on which such leave is based.

''(4) Leave of a member under this subsection may be taken only by the member.''.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Wednesday, June 28, 2006, at 10:30 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to consider the nomination of:

Marc Spitzer, of Arizona, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2011, vice Nora Mead Brownell, resigned.

For further information, please contact Judy Pensabene of the Committee staff.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2006, at 11:30 a.m.

The purpose of this meeting is to consider the nominations of Phillip D. Moeller to be a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2010, vice Patrick Henry Wood III, resigned; and Jon Wellinghoff to be a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2008, vice William Lloyd Massey, term expired.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, June 21, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. in SD 628 the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to hold a hearing on inherently safer technology in the context of chemical site security.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing on the

United Nations Convention Against Corruption.

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

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet on Wednesday, June 21, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. in Room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing on S. 480, the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2005, and S. 437, the Grand River Band of Ottawa Indians of Michigan Referral Act.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on ''The Analog Hole: Can Congress Protect Copyright and Promote Innovation?'' on Wednesday, June 21, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. in Dirksen Senate Office Building Room 226.

Witness list

Panel I: LeVar Burton, National Board Member, Directors Guild of America, Los Angeles, California; Dan Glickman, Chairman and CEO, Motion Picture Association of America, Washington, DC; Gary Shapiro, President and CEO, Consumer Electronics Association Chairman, Home Recording Rights Coalition, Washington, DC; Chris Cookson, President, Warner Bros. Technical Operations Inc., Chief Technology Officer, Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc., Burbank, California; Matt Zinn, Senior Vice President, General Counsel, and Chief Privacy Officer, TiVo Inc., Alviso, California; Gigi Sohn, President and Co-Founder, Public Knowledge, Washington, DC.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on ''Judicial Nominations'' on Wednesday, June 21, 2006, at 4 p.m. Dirksen Senate Office Building room 226. Witness list:

PANEL I: (Members of Congress).

PANEL II: Neil M. Gorsuch, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

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

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTXEPRENEURSHIP

Mr. WARNER. 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 hearing entitled, ''Nomination of Steven C. Preston to be the Administrator of the U.S. Small Business Administration'' on Wednesday, June 21, 2006, beginning at 10:30 a.m. in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2006, at 2:30 p.m. to hold a closed business meeting.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION, CIVIL RIGHTS, AND PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Property Rights be authorized to meet on Wednesday, June 21, 2006 at 2:00 p.m. to conduct a hearing on ''Reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act's Temporary Provisions: Policy Perspectives and Views from the Field'' in Room 226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. Witness list:

PANEL I: Debo Adegbile, Associate Director of Litigation, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., New York, NY; Gerry Reynolds, Commissioner, United States Civil Rights Commission, Washington, DC; Don Wright, General Counsel, North Carolina Board of Elections, Raleigh, NC; Jack Park, Office of the Attorney General, Montgomery, AL; David Canon, Professor, Department of Political Science University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI; Carol Swain, Professor of Political Science and Professor of Law, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY, EXPORT, AND TRADE PROMOTION WILL MEET JOINTLY WITH THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON WESTERN HEMISPHERE, PEACE CORPS, AND NARCOTICS AFFAIRS.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, Export and Trade Promotion and Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps and Narcotics Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2006, at 2:30 p.m. to hold a joint hearing on International Methamphetamine Trafficking.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND FORESTS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2006 at 2:30 p.m.

The purpose of the hearing is to review the Government Accountability Office Report entitled ''Wildland Fire Suppression—Lack of Clear Guidance raises concerns about cost sharing between Federal and Nonfederal entities'' (GAO–06–570).

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine be authorized to meet on Wednesday, June 21, 2006, at 10 a.m. on Economics, Service, and Capacity in the Freight Railroad Industry.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY, INNOVATION, AND COMPETITIVENESS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness Subcommittee be authorized to meet on Wednesday, June 21, 2006, at 2:30 p.m. to hold hearings to examine accelerating the adoption of health information technology.

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet tomorrow, June 21, 2006, from 10 a.m.–12 p.m. in Dirksen 106 purpose of conducting a hearing.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jenny Davis, a fellow in my office, be granted the privileges of the floor for the duration of this bill.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Theo Farge be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of the debate on the Levin amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two interns from my office, Marissa Kimball and Anna Butler, be given floor privileges.

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I simply make a unanimous consent request for floor privileges for two military fellows, Howard Shaw and Trevor King, for the remainder of the debate on the bill, S. 2766.

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, first I ask unanimous consent that a member of my staff, Beth Sanford, be granted floor privileges during the remainder of this bill.

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

CONGRATULATING THE MIAMI HEAT

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 519, 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. 519) congratulating the Miami Heat for winning the National Basketball Association Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, it is a happy occasion for Floridians that the Miami Heat won the NBA championship last night, having now won four games in a row after having lost the first two games in Dallas to the Dallas Mavericks.

Naturally, we Floridians have a great deal of pride in this championship coming to our State of Florida. I can tell you that the city of Miami is absolutely going bonkers, they are so happy.

I think it is also noteworthy that two national basketball championships have now been won by teams in the State of Florida within the same year. Earlier this year, in the playoffs of the NCAA, the national champions are the Florida Gators. And then followed by a couple of months, now we have the national NBA champions, the Miami Heat.

Congratulations to Miami, to the University of Florida, congratulations to the State of Florida, and congratulations to the sport of basketball.

Mr. TALENT. I am glad the Senators from Texas were not here, 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. 519) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 519

Whereas on Tuesday, June 20, 2006, the Miami Heat defeated the Dallas Mavericks by a score of 95 to 92, in Dallas, Texas;

Whereas that victory marks the first National Basketball Association (NBA) Championship for the Miami Heat franchise;

Whereas after losing the first 2 games of the NBA Finals, the Heat came back to win 4 games in a row, which earned the team an overall record of 69-37 and the right to be named NBA champions;

Whereas Pat Riley, over his 11 seasons with the Heat, has maintained a standard of excellence within the franchise and has won his fifth championship as head coach of an NBA team;

Whereas Dwyane Wade, who averaged 34.7 points in the series, was named the Most Valuable Player of the NBA Finals following the Heat victory;

Whereas Shaquille O'Neal fulfilled his 2004 promise to his teammates and the residents of Miami by delivering the title to the Miami Heat;

Whereas each member of the Miami Heat roster, including Derek Anderson, Shandon Anderson, Earl Barron, Michael Doleac, Udonis Haslem, Jason Kapono, Alonzo Mourning, Shaquille O'Neal, Gary Payton, James Posey, Wayne Simien, Dwyane Wade, Antoine Walker, Jason Williams, and Dorell Wright, played a meaningful role in bringing the NBA Championship to Miami;

Whereas owner Micky Arison has built a top-flight sports franchise and shown a consistent commitment to bringing a winning team to Miami; and

Whereas, the Miami Heat and its fans are hot in the wake of its first NBA championship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(a) congratulates the Miami Heat for its victory in the 2006 National Basketball Association Championship; and

(b) requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit for appropriate display an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(1) the owner of the Miami Heat, Micky Arison; and

(2) the general manager and coach of the Miami Heat, Pat Riley.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 2006

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, June 22. I further ask that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate resume consideration of S. 2766, the Defense authorization bill.

I further ask unanimous consent that there then be 60 minutes of debate divided as follows: Senator WARNER in control of 30 minutes, Senator LEVIN in control of 15 minutes, Senator KERRY in control of 15 minutes.

I further ask unanimous consent that following the 60 minutes, the Democratic leader be recognized for up to 15 minutes to close, to be followed by the majority leader for up to 15 minutes to close. Finally, I ask consent that following that time, the Senate proceed to the vote on the Levin amendment, to be followed by a vote in relation to the Kerry amendment, with no amendment in order to the Kerry amendment, to be followed by the vote on invoking cloture. Further, I ask consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

FILING OF SECOND-DEGREE AMENDMENTS

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that second-degree amendments be filed no later than 10:30 a.m. on Thursday.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, today, we have had lengthy debate on the Levin and Kerry amendments on Iraq. Tomorrow morning, we will have approximately 90 minutes for closing remarks before a series of votes. We will be voting on the Levin language, the Kerry language, and finally on cloture on the Defense bill. Under the provisions of rule XXII and the previous consent, the filing deadline for second-degree amendments will be at 10:30 tomorrow. We hope cloture will be invoked and that we can then work toward completing this vitally important Defense authorization measure. Additional votes are expected during Thursday's session.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 11:36 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 22, 2006, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN E. SWEENEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5576) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes:

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your leadership on this bill. I am proud to serve as the Vice-Chairman of this Subcommittee. I want to echo the words of my friend, Mr. REHBERG, because Amtrak is an essential service in my Congressional District and home state of New York.

We have had this debate every year, and we go through this process in each of those years. Last year in particular, we fought possibly the toughest battle in years for passenger rail. We were threatened with vetoes, unless some Amtrak reforms were enacted. So what did we do? We enacted reform. One year later, we have seen evidence these reforms are working.

Yet, here we are today with a proposal to fund Amtrak at $900 million. This allocation is a shutdown number for Amtrak, and it would come at the worst possible time to shut down Amtrak.

This is because we have seen evidence these reforms are working. We required Amtrak put in place a new business plan. We required Amtrak to institute new service contracts and plans. For instance, they had to adopt more efficient accounting procedures. We also demanded they restructure their dining services, which was a big money loser.

The Department of Transportation Inspector General just issued a report on Amtrak business practices. According to this April 6th report, Amtrak has saved $19 million from October 2005 through February 2006, thanks to these reforms. This is better than expected.

Amtrak is saving money because of the institution of these new reform plans that we demanded of them. To now shut them down would go back on our word. They lived up to their end of the deal, now we must live up to ours.

Finally, in these times of record high gasoline prices, allow me to mention that Amtrak promotes fuel conservation. At this time, when we are all sensitive about that, it is something that we ought to seriously consider.

A recent study by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory shows Amtrak consumes 17 percent less energy per passenger than automobiles and 18 percent less than planes. A vote to fund Amtrak is a vote to promote energy independence.

I am not naïve enough to think that this will solve all of our energy problems. Our energy policy should be a multi-faceted approach involving increasing our supply of traditional energy, investing in forms of alternative energy and promoting conservation. Increasing our domestic supply and investing in alternative fuels takes time—years in many cases.

Here is an amendment that is part of this larger solution. Furthermore, this is an amendment that will make an immediate difference. This will not save gasoline 1 year, 5 years, 10 years from now. This will save gasoline tomorrow.

I urge support of the LaTourette Amendment.

CONGRATULATING JONES METAL PRODUCTS

HON. GIL GUTKNECHT

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jones Metal Products of Mankato, Minnesota, on receiving the National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve's Above and Beyond award.

The National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve, ESGR, was established in 1972 to promote cooperation and understanding between Reserve component members and their civilian employers. Their mission is to continuously gain and maintain active support from all public and private employers for the men and women of the National Guard and Reserve. Local and national representatives stand ready to help employers understand federal laws that affect the call-up of their employees. The Above and Beyond award recognizes those who have gone beyond what federal law requires for supporting activated Guard employees.

Minnesota businesses that employ Guard members are an essential link in family support for deployed service members. The state of Minnesota is recognized as a leader among those employing Guard and Reserve members and received the 2004 Secretary of Defense Employer Support Freedom Award.

Jones Metal Products, one of 475 companies nominated for the Above and Beyond award, was nominated by Staff Sgt. Juan Berrones. While Staff Sgt. Berrones was deployed to Iraq, Jones Metal Products provided him pay raises, two bonuses and showed continuous support to his family.

I extend my sincere congratulations to Jones Metal Products for receiving the Above and Beyond Award from the National Committee for Employer Support of Guard and Reserve and commend them for the extraordinary services provided to those who serve our country.

ECOZONE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, in a time of increasing public demand for clean air, clean water, energy independence and improved environmental quality, I wish to commend the founder of EcoMedia—Mr. Paul Polizzotto for his visionary public-private partnership called "EcoZone," which will debut this week here in our Nation's capital. EcoZone leverages the resources of private corporations to improve local community environments at no cost to the taxpayer. Whether this is through funding projects which promote clean air, clean water, energy efficiency or greenspace, EcoZone allows corporations to demonstrate their commitment to local communities and is an example of the growing recognition by corporations that environmental sustainability and good corporate citizenship are profitable enterprises. I encourage the EPA, the Department of Energy, NOAA and other relevant government entities to pursue partnerships via the EcoZone program all across this country.

ECOZONE℠ DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

OVERVIEW

1. EcoZone is the flagship program of EcoMedia, the world's premier environmental media company, which brings together government and industry to fund technologies and solutions to serious environmental problems—at no additional cost to taxpayers.

2. EcoMedia's flagship program, EcoZone, is the first public-private media partnership model in the nation to use corporate sponsorships to generate revenue for local governments to fund critical environmental and clean energy projects in their communities.

3. EcoZone consists of initiatives in four signature areas: air; energy; water; and parks and green space.

4. District of Columbia is the first city in the nation to launch EcoZone; other cities and states expected to launch EcoZone programs in 2006 include St. Petersburg, Miami, Long Beach and additional Southern California communities and the State of New Jersey and many more.

5. The historic agreement between the District of Columbia and EcoMedia implements the nation's first EcoZone program and will help the city comply with federal and state environmental regulations mandating clean water and air in Washington, as well as identify best management practices to promote greater energy efficiency, preservation of greenspace and a cleaner local environment.

6. Previously, EcoMedia launched its EPA award-winning pilot program Adopt-A-Waterway®, to help fund and clean up local waterways. Successful Adopt-A-Waterway cleanup programs are currently underway in Miami, FL; Long Beach, CA: Sacramento County, CA, among other communities.

7. Under the EcoZone program, the city will receive critical funds secured through sponsorships of educational signage that promote environmental messages. The signage will include EcoZone's public education messages, encouraging citizens to be stewards of

the environment and remind them to recycle, ride-share, turn lights off when not in use and avoid littering, among other eco-friendly tips, accompanied by sponsoring corporate logos. In the District of Columbia, there will be approximately 100 EcoZone signs located throughout the city.

8. Half of the sponsorship revenues from the educational signage go directly to a dedicated and audited local government account to fund pre-determined environmental projects selected by the cities. This is accomplished at no additional cost to local taxpayers.

9. Since 2002, EcoMedia Partnerships, through the pilot Adopt-A-Waterways program, have funded critical community programs such as these:

Water quality testing

Storm drain catch basin insert filters that mitigate storm water runoff

Watershed cleanup

Steambank restoration

Extensive educational programs

10. Local governments can also use EcoZone funding to undertake environmental projects that otherwise simply wouldn't happen. The funds can be used for such things as:

Hybrid and alternative fuel vehicles (buses and municipal auto fleets) that improve both air quality and energy efficiency;

Solar paneling on city facilities to provide alternative, cleaner energy;

Greening projects to convert industrial lots into green space;

Catch basin insert filters that filter out trash and debris, oil and grease, contaminated sediments and even pathogens.

11. EcoZone leverages corporate sponsorships to fund, produce and implement comprehensive public education and environmental outreach programs including public service commercials on local cable stations and radio, grassroots education campaigns, local community events and online media.

12. EcoMedia's founder and chief executive is noted environmental entrepreneur Paul Polizzotto, who was named an ''environmental hero'' in 1999 by the Environmental Protection Agency for a process he pioneered while running his industrial environmental cleaning company, Property Prep—the first of its kind to help companies become environmentally compliant. Paul's inspiration for pioneering private sector solutions to environmental challenges began during his surfing days in Manhattan Beach, California, his hometown. Paul recognized the importance of creating a comprehensive model that involved business, government, environmental advocates and communities without increasing additional costs for local communities and taxpayers.

13. In recognition of his achievements, Polizzotto has received the following recognition: ''Public-Private Visionary'' as featured in Vanity Fair magazine's May 2006 ''Green Issue''; the Coastal Living 2003 Leadership Award from Coastal Living magazine for protecting our coastlines; the 2002 Keeper Award for improving water conditions in the Santa Monica Bay from the Santa Monica Baykeeper; and the Year 2000 Achievement Award from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for developing innovative technologies to mitigate toxic urban runoff.

MAYOR ANTHONY A. WILLIAMS ANNOUNCES THAT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WILL BECOME THE NATION'S FIRST SITE TO IMPLEMENT THE 'ECOZONE℠ PROGRAM

WASHINGTON, DC, June 20, 2006.—In a unique public/private partnership designed to forge solutions to the District's most critical environmental challenges, District of Columbia Mayor Anthony A. Williams today announced that the city will launch the nation's first, and flagship, 'EcoZone℠ program designed to fund important technologies and solutions to measurably improve the local environment in the areas of air, water, energy and greenspace—at no additional cost to taxpayers.

As the Nation's Capital, it is fitting that the District of Columbia should implement the nation's first—and flagship—EcoZone program,'' said Mayor Williams. ''In partnering with the federal government and the private sector for revenue and support, the city can now address some of the most urgent environmental challenges in our city—at no additional cost to District taxpayers. Washington, DC is one of the most beautiful cities in the world, and it is critical that we maintain its beauty and a clean and healthy environment for our residents and visitors.''

Initial corporate sponsors for the District of Columbia's EcoZone program include DaimlerChrysler and CH2MHill, AbTech, Alcoa, BAE Systems, Zipcar and Willard Intercontinental Hotel. Government agencies that will lend their support include NOAA, EPA and the Department of Energy.

Mayor Williams made the announcement at a press conference at the City Museum & Historical Society of Washington, DC, at Mt. Vernon Square. Among those joining the Mayor were Paul Polizzotto, founder and CEO of EcoMedia; John Bozzella, Vice President of External Affairs and Public Policy, Americas, DaimlerChrysler Corporation; Liliana Maldonado, Senior Vice President and Northeast Regional Manager, CH2M HILL; Benjamin Grumbles, Assistant Administrator, Office of Water, EPA; Alan Hecht, Director for Sustainable Development, Office of Research and Development, U.S. EPA; Stephanie Branche, Government Liaison, Region 3, EPA; Richard Moorer, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Technology Development, U.S. Department of Energy; Elizabeth Scheffler, CFO, Administrator for Management and Budget, National Ocean Service, NOAA; and William O. Howland, Jr., Director, Department of Public Works, the District of Columbia.

The District has entered into an agreement with EcoMedia to implement the EcoZone program. EcoMedia is a leading environmental media company that brings together government and industry to forge solutions to pressing environmental problems. The initiative will be funded solely through corporate sponsorships, with half of all EcoZone revenues generated from educational outdoor signage going to fund the District's predetermined environmental and clean energy projects in each of the EcoZone's four signature areas: air, energy, water, and greenspace.

''We are particularly happy today to announce our corporate sponsorship of the innovative EcoZone program as it launches in the nation's capital,'' said John Bozzella, Vice President of External Affairs and Public Policy, Americas, DaimlerChrysler Corporation. ''The EcoZone program complements our commitment to developing vehicles that have less impact on our environment, whether that's through reducing fuel consumption and exhaust emissions, emitting less CO_2 or developing new alternative drive systems, such as fuel cells.''

Said Liliana Maldonado, Senior Vice President and Northeast Regional Manager, CH2M HILL, ''We are proud to join in the launch of today's EcoZone program, a partnership project between communities and companies, because it reflects CH2M HILL's ongoing mission to protect and preserve natural resources around the globe. Since 1946, CH2M HILL has been helping clients provide high quality drinking water and sanitation for communities around the globe, environmental remediation, sustainable development, habitat restoration, energy efficiency, green architecture and low impact development. From planning to design to construction and operations, CH2M HILL embraces health, safety and environmental protection because it is the right thing to do for our people, our communities and our environment.''

Under the EcoZone program, educational signage featuring environmental messages will be posted throughout the district. The signage will include EcoZone's public education messages reminding consumers to recycle, ride-share, turn lights off when not in use and avoid littering, among other eco-friendly tips. In the District of Columbia there will be approximately 100 EcoZone signs located throughout the city.

Half of the revenues from the EcoZone corporate sponsorships of educational outdoor signage will go directly to a dedicated and audited government account to fund the predetermined environmental projects selected by the District government. This will help the city comply with federal environmental regulations, and/or fund new local environmental programs that otherwise would not happen. Cleanup projects can include:

Storm drain catch basin insert filters that mitigate storm water runoff,

Hybrid and alternative fuel vehicles for municipal fleets that improve both air quality and energy efficiency,

Solar paneling on city facilities to provide alternative, cleaner energy,

Greening projects to convert industrial lots into green space.

EcoZone leverages program sponsorships to fund, produce and administer comprehensive public education and environmental outreach programs, including local cable television and radio public service commercials, grassroots education campaigns, branded merchandise, local community events and online media.

Paul Polizzotto, Founder and Chief Executive Officer, EcoMedia, said, ''We commend Mayor Williams for his commitment to the quality of life in the District of Columbia and for joining with businesses to launch our nation's first EcoZone program. The District's EcoZone program, we hope, will be the beginning of a national grassroots movement among cities, corporations and consumers working together to improve and strengthen our environment.''

Additional cities and states to be included in a 2006 national rollout of the EcoZone program include: Miami; Long Beach and other Southern California communities; and the State of New Jersey, among others. EcoZone is the second public private sponsorship model created by and managed by EcoMedia. Its pilot program, Adopt-A-Waterway®, was launched in 2001. This award-winning, national program pioneered the public/private model of raising money for environmental cleanup—at no additional cost to taxpayers—and is currently underway in Miami, FL, Long Beach, CA, Sacramento County, CA, as well as other communities throughout the country.

Based in New York City, EcoMedia is a leading environmental media company dedicated to pioneering market-based media solutions that generate necessary funds and resources to address critical environmental challenges. For more information, log on to: www.ecomedia.us.

TRIBUTE TO WEST VIRGINIA

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this special day to honor my home among the hills, the great state of West Virginia. It was on June 20, 1863 that West Virginia became the 35th state to enter the Union.

The Civil War changed the landscape of America, and nowhere was its impact felt more significantly than in the Virginias, which, like so many families fighting this bloody war, was rendered into two halves, west and east, North and South.

By some standards small in circumference but by any standards big in heart, West Virginia might have been born a child of national turmoil, but has grown to a State blessed with hard-working and generous people, awe-inspiring natural beauty, and a fount of natural resources.

The natural beauty surrounding us lures people from across the Nation and around the world to visit and play here.

Traditional industries have long played an integral role in our State's economy, and they continue so today.

Agriculture provides dairy, poultry, and feed crops for our State. The lumber industry makes use of our forests that cover 75 percent of our beautiful terrain.

And, we all know the coal industries motto in West Virginia, "Coal Keeps the Lights On."

West Virginia is also a leader in steel, glass, aluminum, chemical manufacturing, and natural gas industries.

And we will continue to support these traditional industries that have powered our Nation, and kept America running.

But, as the old saying goes "nothing endures but change." And we are seeing a change in West Virginia. West Virginia's Renaissance will be marked by West Virginia's foray into the technology industry.

On that front, we have only just begun, but today our future is as bright as an early summer morning sunrise over the Appalachian hills—hills that we are reminded of today by the gentle words of a classic tune that continues to strike a chord among all who have a "Home Among the Hills":

There's a land of rolling mountains
Where the sky is blue above.
And though I may roam, I hurry home,
To those friendly hills I love.
Where moonlit meadows ring
with the call of whippoorwills
Always you will find me in my home among the hills
And where the sun draws rainbows in the mist
Of waterfalls and mountain rills
My heart will be always in the West Virginia Hills
There, autumn hillsides are bright with scarlet trees
and in the spring, the robins sing
While apple blossoms whisper in the breeze
And there is music in the flashing streams
and joy in fields of daffodils
Laughter through the happy valleys of my home among the hills
—Words & Music by E.W. James, Jr.

Today, and every day, West Virginians thank the Lord for our bountiful blessings, and bound together in loyalty and love for our fine state remind ourselves that, yes, West Virginia is truly almost Heaven.

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of World Refugee Day.

As chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I stand with my colleagues to articulate the importance of providing aid to refugees.

Today we call attention to the plight of refugees, celebrating their courage and resilience, and renewing our commitment to solving refugee problems.

Established in 2000 by the United Nations General Assembly, World Refugee Day is celebrated every June 20th. Previously commemorated as African Refugee Day, many countries and regions have held their own Refugee Days to help acknowledge the U.N.'s formal recognition of refugees in 1951. June 20th marks a day of global solidarity in an international effort to help refugees.

From Africa to Asia, the plight of refugees is not owned by one people or one country. Stemming from cultural, political and economic events, there are over 8.4 million refugees worldwide. Often uprooted from their homes and seeking safe haven in other countries, refugees find themselves in dire situations in need of aid and relief.

Founded as a nation of immigrants, we must recognize that many of our Nation's citizens are descendants of refugees or refugees themselves. From the potato famine in Ireland to the war in Vietnam, the U.S. has an established relationship of helping our global neighbors find refuge. While we debate comprehensive immigration reform, we must remember the contributions of refugees and be sure to include provisions to aid those displaced by situations they have no control over.

Additionally, the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina has brought the issue of refugees to our own backyard. Many of those hard hit by Katrina were displaced from their homes, unsure of what to do. Lacking relief efforts and aid, our own citizens experienced the consequences of a situation they had no control over. Let us look to Katrina as an example of the course of action we must take in order for us to prevent situations where those in need are left in despair.

As a Nation, we must protect the basic human rights of refugees and ensure that they will not be returned involuntarily to a country where they face persecution. In addition to protecting human rights, we must do all that we can to provide foreign aid and assistance to nations that help refugees. Providing shelter, food, water and medical care in the immediate aftermath of any refugee exodus must be a priority.

Furthermore, as chair of the Congressional Ethiopia and Ethiopian American Caucus, I had the privilege of visiting Ethiopia and interacting with refugees. I saw first hand the cultural, political, and economic causes of their suffering. Now, more than ever, I believe that the U.S. should be the leader in the international effort to combat displacement.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support World Refugee Day and ensuring that refugees across the globe receive the aid that they deserve. I urge my colleagues to join me to address this important issue.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB OF LA CROSSE, WI

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Boys and Girls Club of La Crosse, Wisconsin on its 40th anniversary of serving the people of western Wisconsin. For many years, it has provided a safe, positive environment that helps to foster values in children and young adults, establish strong relationships, and build good character.

As a young man, I benefited from the La Crosse Boys and Girls Club through my participation in their programs and, therefore, know firsthand the value of their work. Today, my two young boys, Matthew and Johnny, are involved in the club's activities, allowing me to see the benefits young men and women receive from the perspective of a grateful parent. Having served on the board of directors for the La Crosse Boys and Girls Club, I know the amount of time and hard work that goes into operating this organization.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank Terry Erickson, the current director of the La Crosse Boys and Girls Club, who has served since I was a participant. Terry has taken the club beyond its expectations. He has become synonymous with the club and a role model to everyone involved. I commend all the individuals whose leadership and dedication over the past 40 years have created an environment that has enhanced the lives of innumerable youths and their families. Thank you to the Boys and Girls Club of La Crosse for 40 wonderful years; I know you will continue to remain at the forefront of local youth development for many years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the departure time for my flight from California was delayed 2 hours this morning, and I didn't arrive at Dulles International Airport until 5:16 p.m. Because votes were called at 5:00 p.m., it was unfortunately impossible for me to make today's votes.

However, I want you to know I would have recorded "yes" votes for all three bills on today's calendar. They included: H.R. 5540—Sergeant Jacob Dan Dones Post Office Designation Act, H.R. 5504—Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building Designation Act, H. Res. 826—Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Youth Sports Week should be established.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES M. CHAMBERS

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the valuable service of Dr. Charles M. Chambers, Chancellor of Lawrence Technical University, and an advocate of higher education in Michigan and around the world.

Appointed Chancellor on February 1, 2006, Dr. Chambers had served as the president of Lawrence Tech since 1993. He will conclude his tenure July 1, leaving behind an impressive legacy.

During his career at Lawrence Tech, Dr. Chambers spurred an expansion of campus facilities, garnered significant financial support from the community, and spearheaded Lawrence Tech's emergence as one of Michigan's preeminent private research universities. Indeed, just a few years ago I was privileged to have had the opportunity to attend the groundbreaking of the Alfred Taubman Student Services Center, which offers a one-stop center for students combining admissions, academic advising, computer and career services.

Under the stewardship of Dr. Chambers, Lawrence Tech has seen large expansions in research and academic offerings, including the launch of dozens of new degrees and Lawrence Tech's first doctoral programs. He has also overseen a considerable increase in student scholarships and community outreach.

Under his leadership, Lawrence Tech became Michigan's first wireless laptop campus. Exhibiting similar innovation and foresight, Dr. Chambers helped pioneer the creation of learning centers and higher education partnerships in southeastern and northern Michigan, as well as in Canada, Germany, Mexico, and throughout Asia. Recognizing the value of economic expansion and diversification to Michigan, he assured that the University was a founding partner in Automation Alley and the Great Lakes Interchange, an Automation Alley SmartZone.

Dr. Chambers is a life-long advocate of higher education, and has proven a capable steward of an impressive institution. As he returns to teaching at the institution he so vigorously led, I look forward to continuing my friendship with him.

BETHLEHEM STEEL

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the RECORD the following comments I submitted to the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health at their meeting on the Bethlehem Steel Site Profile on June 16, 2006 here in Washington.

This is an urgent matter of justice for hundreds of former Bethlehem Steel workers and their families, and I believe it deserves Congress' due consideration. To that end I respectfully urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3481, legislation introduced by the Western New York congressional delegation to resolve this issue by including workers employed at the Bethlehem Steel site as a class to be included in the Special Exposure Cohort. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE BRIAN HIGGINS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

I want to thank the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker health for allowing me to make this statement today.

I wanted to take the opportunity of your meeting in Washington, DC to appeal to the Advisory Board to recommend that the former workers at the Bethlehem Steel Site in Lackawanna, New York be designated a Special Exposure Cohort.

As this Board is well aware, significant controversy exists with respect to the dose reconstruction efforts at the Bethlehem Steel site. NIOSH undertook an extensive effort on dose reconstruction, but I and my colleagues in the Western New York congressional delegation have gone on record as to the shortcomings of that study, a litany I will not take your time with today. Subsequently, the Board hired an independent private consultant to perform its own analysis, and the results were vastly different from the NIOSH study. Perhaps this is not surprising given the difficulty incumbent in reconstructing radiation exposure that occurred over 50 years ago.

Meanwhile, during all of this debate, study, and re-study, the former, ill-stricken Bethlehem Steel employees and the families of the deceased have waited patiently. They have waited for justice but all they have received are statistics and studies. These workers are not statistics—they are the men and women who, by their efforts, helped America win the Cold War. Now as a result of their work they are sick. They deserve to have their sacrifice honored and recognized, not minimized and trivialized.

We must concede that given the dearth of reliable information we have on the working conditions at Bethlehem Steel over 50 years ago, despite NIOSH's great efforts, any dose reconstruction is doomed to inadequately provide justice to these workers. The only just alternative available to us under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act is to make these workers a Special Exposure Cohort. My colleagues and I have introduced legislation to make this designation, but it is stuck in committee. We have appealed to the President to declare a special cohort administratively, but he has demurred.

It is now up to this Board and the Department of Labor to do right by these workers, and to recommend a Special Exposure Cohort. You are the last, best hope that these workers will see justice; I implore you to act quickly.

Again, thank you for allowing me to address the Board today. I look forward to working with you to ensure that these workers and their families receive the compensation they are entitled to under the law, and the medical care they deserve.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, on Monday June 19, 2006, I was unavoidably delayed and thus missed rollcall votes Nos. 289, 290 and 291. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all votes.

HONORING KATHERINE DUNHAM: ACTIVISM THROUGH ARTISTRY

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to recognize the life and accomplishments of an extraordinary artist and activist, Katherine Dunham. Ms. Dunham, whom recently passed away on May 21, 2006, spent her life using dance and theater to fight for civil rights. Now, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of this influential woman.

Ms. Dunham, born June 22, 1909 in Joliet, IL, began her study of dance by taking ballet lessons in high school. She attended the University of Chicago and fell in love with the study of anthropology which led her to receive a Ph.B. degree in social anthropology in 1936.

While attending the University of Chicago, she received a fellowship that allowed her to perform an anthropological study of traditional and ritual dances of the Caribbean. This study sparked her lifelong passion for the country of Haiti. She once said that she felt an unusually strong connection with the people and the land. Throughout the rest of her life, she was devoted to the liberation and protection of the people of Haiti and used her influence as an artist to shed light on the issues Haitians were dealing with. She owned a home in Haiti, called the Habiticon Le Clerc, which was also a resort.

Her studies in the Caribbean also allowed her to create her own style of dance, taking pieces of Caribbean native dances and blending them with modem Western movements. With her unique style and technique, Ms. Dunham was a true pioneer in America and opened doors for Blacks in the field of dance performance. She started the first all African-American ballet company entitled "Ballet Négre" and was also the first African-American to be a choreographer for the Metropolitan Opera.

Ms. Dunham's unique performances captivated audiences of all races, ethnicities, and backgrounds. This allowed Ms. Dunham to use dance and theater to transcend racial lines and bring light to the important civil rights issues to all who saw her perform. One of her most famous and well-loved performances, entitled "Southland," portrayed the horror of lynchings in the South. Ms. Dunham also refused to perform to segregated audiences, further pushing the race envelope.

Ms. Dunham gave back to the community through opening dance schools in low-income areas. The first school was opened in her home State of Illinois. The purpose of these schools was not only to teach the discipline of dance but to also give youth a productive activity that would help prepare them for success.

Ms. Dunham's fame and influence extended beyond the Americas as she also performed in France, Mexico, Argentina, and Italy. While traveling and performing, she made sure to express her activist message of human rights for people all over the world.

The world recognized and appreciated Ms. Dunham, making her the recipient of many awards, including the Albert Schweitzer Music Awards in 1979, the Haitian Government highest award in 1983 and a Kennedy Center honoree for lifetime achievement in the arts in the

same year. She also received the National Medal of Arts in 1989.

Her husband of 49 years, theater designer John Pratt, died in 1986. They are survived by their daughter, Marie-Christine Dunham-Pratt, whom they adopted from Martinique.

Mr. Speaker, I would once again like to pay tribute to this international icon. Through her creative and unique talents, she was able to break down barriers and shed light on important issues. I hope that we will all remember and continue her legacy. I encourage my colleagues to join me in recognizing and celebrating the life of Katherine Dunham.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN S. TANNER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, because of weather-related travel delays, I was unable to cast votes yesterday evening on rollcall votes 289, 290 and 291. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 5540, H.R. 5504 and H. Res. 826.

COMMENDATION FOR THE LIFE OF REVEREND KENNETH WHITE

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reflect on the life of Reverend Kenneth White.

There are those who pass this way, and touch lives. There are others whose very life and living is a testament to God's teachings of love, compassion and service. Reverend White was this man of great character and strength who touched so many and cared so deeply. Here was a man who lived a full and rich life—rich in its complexity and the depth of challenges he faced; yet wonderfully abundant with the unique touch he so deftly applied to all his endeavors. From fighter to chaplain, from husband to father, from a man of God to a child of God, all of these characterizations are, and was, Reverend White, the man who so loved his people that he would give unselfishly of his time and talents for the betterment of mankind. This gentle man was firm in his convictions that no greater love has one than the love of family. Yet his love and respect went beyond the family bonds, and touched so many, and by so doing, helped generations of young lives uphold the creed of self-respect, honesty, truth and caring for others.

The gaze, the smile, the laugh, and the way he could embrace you and make you his friend, will be missed. Yet these are the very qualities we will cherish as memories of our dearly beloved Reverend White. Rest now, my friend, for your work here is done and your life shall live on forever in each of us.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Monday, June 19, on account of district business I was absent for votes on rollcall numbers 289, 290, and 291. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on each of these votes.

TRIBUTE TO LT. COL. ALBERT A. McCOY: AN AMERICAN PATRIOT

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory and extraordinary life of Lt. Col. Albert McCoy of North Miami, Florida, who passed away on February 5, 2006.

By any standard, Lieutenant Colonel McCoy was a man of diverse interests and noteworthy achievements. In a sense, he was destined to serve his country in the armed services. A native New Englander and graduate of Springfield College, family lore places his ancestors at the Battle of Bennington, fighting for American independence during the Revolutionary War.

He continued the family tradition and served his country in the Army during World War II and the Korean war—rising in rank as his abilities were recognized in an active and reserve military career that spanned 43 years. Even after he left the military, his fellow veterans continued to be an important part of his life. He served for three decades in the United States Guard of Honor, rendering military honors at the funerals of fellow military men and women.

But despite his distinguished and lengthy military service, Lieutenant Colonel McCoy cannot be remembered solely as a military officer. In 1957, he and a partner opened a real estate business so successful that it eventually grew to include a staff of almost 50 people. He became a university professor, teaching at the University of Florida; at the University of Miami, where he had earlier pursued his graduate studies; at what is now Miami-Dade College; and at Broward Community College. A literate man of letters who enjoyed reading and writing, several of his articles were published, and he even began writing an extensive book on another of his great interests, travel.

Lt. Col. Albert McCoy was interred at Arlington National Cemetery, a fitting resting place of honor for one who performed his duty so well and devoted so much of his life to our nation and to our community. His passing is a tremendous loss, and my heart goes out to his wife Nancy, his two daughters, Lorena and Nanette, and all of his many family and friends.

VIETNAM, WATERGATE AND ROVE

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I bring to my colleagues' attention the following column written by Michael Barone. As Mr. Barone shows, the joint efforts of the so-called mainstream media and the political Left to examine current events through the prism of Vietnam and Watergate are—once again—sadly off base.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 16, 2006]

VIETNAM, WATERGATE AND ROVE

(By Michael Barone)

It has been a tough 10 days for those who see current events through the prisms of Vietnam and Watergate. First, the Democrats failed to win a breakthrough victory in the California 50th District special election—breakthrough that would have summoned up memories of Democrats winning Gerald Ford's old congressional district in a special election in 1974. Instead the Democratic nominee got 45% of the vote, just 1% more than John Kerry did in the district in 2004.

Second, U.S. forces with a precision air strike killed Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, on the same day that Iraqis finished forming a government. Zarqawi will not be available to gloat over American setbacks or our allies' defeat, as the leaders of the Viet Cong and North Vietnam did.

Third, special prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald announced that he would not seek an indictment of Karl Rove. The leftward blogosphere had Mr. Rove pegged for the role of Bob Haldeman and John Ehrlichman. Theories were spun about plea bargains that would implicate Vice President Dick Cheney. Talk of impeachment was in the air. But it turns out that history doesn't repeat itself. George W. Bush, whether you like it or not, is not a second Richard Nixon.

It is hard in retrospect to understand why the left put so much psychic energy into the notion that Mr. Rove would be indicted. He certainly was an important target. No one in American history has been as powerful an aide to a president, both on politics and on public policy, as Karl Rove. Only Robert Kennedy in his brother's administration and Hamilton Jordan in Jimmy Carter's come close, and neither was as involved in electoral politics as Mr. Rove has been.

Still, it was clear early on that the likelihood that Mr. Rove violated the Intelligence Identities Protection Act was near zero. Under the law, the agent whose name was disclosed would have had to have served overseas within the preceding five years (Valerie Plame, according to her husband's book, had been stationed in the U.S. since 1997), and Mr. Rove would have had to know that she was undercover (not very likely). The left enjoyed raising an issue on which, for once, it could charge that a Republican administration had undermined national security. But that rang hollow when the left gleefully seized on the New York Times' disclosure of NSA surveillance of phone calls from suspected al Qaeda operatives abroad to persons in the U.S.

In all this a key role was played by the press. Cries went up early for the appointment of a special prosecutor: Patrick Fitzgerald would be another Archibald Cox or Leon Jaworski. Eager to bring down another Republican administration, the editorialists of the New York Times evidently failed to realize that the case could not be pursued without asking reporters to reveal the names of sources who had been promised confidentiality. America's newsrooms are populated

largely by liberals who regard the Vietnam and Watergate stories as the great achievements of their profession. The peak of their ambition is to achieve the fame and wealth of great reporters like David Halberstam and Bob Woodward. But this time it was not Republican administration officials who went to prison. It was Judith Miller, then of the New York Times itself.

Interestingly, Bob Woodward himself contradicted Mr. Fitzgerald's statement, made the day that he announced the one indictment he has obtained, of former vice presidential chief of staff Scooter Libby, that Mr. Libby was the first to disclose Ms. Plame's name to a reporter. The press reaction was to turn on Mr. Woodward, who has been covering this administration as a new story rather than as a reprise of Vietnam and Watergate.

Historians may regard it as a curious thing that the left and the press have been so determined to fit current events into templates based on events that occurred 30 to 40 years ago. The people who effectively framed the issues raised by Vietnam and Watergate did something like the opposite; they insisted that Vietnam was not a reprise of World War II or Korea and that Watergate was something different from the operations J. Edgar Hoover conducted for Franklin Roosevelt or John Kennedy. Journalists in the 1940s, '50s and early '60s tended to believe they had a duty to buttress Americans' faith in their leaders and their government. Journalists since Vietnam and Watergate have tended to believe that they have a duty to undermine such faith, especially when the wrong party is in office.

That belief has its perils for journalism, as the Fitzgerald investigation has shown. The peril that the press may find itself in the hot seat, but even more the peril that it will get the story wrong. The visible slavering over the prospect of a Rove indictment is just another item in the list of reasons why the credibility of the ''mainstream media'' has been plunging. There's also a peril for the political left. Vietnam and Watergate were arguably triumphs for honest reporting. But they were also defeats for America—and for millions of freedom-loving people in the world. They ushered in an era when the political opposition and much of the press have sought not just to defeat administrations but to delegitimize them. The pursuit of Karl Rove by the left and the press has been just the latest episode in the attempted criminalization of political differences. Is there any hope that it might turn out to be the last?

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN BOOZMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Economic Opportunities Subcommittee under the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I traveled to South Dakota on Sunday, June 18, 2006, to hold a field hearing. Due to the timing of the hearing and return travel, I was unable to participate in votes on Monday, June 19, 2006. I am requesting my absence for this date. I would also like you to note that, should I have been present, I would have voted in the following manner: H.R. 5540—Sergeant Jacob Dan Dones Post Office Designation Act, "yes"; H.R. 5504—Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building Designation Act, "yes"; and H. Res. 826—Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Youth Sports Week should be established, "yes."

TRIBUTE TO LYME-OLD LYME, CONNECTICUT ROBOTICS TEAM—TECHNO-TICKS

HON. ROB SIMMONS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the members of the Lyme-Old Lyme, Connecticut robotics team known as the Techno-Ticks. They are Team 236 and they represent the Dominion Millstone power station.

Mr. Speaker, the United States leads the world in technology and innovation, but the only way we will maintain our leading edge is if our young people dedicate themselves to the study of science and technology. The motivated and talented students at Old Lyme illustrate that America's dominance in the future is in good hands.

The Techno-Ticks recently participated in the USFIRST robotics competition and they demonstrated great enthusiasm and proficiency. The acronym FIRST stands for: For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology. The FIRST competitions began in 1989 and since then student interest has flourished. The number of teams participating has grown over the years from 28 to more than 1,100. The competition involves designing and constructing a robot and it is an exciting and practical way for young people to discover the remarkable and rewarding world of engineering and research.

These competitions are important. Engineering schools and professional societies have warned that we are not educating enough engineers and scientists. Well, that's not the case in Lyme. I visited their school and I watched the Techno-Ticks in action. They understand teamwork, they understand technology and they understand that everything they are learning today will better prepare them for the world of tomorrow. It will be a world they will help shape.

USFIRST celebrates partnerships between school systems, educators, parents and professionals in the various fields that define technically challenging problems. The students implement solutions under simulated real world pressures of time, money and resources. The teams develop decision making, project management and business skills as they solve realistic technical issues such as how to design, construct and remotely operate robotic devices to perform tasks.

They employ gyroscopic control and barrier recognition and avoidance in order to enable the robot to navigate obstacle courses, climb stairs and ramps and lift or throw objects. They also gain experience by raising money to fund their teams; by learning how to communicate with sponsors, team members and their communities; how to negotiate resource issues, and how to transport a robot and a team thousands of miles to compete in 33 regional competitions and a championship event held annually in Atlanta, Georgia. USFIRST participants learn real world skills.

These students have a passion for learning and are eager to help solve our nations' and the worlds' most pressing problems. I congratulate the Techno-Ticks on their accomplishments and encourage them to continue to pursue knowledge. The lessons they are mastering today will serve them, and our nation, in the world of tomorrow.

HONORING DORE VAN DYKE

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Mrs. Dore Van Dyke, an exceptional woman who is retiring after serving 9 years as the executive director of the Attleboro Arts Museum. I am proud to know Mrs. Van Dyke and to salute her many contributions to the arts community in New England.

She took over the museum as executive director in 1997, shortly after it moved from a small stucco house in Capron Park to a much larger facility on Park Street, as part of the Attleboro downtown revitalization project. Mrs. Van Dyke successfully led the museum through an important phase of growth by improving the museum's finances, expanding educational programs and bringing nationally respected exhibits to its gallery. In addition, she increased the museum's visibility and credibility in New England, making it an energetic arts resource and a respected gallery venue.

Without a doubt, Mrs. Van Dyke's dedicated leadership during the museum's period of growth built a sturdy foundation upon which future leaders can continue to flourish. In her retirement, Mrs. Van Dyke plans to return to her own art as a sculptor and venture into new media.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the entire House of Representatives joins me in congratulating Mrs. Dore Van Dyke for all she has accomplished and in wishing her the best in her retirement.

ACCOLADES FOR THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF KING ADULYADEJ AS MONARCH OF THAILAND

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter into the RECORD, an article from the Washington Times by Sebastian Berger titled, World's royals fete Thailand's King. This article describes the celebration of history's longest-reigning monarch, King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand. The celebration of this king's reign will last 3 days and has included the biggest reunion of royal heads of state in decades. I would like to join these world leaders in celebration and tribute to King Adulyadej and in recognition of the anniversary of his ascent to the throne.

King Adulyadej's reign of 60 years has outlived many turbulent times in Thailand and his leadership has survived 17 military coups, 23 different prime ministers and 15 constitutions of Thailand. His soft spoken yet effective manner of advocating for issues important to Thailand has won him admiration and affection from all of his people.

Known as the ''Developer King'' to many, Secretary General Kofi Annan visited the King during the celebrations in order to present him with the United Nations Development Program Award. This award presentation was meant to recognize the King's steadfast devotion for improved living circumstances for the Thai people. He initiated many development projects which, throughout 60 years, have created progress and prosperity for the country. So beloved is this sovereign that he has also been nicknamed the ''soul of the nation'' by his people.

The King is also well known for his abilities in the artistic field. Because of this, King Adulyadej was granted the title of ''Supreme Artist'' in recognition of his contributions to art and artists in Thailand. So great was his role that the country established ''The Supreme Artist Hall'' to commemorate and display the King's work.

His model for sustaining a unified Thailand despite numerous obstacles against progress is a great example for all. With words alone, King Adulyadej ended bloodshed in 1973 and 1992, during times of hostility against military dictatorships. His current appeal for Thai people is a call for unity during a time of national division. Indeed, the entire nation has united in order to pay homage to its beloved ruler and I stand in camaraderie with the Thai people to celebrate and appreciate the example of King Adulyadej.

HONORING DR. JAMES CAMERON

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I rise today to pay tribute to one of America's great heroes, Dr. James Cameron. Dr. Cameron is a living representation of how greatness and truth can overcome the hatred and intolerance of racism.

As a young man, Dr. Cameron lived through the atrocity of being lynched and beaten in front of a mob of 15,000 for a crime he did not commit.

As the only living survivor of a lynching, Dr. Cameron has stood up and served as a reminder of the violence and hatred that can exist within mankind. Too often we seek to ignore such atrocities when writing our history; however, Dr. Cameron has dedicated his life to remind us of our true history.

Dr. Cameron has devoted his life's work to the pursuit and recognition of civil rights. He has revealed to millions of Americans the true account of this Nation's racial injustice through his founding of the American Black Holocaust Museum in 1988.

The American Black Holocaust Museum's straightforward presentations of pervasive racial injustices and violence serve not only to educate but to allow us to reexamine and rethink our own views towards racism.

There are many young people who may not know of or did not experience this period of history. However, it is imperative we recognize our true American history. We cannot develop future policies or laws without knowing or applying the lessons we have learned from the past. It is through work such as Dr. Cameron's that young people can remember the sacrifices and contributions of those who came before them, and find new inspiration to fight for change.

INTRODUCTION OF AMENDMENT TO THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation giving America's seniors a new opportunity to benefit from culturally competent multigenerational programs with our young people. Specifically, many older Americans have limited English proficiency and can face difficulties finding younger individuals with whom to communicate because of language barriers. In addition, multilingual young people can act as a valuable communication resource to help increase awareness for seniors on a range of issues.

I became aware of this issue recently while visiting a site for a supportive senior housing project in my district in San Diego. This supportive housing includes affordable housing for low-income seniors, nutrition services, social services, and mental healthcare. The program is in a culturally diverse neighborhood, and therefore, the people whom this program benefits come from a wide variety of backgrounds and speak many languages. The program staff wants to ensure that the seniors in the neighborhood are aware of the programs available to them, and feel comfortable coming to the senior center to receive those services.

But there are major language and cultural barriers to overcome. In this case, young people in the neighborhood, who speak English and another language, could go out into the community to help increase awareness about the programs, and help seniors navigate the programs—the eligibility requirements, the enrollment process, and other vital information.

Mr. Speaker, not only is it important that we do what we can to give older Americans the opportunity to share their wisdom and experiences with younger generations, it is also important that we give young people the opportunity to work with and help seniors. We know about the joy our seniors experience from visiting with younger folks. We must ensure that all segments of our older population have this opportunity and multigenerational programs are an excellent way for seniors and young people to benefit from each other.

My legislation would amend the Older Americans Act, OAA, to encourage and facilitate regular interaction between seniors with limited English proficiency and students with multilingual skills across the United States. Now that we are on the verge of reauthorizing the OAA, I encourage my colleagues to support action to give all of our seniors the gift of multigenerational activities.

WISHING SUCCESS TO THE JAMAICAN PRIME MINISTER, PORTIA SIMPSON-MILLER

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today enter into the RECORD, the inaugural address of the Most Honorable Portia Lucretia Simpson-Miller, the newly elected Prime Minister of Jamaica.

In her inauguration speech Ms. Simpson-Miller pledged to advance the human rights and individual liberties of the people of Jamaica. Acknowledging that the duty of the state is to protect the society as a whole, she condemned sacrificing individual liberties in execution of that duty. She promised to stamp out corruption and criminality by working closely with the Minister of National Security as well as the law enforcement community to reduce the high rate of crime in Jamaica and provide greater security for the people.

Pointing out that economic transformation cannot take place without an overhaul of the educational system of Jamaica, Ms. Simpson-Miller pledged to provide access to quality education for youth and children. In light of the high unemployment rate in Jamaica—11.5 percent (2005 estimates)—she promised to create jobs and wealth-earning opportunities for the Jamaican people. She vowed to focus her efforts on developing the communities, strengthening democratic governance, and uplifting the poor.

Ms. Simpson-Miller is a champion of the downtrodden and the dispossessed. She is seen as a symbol of the hopes and aspirations of the poor, underprivileged black people, particularly black women of Jamaica. She has really risen through the ranks of the party, coming from a very, very poor section of Jamaica to the highest elected position in the government. She has asserted her commitment to improving the living standards in the destitute communities in Jamaica.

As the first woman Prime Minister of Jamaica and a leader of the people, Ms. Simpson-Miller represents the hopes and wishes of many. Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Ms. Simpson-Miller and praying for her success in achieving her goals for her nation.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY THE HON. PORTIA LUCRETIA SIMPSON-MILLER, MP, PRIME MINISTER OF JAMAICA

I want to begin by recognizing the source of my strength, Almighty God. Let us stand and pray. Almighty God, in the presence of all here attending; in the presence of the people of this land and everyone else sharing this occasion, I do pay homage to you, in acknowledgement that you are the Sovereign and Supreme Lord God in this island and all the world. As I assume the Office of Prime Minister of all Jamaica, I do so Lord, truly conscious that the glory is yours, and the office, an affirmation of my devotion to you and to all the people of this nation. You laid the foundations of the earth. Lord, lay now, I beseech you, the foundations of the Government, that you have graciously enabled me to lead, so that its purpose be firm, its endeavors right, and its accomplishments blessed. Let it be joy to those through whom you dispense it; bless those who will receive it; and glory to you who give it.

Good Lord, let Jamaica find in me, my colleagues, and all who offer governance under our leadership, complete fulfillment of the righteous Government that you have offered to this nation; let it manifest in removal of blight and poverty; the stigma and loss due to crime and violence; let the radiance of it raise a larger assertion of moral strength and rectitude in our public and private sectors. Unite our people with a stronger sense of compassion and love. Use us as the vessel for your purpose, and the people as instruments of your peace, and prosper us that we may know the joy of your presence and experience the pleasure at your right hand. These we ask of you in faith, believing, giving

thanks, even so, in the name of your Holy Son, Jesus Christ—our Lord, and in the name of your Holy Spirit: one God.

Amen.

Today is a truly historic day in the life of this nation. A girl from Wood Hall in deep rural St. Catherine has become Prime Minister of Jamaica, a true manifestation of the Jamaican Dream. This indicates that any child, regardless of circumstances, can rise to the top.

It has been said ''Hope springs eternal in the human breast''.

Ladies and gentlemen, if there were a way to quantify the intangible, it would be proven without a shadow of a doubt today that it is the spirit of hope which is most dominant here at King's House; in homes throughout the length and breadth of Jamaica; at the Haile Selassie School and Sam Sharpe Square where people are gathered and, indeed, in many parts of the world where Jamaicans are joining us via the Internet.

I come to the Office of Prime Minister with a profound sense of my obligation to the people. Only with the help of Almighty God can I carry this weight of trust and hope that is placed on my shoulders. I will not betray this trust and I will keep hope alive.

All across Jamaica there is this hope, this positive expectancy, this hunger to believe that a new day is dawning. You can almost touch it. It is not an expectation that anyone individual can fulfill, but together we can make it.

My role as Prime Minister of Jamaica will be to use this high office to facilitate change. Today, I want to commit myself to certain goals.

The first pledge to the Jamaican people is to advance human rights and individual liberty. Each individual life is sacred. None is more important than the other. Money should not make one person more important than the other. Learning should not make one person more important than the other, nor should class, colour or gender. We are all equal in the sight of God.

While the state has a responsibility to protect the society as a whole, it must never, in the execution of that responsibility, sacrifice individual liberty. We cannot build the harmony and peace that this society so desperately needs unless all Jamaicans know that they will be treated with dignity and respect.

We need to recapture our roots: the courtesy, the decency, the good manners and trust which were routinely practised. We need to rekindle those tested and proven values. We must practice them ourselves and demand them from others. I want to continue to lead a process for the recovery and promotion of our best values.

I want to pledge to the Jamaican people to work tirelessly to eradicate corruption and extortion. I am committed to their eradication as I am committed to uplifting the poor.

I pledge to do everything in my power—with the help of the Almighty and your support to break the power of the criminals. I will be working closely with the Minister of National Security, the Law Enforcement Officers, the Opposition and our 780 identified communities to successfully tackle this problem, in the interest of all Jamaicans, including those in the Diaspora who want to see a peaceful Jamaica.

Closely aligned to eliminating criminality and restoring power to communities, is the creation of employment and wealth-earning opportunities for people. Jamaicans do extremely well when given the opportunity. I believe that if we create the right conditions for people to flourish; if as government we see ourselves as facilitators, then we will experience the unleashing of the Jamaican creative spirit that can move this country forward.

I pledge to the Jamaican people to foster and facilitate the conditions for employment opportunities and wealth creation.

I want to say directly to the private sector both here and overseas that we treasure the gains which have been made through our macro-economic policy and international credibility. It is our intention to build on these hard-won gains of pain and sacrifice.

At the same time, we have to find the way while balancing the books to balance people's lives. Indeed, both the World Bank and the IMF have recognized the need for policies which promote equity and poverty alleviation.

We must find a way to expand opportunities for all Jamaicans so that they can share the fruits of macro-economic stability. When we think of the achievements of our sports men and women, of our musicians and others in the cultural field, they tell us that together we can make it.

Let me recognize the presence today of our athletes, who represented Jamaica at the recent Commonwealth Games in Melbourne, Australia. They earned a record 22 medals, including 10 gold.

Thank you for adding golden value to brand Jamaica. We are proud of you. You are an example to all of us. We can use your determination, strength, courage, discipline, perseverance, loyalty to country and pride in being Jamaican as motivation to work together for the advancement of our country.

As I said before, together we can make it.

I have an abiding faith and confidence in the Jamaican people. They believe in me and I passionately believe in them.

Critical to this matter of entrepreneurship, employment expansion and wealth-creation, is education. We will only become a first-class, competitive society if we are an educated, knowledge-based society. We have to build on the progress already made and intensify our drive to transform Jamaica's education system.

Our ability to attract quality foreign direct investments is directly dependent on the quality of our human capital. There can be no economic transformation without educational transformation. I pledge to the people an unyielding commitment to education, including programmes in character education to build a society committed to the highest ethical principles.

In this regard, we as political leaders have to set the example. I have had the finest teacher possible in this matter of consensus-building and respect for differences of opinion. I refer to none other than our esteemed former Prime Minister, the Most Hon. P. J. Patterson, to whom I owe a great debt of gratitude.

I must thank him for his fourteen years of service as Prime Minister of Jamaica. His loyalty and commitment to country, his passion for service, his civility and ability to achieve consensus make him unforgettable. As a team builder, he has shown us that together we can make it.

I want to build on his legacy of cooperation. I consider it my duty not only to protect, but to build on the legacies of all my predecessors in the continuing process of nation building. I recognize today the presence of the Most Hon. Edward Seaga, former Prime Minister of Jamaica, and thank him for his contribution to the development of our country.

I pledge to ensure that the interests of all our people are protected and that victimization never rears its ugly head in any way under my administration. Unity is a prerequisite for success in Jamaica and is very high on my list of priorities.

I say to the Opposition, let us launch a new era of cooperation. Let us work together in the interest of all Jamaicans. Let us put the people's hopes and aspirations before our own interests.

A more united, engaged, and spiritually strong nation will provide a good foundation for dynamic integration in the Caribbean Community. Jamaica's commitment to and active involvement in Caricom, has been steadfast and this will continue and, indeed, be expanded during my tenure. In that regard, I am happy and encouraged by the presence of so many of my CARICOM colleagues today. I am also pleased to note the presence of a large delegation from the United States Congress. Our active involvement in the international community will continue, because Jamaica is respected for its enviable tradition of leadership among developing countries. We will maintain respectful and harmonious relations with all states and will work with both the developed and developing nations to build a world of peace, justice and a better quality of life. We will continue to remind the international community that security considerations cannot be divorced from development, and that poverty is the greatest threat to security.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is nothing that can withstand the force of an energized, confident, united, determined and visionary people. The Bible says without vision the people perish. If we embrace one vision—not a PNP or JLP vision, not an uptown or a downtown vision, not an urban or rural vision but one Jamaican vision; then we will deal with our challenges as a nation. Together we can make it.

I pledge to the Jamaican people to lead that process. I cannot do it alone. Together we can make it. I want to build a partnership with the Jamaican people. A partnership which will involve the recognition that we all have a responsibility to lift up the poor and the downtrodden; A partnership which will see us giving greater respect to the rights and dignity of the persons with disabilities; A partnership to restore the centrality of family life in Jamaica; A partnership for responsible fatherhood, motherhood and responsible sexual behaviour; A partnership for love, honour and protection of our women; A partnership for love, honour and respect for our men; A partnership for the protection and nurturing of our children, who represent the future and which recognizes that children are the torchbearers of all the good that we must pass on to posterity; A partnership to provide access to quality education for all our children; A partnership for the empowerment of youths through education, training and economic opportunities; A partnership for the development of our communities, for strengthening democratic governance and for truly giving a voice to all the people. A partnership to eradicate crime and drive the criminals from our communities; A partnership to deepen the involvement of Jamaicans in the Diaspora; A partnership in the building of a harmonious, prosperous and vibrant Jamaica, committed to making the Jamaican Dream accessible to every single Jamaican; Together we can make it. A partnership where we recognize that God is supreme. I call upon all Jamaicans to join those who will worship on Friday, Saturday or Sunday to pray for the prosperity of our country and peace in the nation. In these partnerships, I pledge to be accountable to you, the people of Jamaica. I am and will remain your servant. Together we will make it.

Today is not only my day. It is Jamaica's day. Indeed, it is the day that the Lord has made. Let us rejoice and be glad in it, for we are His People.

Eternal Father, bless our land, Guard us with thy Mighty Hand.

HONORING HOLLIS BRASHEAR

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Hollis Brashear and his 14 years of outstanding service as Trustee to the Dallas Independent School District. His commitment to the students of Dallas ISD is to be commended. During his many years on the Board of Trustees, Hollis Brashear served as Chairman to multiple committees, vice-president and president.

Mr. Brashear has always had a special connection to Dallas ISD and the students, as he was a graduate of Dallas ISD's Lincoln High School. He then went on to earn his bachelor's degree in civil engineering from Prairie View A&M University and his master's from Oklahoma State University.

In addition to his academic accomplishments, Hollis Brashear went on to serve a notable 21 years in the military where he was awarded two bronze stars during the Vietnam War.

Through his military service and outstanding academic and professional credentials, Hollis Brashear led the way towards improvement and change at Dallas ISD. His dignified dedication to the children, teachers, parents and administrators has made an immeasurable impact on the lives of Dallas ISD students.

I commend Mr. Brashear on his 14 years of exceptional service and wish him all the best on his retirement in the years ahead.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HENRY E. BROWN, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am writing to notify you that I was absent on the evening of June 19, 2006 for votes. The reason for my absence was that the flight from Charleston, SC, was delayed due to a severe storm over the Washington, DC, area. I had no control over this issue and I did not arrive into Washington DC until late in the evening of June 19, 2006.

Regarding the votes that I missed, please see below for the way that I would have voted had I been present:

Vote No. 288—Declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary—"aye";

Vote No. 289—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 217 Southeast 2nd Street in Dimmitt, Texas, as the Sergeant Jacob Dan Dones Post Office—"aye";

Vote No. 290—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6029 Broadmoor Street in Mission, Kansas, as the Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building—"aye"; and

Vote No. 291—Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Young Sports Week should be established—"aye."

INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS ARE KEY IN THE FIGHT AGAINST HIV/AIDS IN THE CARIBBEAN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the necessity of worldwide cooperation in the battle against HIV/AIDS in the Caribbean. Today, the Caribbean nations rank only second to sub-Sahara Africa in prevalence of the HIV virus. However, some countries in the region also have some of the highest per capita incomes among developing countries, which make these countries ineligible for foreign assistance.

I would like to submit an article for the RECORD from the June 13th issue of CaribNews entitled CARICOM's Need for Universal Access in HIV/AIDS Fight. In this article, author Tony Best describes the dilemma that many Caribbean countries face when attempting to secure aid for HIV/AIDS programs while possessing high per capita income, thus disqualifying them as priority recipients.

The article is based on an address made by CARICOM's lead spokesman on health, Dr. Denzil Douglas' address to a special United Nations High Level meeting on HIV/AIDS. In this address, Dr. Douglas expressed his concern on behalf of the Caribbean community about the criteria established by the international donor community regarding financial support for programs to reduce HIV/AIDS in the region. The main criterion of concern is that the international donor community will not grant middle income nations, such as those in the Caribbean, to collect grants for HIV/AIDS programs. Instead, these countries must apply for loans if they wish to obtain some support. Furthermore, the only way that a middle income country can become eligible for aid is if their HIV prevalence rate rises above five percent.

Dr. Douglas opined that this requirement of five percent prevalence rate will only hinder in a successful fight against HIV/AIDS due to the fact that the time wasted in waiting for the five percent mark to be recorded will allow the disease to advance so far that the economic and social costs may be unbearable at that point. For the moment, some countries in the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), and other groups such as the Clinton Foundation and Global Fund have provided some aid to these countries. However, this aid has only resulted in the expansion of retroviral coverage for already infected persons.

Thus, the Caribbean region still lags behind in any progress in prevention of HIV incidence. The area has not been able to decrease the number of new cases of HIV, and so CARICOM feels that a social system based on an integrated network of services such as prevention, diagnosis and treatment can provide the best medium for prevailing in the fight against HIV/AIDS.

The global community is a vital player in helping create this visionary system of social services. By agreeing to provide aid despite of per capita income, international authorities can further strengthen the partnerships they have with the Caribbean nations and be of utmost benefit in the defeat of HIV/AIDS, not just in the Caribbean, but worldwide. After all, a united effort will prove to be much more successful than minor individual efforts striving towards a common goal.

[From the Carib News, June 13, 2006]

CARICOM'S NEED FOR UNIVERSAL ACCESS IN HIV/AIDS FIGHT

(By Tony Best)

Dr. Denzil Douglas, CARICOM's lead spokesman on Health, has called on the international community to make it easier for middle-income Caribbean nations to boost the level of care provided to victims of the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

In an address to a special United Nations High Level meeting on HIV/AIDS and in a session with Carib News Editorial Board on Monday morning Dr. Douglas, St. Kitts-Nevis' Prime Minister appealed for a new that would enable donor agencies and institutions to provide help to the region hard hit by HIV/AIDS virus. Many of the countries, he said, were being forced to bear the brunt of the financial burden of providing care to HIV sufferers and information to the general public about the dangers of the disease.

"We are concerned about the criteria established by the international donor community with regard to access to financing for fighting HIV/AIDS," he told Carib news editors and community leaders, including Yvonne Graham, Brooklyn Borough President, Michael Flanigan, Citibank Community Relations Director, and Leyland Hazelwood, an international business executive.

"One of the important criteria is that it (international donor community) will not allow middle income countries to have grants," he pointed out. "Rather, you have to go through the process of loans. Also unless the prevalence rates get beyond five per cent, you are not going to be able to access the financing that is required."

The trouble is that although the Caribbean region may have some of the highest per capita incomes among developing countries, the countries collectively are second only to subSahara Africa when it comes to the prevalence of the HIV virus. But their rates of infection are below the five per cent threshold. Hence they are ineligible for assistance.

"I made the point to the General Assembly of the United Nations that if we are going to wait until we get to five per cent, what is the point," he said. "It is almost foolhardy to wait until the disease has reached a certain level in the population to give us the required assistance. We need the assistance now so that we don't reach there."

Dr. Douglas, himself a physician, said that if the countries were forced to wait until the five per cent mark was recorded, then they would be faced with unthinkable economic and social consequences.

"If we wait for that stage with our small populations in the region, it can have very, very serious setbacks in the development of the Caribbean, especially in view of the gains we have recorded in the last few years," he asserted.

The Prime Minister pointed out that several Caribbean countries, especially those in the OECS, Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, were receiving help from Brazil in the form of free medication for HIV sufferers while the Clinton Foundation and Global Fund had "come on board with assistance."

As a result, states had been able to slow down the growth in the incidence of the virus, cut the number of deaths and slash mother to child transmission of the virus. "More still remains to be done and must be done," he said.

Caricom nations are aiming for "harmonized international partnership" that

would result in an acceleration of care during the next 15 years.

Dr. Douglas' appeals to the international community were designed to ''sustain the harmonized partnership'' and expand care and the dissemination of information, he explained.

''By 2010, we are hoping that our health and social system would form the basis of an improved and integrated network of services, from prevention, diagnosis and treatment to care and support,'' he added. ''The main issue is how we can we sustain the services that we have put in place to prevent and manage the disease. That is a concern.''

A major hurdle in the Caribbean centers on ''the issue of prevention,'' he pointed out. ''We have not been able to scale back the number of new cases that are occurring in the Caribbean region,'' he said. ''While we have been able to manage those who have the disease in terms of providing the necessary anti-retroviral drugs we have not succeeded on the issue of prevention. We believe that if we are to scale back the prevalence we must be able to prevent its spread.''

RECOGNITION OF STUDENTS FROM WEST PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL'S ACADEMY OF AUTOMOTIVE AND MECHANICAL ENGINEERING FOR THEIR SECOND CONSECUTIVE CHAMPIONSHIP IN THE TOUR DE SOL

HON. CHAKA FATTAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the West Philadelphia High School's Academy for Automotive and Mechanical Engineering for winning their second Tour de Sol Championship.

The National 2006 Tour de Sol, a nationwide competition, allows students and entrepreneurs to showcase their efforts to design vehicles that approach zero climate change emissions and reduce oil use. The Tour de Sol highlights the largest innovations in alternative-energy technology and advanced fuel vehicles, showcasing the future of the clean-energy and transportation industries. The cars are put through rigorous tests to assess emissions, fuel economy, and other technical standards.

The Tour de Sol provides a key platform for vehicle manufacturers, students, and entrepreneurs to demonstrate future designs and current products that aim to reduce oil use and climate change emissions to near zero. This year, over 50 teams from all over the world participated in the Tour de Sol Championship, which began in 1989. The competition aims to inspire students and businesses to design, build, showcase, and use concept vehicles that push the envelope and work toward the ultimate goal of the event.

The winner of the coveted ''Student Hybrid and Alternative Fuel Division'' was awarded to one of the only high school teams to enter the competition, West Philadelphia High School's Academy for Automotive and Mechanical Engineering, for their Hybrid biodiesel electric car called The Attack. The team beat university and private teams from around the country for developing a vehicle that demonstrates high energy efficiency. The Attack ran the equivalent of 50 miles per gallon of gasoline.

I salute the students, faculty and team sponsors who worked tirelessly over the past 2 years to construct a hybrid vehicle that efficiently uses gas to create a cleaner environment. I applaud their efforts and congratulate them on a winning design that makes all Philadelphians proud.

INTRODUCTION OF THE RENEWABLE FUELS AND ENERGY INDEPENDENCE PROMOTION ACT

HON. KENNY C. HULSHOF

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, today, my colleague EARL POMEROY of North Dakota and I are introducing the Renewable Fuels and Energy Independence Promotion Act. We are joined by a bipartisan group of original cosponsors, a complete list of which follows this statement.

Rising fuel prices have again focused the public's attention on our nation's energy situation. Gas is at or near $3 a gallon across the country. We are importing over 60% of the oil we use, and this number is expected to grow to over 70% by 2025. In addition to our own increased domestic demand for energy, there is instability in oil-producing areas of the world, and demand for petroleum from China and India will continue to apply upward pressures on the price of oil.

Perhaps the one point in the energy debate that garners agreement from both sides of the aisle is that federal policy should strive to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. And though there may be ideological differences about how to achieve this end, there is broad, bipartisan consensus that domestically produced renewable fuels must play an integral role in a plan to promote energy independence.

Consistent with this common sense premise, we are introducing the Renewable Fuels and Energy Independence Promotion Act. This legislation will provide a permanent extension of the Tax Code's primary renewable fuels tax incentives for ethanol and biodiesel. The idea is to provide a single legislative vehicle for members to show their support of renewable tax incentives and to support a policy that sees a public good in reducing our dependence on foreign oil by boosting our energy independence.

If renewable fuels are to displace significant amounts of petroleum as transportation fuel, we must take bold, aggressive steps to achieve this end. History has demonstrated that the federal ethanol tax incentive has accomplished exactly what it is designed to do—promote the production and use of alcohol fuels. The numbers don't lie:

According to the Renewable Fuels Association, the United States produced 175 gallons of alcohol fuels in the year 1980. Today, we have an industry with a 4.817 billion gallon production capacity, and another 2.122 billion gallons of production capacity is currently under construction.

These numbers prove the tax incentive is working. Previous Congresses and Presidents—both Republican and Democrat—have recognized the benefits from replacing petroleum products with domestically produced renewable fuels. Long-term, consistent, and bipartisan support of ethanol tax incentives have yielded positive results that are helping reduce our dependence on foreign oil. As production increases and new technologies—such as cellulosic ethanol production—are perfected, renewable fuels will play an even greater role in our economy. History has shown us that the tax incentive works, and a long-term commitment to a federal policy that supports renewable fuels will help provide stability and promote growth for those working to expand the use of ethanol in the United States.

Congress should also strongly support efforts to promote biodiesel. Biodiesel is a clean-burning, renewable fuel that can be produced from a variety of feedstocks, including soybeans. It can be blended with diesel fuel and burned in conventional diesel engines without modification to the engine.

From a policy perspective, biodiesel shares many of the positive characteristics of ethanol. It is environmentally friendly and produced from renewable sources. Its production helps promote economic growth and opportunities in value-added agriculture. And most importantly, expanded use of biodiesel will help make America more energy independent by displacing petroleum products with a renewable fuel source.

Though there are distinct differences between biodiesel and ethanol, the situation facing the biodiesel industry today resembles the challenges facing ethanol industry upon its inception. I think we can replicate ethanol's success with biodiesel. If federal policy can increase demand and spur the development of the infrastructure required to utilize biodiesel, the nation as a whole will reap the benefits.

The current tax incentive took effect in 2005, and is currently set to expire after 2008. And though things are going well for the industry, and the market is beginning to embrace the fuel, there is more work that must be done. Federal policy should create an atmosphere that rewards entrepreneurs for investing their time and resources to build the production facilities and distribution systems needed to bring biodiesel to market. Providing certainty to the markets and to the industry will help further this progress, and federal policy can help provide this certainty through a long-term extension of the biodiesel tax incentive.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting a strong federal commitment to the development of renewable fuels.

Original Cosponsors, Renewable Fuels and Energy Independence Promotion Act: Pomery, Nussle, Peterson, Shimkus, Terry, Boswell, Osborne, Emanuel, Moran (KS), Salazar, Moore (KS), and Herseth.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD W. POMBO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on June 19, 2006 on the House floor. I take responsibility to vote very seriously and would like my intentions included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall 289 for H.R. 5540, which designates the facility of the United States Postal

Service located at 217 Southeast 2nd Street in Dimmitt, Texas, as the Sergeant Jacob Dan Dones Post Office; ''yea'' on rollcall 290 for H.R. 5504, which designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6029 Broadmoor Street in Mission, Kansas, as the Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building; and ''yea'' on rollcall 291 for H. Res. 826, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Youth Sports Week should be established.

STAY THE COURSE? WHAT COURSE?

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into the record a column by Eugene Robinson entitled Stay the Course? What Course? appearing in The Washington Post Friday, June 16, 2006.

Mr. Robinson asks this question more than 3 years after the preemptive invasion of Iraq on false pretenses. I too ask this question as do many of my fellow Americans and my Democratic colleagues in the House of Representatives. The President and House Republican leadership have no answer as the so-called ''debate'' on the Global War on Terror on June 15th in the House proved.

For 10 long hours, those who listened to the speeches from the Republicans from the floor of the House heard unremitting propaganda with 1983 bomb attacks, the 1988 bombing over Lockerbie Scotland, the first attack on the World Trade Towers, the bombing of the United States embassies in Africa, and over and over again the about the terror attacks by al-Qaeda on 9/11.

Not only was a plan for an end of the Iraq war not mentioned all cited these attacks which were cited had nothing to do with Iraq. They had not even a de minimums connection with Iraq or even with the present situation in which we find ourselves. These reminders of past acts of al-Qaeda were merely a piling on of the non-existent connection between al-Qaeda and Iraq. So, instead of a plan for bringing our soldiers home from Iraq, the Republicans continued in their unrelenting propaganda answering no genuine questions the American people want answered.

I am tired of hearing about ''free democratic elections'' in Iraq and the school houses our troops have painted. We did not go to war to set up free elections in Iraq. I am also tired of hearing how grateful our gravely wounded troops are to have had their legs blown off for the freedom of our country. Republicans should be embarrassed to repeat those stories.

Those are not good stories. I wanted to hear the Republican plan to make sure no one else has to lose their legs and their arms and their sight for my ''freedom.'' My freedom is threatened by the PATRIOT Act and a President who believes he can violate the Fourth Amendment at will. My freedom was never threatened by Saddam Hussein.

I am also hearing from the party of the endless war in Iraq that the Democrats have no plan. The Democrats made it clear yesterday in our statements last week that the House Democrats' plan is the Murtha Resolution. It was also made clear that the Republicans are afraid to hear a Democratic plan by the Republican majority voting for a Rule for the ''debate'' that did not allow any amendments to the Resolution by the Democrats. The Republican Leadership made this the Rule for the ''debate and pushed it through ignoring the democracy they so applaud when the Iraqis show any faint signs of achieving it.

Eugene Robinson wrote in the Post: ''Fresh from his triumphal visit to Baghdad—a place so dangerous he had to sneak in without even telling the Iraq prime minister—George W. Bush is full of new resolve to stay the course in his open-ended ''war on terror. That leaves the rest of us to wonder, in sadness and frustration, just what that course might be and where on earth it can possibly lead.''

Thirty-seven months since the President declared the ''end of major combat'' in Iraq he has given the American people platitudes, rhetoric, slogans, or worse, fear of an ''evil ideology'' and ''evil doers.'' But he has given us no real plan, not even a hint of a plan for the conduct of the war, the reconstruction of the Iraq, the plan to begin the withdrawal of American troops or the metrics by which we can define ''victory'' in Iraq.

George W. Bush wanted to be a ''war president'' and whatever acts and whatever lies it took, he became a war president. Now it is apparent he will stay a war president no matter what the American people want. He plainly said the next president would have to find an exit plan so our men and women can finally come home from Iraq.

But Bush's war and his need to be a war president have serious consequences. Some of these are pointed out by Eugene Robinson; ''Three desperate suicides at Guantánamo is answered by Rear Adm. Harry Harris's all-about-me lament—'' I believe this . . . was an act of asymmetrical warfare waged against us.'' He wrote: ''This is a 'war' in which the United States drops two 500-pound bombs with the express intent of assassinating Abu Musab al Zarqawi the leader of al-Qaeda in Iraq, a group that wouldn't have existed if Bush hadn't decided to invade.'' If Iraqi civilians are killed in a bomb attack such as the one on the Zarqawi safe house we did not say we were sorry about those civilians. Zarqawi was a ''high value target.'' We said we are sorry that a ''few bad apples'' did bad things at Abu Ghraib prison. Or pardon us if a few soldiers killed civilians in cold blood, but after all we are at war.

Mr. Robinson wrote that if the Iraqi government does pardon Iraqis who have killed Americans we will have taught them well. ''They'll be saying 'pardon me' just like their American tutors.''

Mr. Robinson reminds us that the jhadists of today were forged fighting Russians in Afghanistan. The next generation are being forged today fighting Americans in Iraq. He also reminds us that Iraq is just one theater in Bush's war. He writes: ''Afghanistan is once again 'ablaze' with counterattacks by Taliban.''

Mr. Robinson is right: ''American's popularity in the world continues to fall. But George W. Bush forges ahead, trying vainly to kill a poisonous retrograde ideology with bullets and bombs. His 'war' is self-perpetuating, and no one even knows what victory would look like. Long after he's gone, we'll still be looking for a way to end the mess he began.''

EXPLANATION OF LEAVE OF ABSENCE

HON. JOHN CAMPBELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 19, I was in California attending my son's graduation from high school. I arranged ahead of time to be granted an official leave of absence from the House on Monday, June 19th. Through a misunderstanding, I was granted a leave for the entire week. I want the House to know that I am present and voting on Tuesday, June 20th and the balance of the week.

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on Keeping the Flame of Hope Alive.

Throughout their long and daunting journey from oppression and persecution to asylum and protection, and eventually to a place they can call home, refugees show incredible strength, courage and determination. Their journey is a dangerous and arduous one and every day spent in exile is a day too long.

But in every step of their journey refugees carry with them an unshakable, unrelenting hope. By hanging on to their hopes for basic survival, sustenance and protection, and for the chance to one day rebuild their lives, refugees defy all odds. The U.N. Refugee Agency must continue to be impressed by the tenacious hopefulness of refugees which, in turn, motivates us to leave no stone unturned in the fulfillment of our mandate, to protect them and to find durable solutions to their plight.

On World Refugee Day, we ask you to remember the millions of refugees under U.N. care who are trying to pick up the pieces of once-peaceful lives. As different as they are from each other, one thing connects them all: hope for a better future and a chance to restore lasting peace to their lives.

Help us keep that flame of hope alive!

Latest Statistics: 20.8 million

Latest statistics indicate that of the 20.8 million people of concern:

8.4 million are refugees who have fled their countries due to civil wars and ethnic, tribal and religious violence and who cannot return home

6.6 million are internally displaced persons—people forced to flee their homes, but who have not crossed a border

2.4 million are stateless people

1.6 million are returnees

773,000 are asylum seekers

960,000 are others of concern

RECOGNIZING PAUL JENSON FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Paul Jenson, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 495, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Paul has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Paul has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Paul Jenson for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN HONOR OF THE 112TH ANNUAL BALL OF THE MONDAY CLUB

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Monday Club as it celebrates its 112th anniversary of serving the Delaware community. The Club was incorporated in 1893 for the promotion of the moral and intellectual welfare of its members.

The Monday Club is a male leisure organization, and the oldest chartered African American organization in the State. Early members of the Club consisted of butlers, waiters, coachmen, cooks, and janitors who encompassed the economic, social and religious life in the community. Later, the Club expanded to include businessmen, politicians, men working in industry, as well as workers and laborers of all skills in every area of Delaware's economy.

Through the years, the Monday Club has developed into more than just a social club. In fact, due to its members' strong community ties, the Monday Club has contributed to many local churches, individuals and charities. In doing so, the Monday Club provides support for numerous charitable organizations in Delaware and has established scholarship funds for students, such as the Dr. Woodrow Wilson/Senator Herman H. Holloway Scholarship Fund, which awards four $1,000 scholarships to graduating high school seniors planning to attend college each year.

I congratulate the Monday Club for reaching this extraordinary milestone. The dedication of its members to the community enhances the quality of life for many Delawareans and provides opportunities for children across the State. I would like to thank the Monday Club for their valuable impact on Delaware.

IN MEMORY OF PFC STEPHEN M. LASHINSKY (UNITED STATES ARMY) AND SGT JAMES F. FORDYCE (UNITED STATES MARINES)

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, without exception, each of us who has the honor of serving in Congress does not have to look far from home for our American heroes. In my 7th Congressional District, the Newtown Township Supervisors recently hosted a ceremony at their June 12 meeting to recognize the sacrifice of two mothers whose sons were killed in action. The fallen soldiers come from different generations but are forever united in spirit as they join all who have given their lives serving in our Armed Forces to preserve our rights and freedoms. Every person who dies in the line of duty commands the eternal gratitude of the American people.

PFC Stephen M. Lashinsky was killed while serving in Vietnam and SGT Jimmy Fordyce died along with ten other marines in a helicopter crash off the east coast of Africa in February 2006. Both PFC Stephen Lashinsky and SGT Fordyce joined the military with a strong desire to serve and protect our country. In doing so, they made that incredible commitment, putting their lives on the line to accomplish their mission. It is because of soldiers like PFC Stephen M. Lashinsky and SGT Jimmy Fordyce that our country remains free today. We must commit to remembering forever their lives and valiant sacrifices.

Our thoughts and prayers are with our fallen service men and women and their families. May God bless them and all Americans serving with honor today.

IT'S TIME FOR CONGRESS TO OPEN ITS DOORS TO MORE DIVERSITY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column in the Stirring the Pot segment of the June 20, 2006 edition of the Rollcall periodical newspaper and an article from the June 2006 edition of DiversityInc.

The column, entitled "It's Time for Congress To Open Its Doors to More Diversity" is authored by Donna Brazile, political strategist, former congressional chief-of-staff, and Chair of the Democratic National Committee's Voting Rights Institute (VRI). The article, entitled, "Who Is Worst for Diversity? The United States Senate", is authored by C. Stone Brown and Mark Lowery.

Donna Brazile captures your attention by stating that "one of the hottest and most illuminating stories to hit the newsstands last week discussed the lack of diversity in the Senate." She goes on to address the content of that news story written by C. Stone Brown and Mark Lowery of DiversityInc. Brown and Lowery reported that equal opportunity is sorely missing in action in the Senate.

The articles point out that there is one black, three Hispanic, two Asian Americans and fourteen women Senators. This membership does not represent a good cross-section of the Country.

While Ms. Brazile's article encourages the Senate to establish a process to open doors to qualified candidates of colors and women it does not exclude the House of Representatives. Take a look at the number of minority chiefs-of-staff and legislative directors for members outside of the Congressional Black Caucus or the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Brown, Lowery and Brazile reveal thought provoking data and information that relates to the issue of diversity in staffing in the Senate and the House. They cleverly summarize the issue by quoting a leading diversity consultant who states if change is to come to diversity in placement of key Congressional positions . . . "It has to start at the top, with the CEO (Senator), and be made a priority with some accountability."

Mr. Speaker, I enter this article with the hope that it will impress upon the legislative body the need for sensitivity in including people of color and women in the "pool" from which future personnel is chosen.

[From the Rollcall, June 20, 2006]

IT'S TIME FOR CONGRESS TO OPEN ITS DOORS TO MORE DIVERSITY

(By Donna Brazile)

One of the hottest and most illuminating stories to hit the newsstands last week discussed the lack of diversity in the Senate. In their cover story, DiversityInc writers C. Stone Brown and Mark Lowery discovered that when it comes to "equal opportunity," the Senate is sorely missing in action.

With only one black, three Hispanic, two Asian Americans and 14 women Senators, the chamber's membership isn't exactly a good cross-section of the Nation. And furthering that problem, the reporters write, their review of "people of color" serving in Senate offices and committees found that senior positions such as chief of staff, legislative director, counsel and even communications director are "practically reserves for white men and women."

As a former chief of staff and press secretary for Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D–D.C.), I believe it's time the Senate makes diversity in its ranks a major priority.

This investigative report is worth reading because it takes on both major political parties for their lack of significant progress in bringing more diversity to one of the most powerful institutions in America. According to DiversityInc's investigation, of the 1,000 senior-level staffers, about "7.6 percent are people of color." The report then breaks that down even further: "2.9 percent are Black, 2.8 percent are Asian American and 1.9 percent are Latino." Given the multitude of issues and concerns the Senate addresses each year, it's time every Member take a look inside his or her own office to see if any changes should be made and to figure out a process to open the doors to qualified candidates.

(And the House of Representatives should do so, as well. How many minorities are chiefs of staff or legislative directors for Members outside of the Congressional Black Caucus or the Congressional Hispanic Caucus?)

When the reporters tried to obtain this important data from some Senate offices, they were greeted with no responses. (The report indicated that repeated calls were made to the Sen. John McCain (R–Ariz.), Majority Leader Bill Frist (R–Tenn.) and even Sen.

Hillary Rodham Clinton (D–N.Y.), but to no avail.) Since most Senators refuse to acknowledge or even discuss this matter, I am sure out of embarrassment, let me do what any former Congressional staffer would do and offer some useful advice in correcting this problem and perception.

First, I would take Paul Thornell's advice to urge Senators to ''widen their networks.'' Thornell, a one-time colleague from my days working with Al Gore and a former Senate staffer, said he believes Senators ''can start by committing to interview at least one qualified minority candidate anytime there is an opening at mid and senior level.'' He stated that ''this is the same approach used by the National Football League to hiring head coaches. If they aren't interviewing qualified minority candidates, that guarantees they won't hire them.''

Bottom line, as a leading diversity consultant who works with Fortune 500 companies explained to me: It has to start at the top, with the CEO (Senator), and be made a priority with some accountability.

Thornell also suggests that the Senate should hire a diversity consultant to advise them on how best to remedy this problem. When Texaco, Coca Cola, Wal-Mart, Denny's or any of the countless other companies that have had problems with diversity issues tried to solve them, did their CEOs just call their peers and ask what to do? No, they hired someone with expertise to give them counsel based on their experience to help them improve on issues surrounding diversity.

When I first came to Capitol Hill right out of college, I started as an intern in the office of the late Rep. Gillis Long (D-La.). I so enjoyed being on the Hill and didn't mind sitting at the front desk or running errands (delivering ''Dear Colleague'' letters, etc.) for months because I knew once I was in the door, I could move up the ladder. Today, there is such a gap in the Senate between entry-level positions and senior-level slots (legislative assistant up to chief of staff) that even a strong and competent person who starts as a staff assistant realistically is not going to be considered for a LA position for years and rarely, if ever, for chief of staff.

Such evidence suggests that promoting internships as the sole solution is not going to attack the problem. The difference in the House is you can begin as a staff assistant right out of college, the offices are smaller and there are more opportunities in the House. So, you can get on a track that accelerates your career path. Some Senate offices will tell their entry-level staff right away that they won't get promoted to LA from the position of staff assistant.

Senators, it's time for some introspection and a deep look at the picture you're sending to others you tell to ''clean up their act.'' It's time for a little bit of humility and some sensitivity to make sure that people of color and women are included in the ''pool'' from which future personnel are chosen. Just remember: We, too, are Americans. We bring a different, and often unique, perspective to the debate, whether it's on privatizing Social Security or predatory lending practices and their impact on communities of color. And many of us would like to have a seat—or even a folding chair—at the table when policies that impact our communities, as well as our Nation, are being brought up on the floor.

Just remember, like that of former President Bill Clinton, President Bush's Cabinet looks like America. Why should Senate offices look or behave differently?

RECOGNIZING ALEX DAVENPORT FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Alex Davenport, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Alex has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Alex has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Alex Davenport for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO RAY SUTHERLAND

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that a long and exceptionally distinguished career in education has come to a close. Ray Sutherland retired from his position after 31 years last spring.

A graduate from Central Missouri State University, Mr. Sutherland has been highly respected in his many years of teaching and administrative duties.

Mr. Sutherland is well known for his sense of humor and ability to maintain good relationships with all of his students. During his career, he was admired by his students and has treated all before him with the same sense of justice and respect.

In 1971, Mr. Sutherland graduated from Higginsville High School. After graduating from Central Missouri State University in 1975, he began teaching Industrial Arts at Higginsville High School. In 1990, he was named Principal of Lafayette County C–1 Middle School.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Ray Sutherland all the best as he moves on to the next step in his life. I know the Members of the House will join me in wishing him all the best in the days ahead.

COMMEMORATING THE LAUNCHING OF THE WORLD HARMONY FOUNDATION'S GLOBAL RECYCLING FOR PEACE AND HARMONY PROGRAM TO CREATE HARMONY BELLS FOR PEACE

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the World Harmony Foundation and the launching of their Global Recycling for Peace and Harmony program to create Harmony Bells for Peace.

The World Harmony Foundation is dedicated to building cultures of peace with sustainable environments. Through their Global Leadership Initiatives with Global Recycling for Peace and Harmony program they will bring together heads of state, parliamentarians, mayors, and community leaders with students and educators worldwide to work in partnership in building cultures of peace for generations to come.

The first Harmony Bell for Peace, which is here today on Capitol Hill to be rung for peace, was at the United Nations for its 60th anniversary ceremony and celebration on October 24, 2005, in honor of the theme ''A Time for Renewal.'' Secretary General Kofi Annan was the first person to officially ring the Harmony Bell during the ceremony followed by His Excellency Mr. Jan Eliasson. The Harmony Bell for Peace can be rung by all people from all walks of life that make their commitments to building cultures of peace with sustainable environments for all. A moment of silence will be held today when the bell is rung.

The World Harmony Foundation designed the Harmony Bell for Peace with the word ''Harmony'' appearing around the center in the six official languages of the United Nations with elements of nature. This first Harmony Bell was made with ammunition donated by the Chinese military and recycled scrap metal collected and donated by school children.

Future Harmony Bells for Peace will be made from metal and decommissioned shredded guns donated by heads of state, parliamentarians, mayors, and community leaders who are making their own commitments to peace. These materials will be combined with the recycled scrap metal collected and donated by students in schools around the world that also have curriculums on peace and environmental studies to the Global Recycling for Peace and Harmony program of the World Harmony Foundation.

The Harmony Bells for Peace created from this program will travel as Ambassadors of Peace and inspire people in communities around the world. Later, they will be donated to schools, civic centers, and hospitals.

I thank Mr. Frank Liu, President of the World Harmony Foundation and Ms. Margo LaZaro, CEO of the World Harmony Foundation, for creating this program. I also want to thank all of their sponsors and supporters for encouraging and supporting this important organization and the valuable contributions that they are making to the global community for peace and Harmony for all people.

I congratulate the World Harmony Foundation on this Global Leadership Initiative for Peace and Harmony. Today, as we ring the Harmony Bell for Peace to launch the World Harmony Foundation's Global Recycling for Peace and Harmony program, I encourage my colleagues to work for peace and celebrate this remarkable effort. I would like to thank all those responsible for bringing the Harmony Bell for Peace to Capitol Hill today.

Generations to come will have Harmony Bells for Peace in their communities because of the contributions the World Harmony Foundation is making to the world.

TRIBUTE TO ESSAY WINNER, MR. SEAN DOHERTY

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, every year in my district, I ask students in grades 8th and 12th to participate in an essay contest. This year's contest focused on the issue of protecting our nation from terrorism.

I am pleased that so many students chose to enter this essay contest. Unfortunately, however, there can only be one winner in each group: 8th grade and 12th grade. This year's 8th grade winner was Sean Doherty from Elmhurst, Illinois. He attends St. Charles Borromeo School in Bensenville, Illinois. The 12th grade winner was Katie Horton from Addison Trail High School. She lives in Addison, Illinois.

This is Mr. Sean Doherty's essay, entitled: "How does the Homeland Security Agency protect us from Terrorism?" is as follows:

The Homeland Security Agency (HSA) is a government agency responsible for tracking down those responsible for terrorism against the United States of America. It is part of The Department of Homeland Security. It works closely with the FBI, CIA, and other agencies to track down terrorists and those who are planning an act of terrorism, before they can commit such an act.

Those responsible for the vast majority of terrorism against the United States are Muslim terrorists who operate in cells around the world. They seek to destroy us because of our basic freedoms such as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion. They will stop at nothing to destroy us; death is no border to them. To them, death is when they will be rewarded. This can be seen by the frequent homicide bomber attacks that occur.

The HSA uses wiretaps, satellite imaging, email monitoring, and various other methods to track down terrorists. The terrorists use every tool at their disposal to evade capture and kill innocent Americans, so the NSA should and must use every tool at their disposal to stop terrorists before they can attack.

At airports, the HSA uses metal detectors, bomb sniffing dogs, cameras, and physical searches of bags and passengers to make sure our airlines are safe. One machine, the Chemical Trace Examination (CTex) machine can even detect explosives by their density. At ports, containers are scanned with x-rays and gieser counters to make sure nothing that can be used for a terrorist attack is transported into the country. Also, some containers are even searched physically.

The PATRIOT Act is a piece of legislation that was passed after September 11, 2001. It is designed to help the HSA track down terrorists. It makes small changes to already existing laws so that the process of hunting down a terrorist cell is streamlined. For example, the PATRIOT Act allows the HSA to wiretap or monitor a suspected terrorist without a court warrant. If a court warrant were required, the terrorist could be tipped off and destroy evidence or flee the country.

In order to reduce terrorism, we need to stay in Iraq and Afghanistan. If we stay there, we can start to spread more moderate feelings about western culture throughout the region. The people of those countries already show their gratitude to the United States for bringing democracy to their countries, now imagine if the whole Middle East was democratic and freedom of speech and religion were commonplace throughout. The world would be a better, safer place.

Another additional precaution we need to take is to secure our borders. We need more border patrol agents and more Unmanned Aerial Vehicles and sensors on the northern and southern borders. If we do these things, the risk of terrorism both at home and abroad will be significantly lowered.

HONORNG THE LIFE OF SOLDIER COLBY FARNAN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor today to recognize the life of Army Spec. Colby Farnan of Weston, Missouri, who passed away in Taji, Iraq while in Support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. As a son, brother, and friend Colby is missed by many.

Colby was a strong member of our community. He was active in various high school sports, where he nurtured the leadership skills and sense of teamwork that so many people came to admire. His service as a coach in the youth baseball league was just one example of his desire for wanting to help our community. Colby's service to our country was an extension of his support of the community and a commitment to making a better future for us all.

I offer my condolences and support to the many people that Colby had an impact on. In the wake of their loss, the Farnan family has embarked on a campaign to honor our fine men and women who have perished in Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom.

The family and community of Weston, Missouri are raising money to provide communities with Battlefield Cross statues to remember the lives of the fine Americans that gave their life for their country.

The lives of all our soldiers are remembered everyday and the efforts by the Farnan family and friends can be appreciated all Americans. I am exceptionally proud of our troops, their families, and their communities in their support of one another. All of Northwest Missouri and America should follow the example that is being set by the people of Weston, Missouri in their 5K Walk to Remember fundraiser and support of our troops.

IN HONOR OF STATE REPRESENTATIVE ROGER P. ROY

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor and pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to State Representative Roger P. Roy, who after 30 years of service has chosen not to seek another term in the State House of Representatives. This extraordinary man is undoubtedly a valuable asset to the State of Delaware and a friend to all. He has been described as not only a compassionate and accomplished citizen, but also an admirable leader. An enduring professional representing his beloved Limestone Hills-area district, he truly is a distinguished Delawarean.

In addition to serving his district, he serves as the Chairman of the influential State Bond Bill Committee, where his leadership has been instrumental in the Committee's sound financial management, earning Delaware's bonds the highest rating. Representative Roy has also worked to protect Delawareans, authoring the State's version of Megan's Law and sponsoring legislation that requires registered sex offenders to have their status indicated with a designation on their driver's license. Currently serving as the Executive Director of the Transportation Management Association of Delaware, he has worked to bring innovative transportation solutions to the State.

As his 15 consecutive terms in office acutely demonstrate, he is well recognized and respected by his constituents and colleagues. He actively participates in the community through sponsorship of youth athletic teams, American Legion Post #29, and by serving on the Board of Directors of the Central YMCA and the Mid-County Senior Center.

I congratulate State Representative Roger P. Roy for his years of remarkable service and countless contributions to the State. I am sure that as he begins to spend more time with his wife, Paula, their two daughters, Michele and Tanya, and their grandchildren, he will remain an integral member of the community. I would like to thank him for the many contributions he has made to the State of Delaware.

TRIBUTE TO JEAN DIEHL FOR HER MORE THAN THIRTY YEARS OF DEDICATED VOLUNTEER SERVICE WITH THE U.S. FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Jean Diehl for her more than 30 years of dedicated volunteer service with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, where she has served as a major community force in establishing and developing the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge at Tinicum. Jean's enthusiasm and deep love of the Tinicum Marsh has provided decades of consistent strength and leadership through the Concerned Area Residents for Preservation of the Tinicum Marsh (CARP) and later the Friends of the Heinz Refuge (FOHR), ensuring that future generations of Americans will be able to enjoy and learn from the treasurers of our Nation's natural heritage protected through our National Wildlife Refuge System. I was pleased to work with Jean and others to make the dreams of this unique National Wildlife Refuge a reality, promoting conservation and a cleaner, healthier environment for both wildlife and the citizens of the greater Philadelphia region.

The history of Tinicum Marsh, the largest remaining freshwater tidal wetland in Pennsylvania, goes back to the first settlements in the region in 1634. Swedes, Dutch and English diked and drained parts of the marsh for grazing. At that time, the tidal marshes measured over 5,700 acres. The rapid urbanization since

World War I reduced tidal marshes to approximately 200 acres. The remnant of this once vast tidal marsh is protected by the Refuge.

Jean first discovered the wonders of Tinicum Marsh as a youth while exploring the wilds of her neighborhood and learned of their endangerment through her involvement with Girl Scouts. Jean soon became an active member of CARP, a grassroots conservation organization that worked closely with government and political leaders to preserve and protect Pennsylvania's largest remaining freshwater tidal marsh. Through much of Jean's leadership with both CARP and as President of the Friends of the Heinz Refuge, as well as her community work with the League of Women Voters and with many other concerned local citizens, the Tinicum National Environmental Center (later renamed to the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge at Tinicum) was established. Jean's leadership helped with the passage of four pieces of Federal legislation adding both land and funding for the refuge.

Ever the environmental champion, Jean has worked diligently over the past 30 years to ensure the future of the Reserve. Her work helped realign Interstate 95 to avoid paving over this important wildlife habitat; raise funds for the purchase of the Tinicum Lagoons to be included in the Refuge; establish the Tinicum Treasures Bookstore (all proceeds of which are used to support refuge educational and biological programs); and create the Cusano Environmental Education Center. Jean Diehl has, indeed, truly served our Nation as a founding parent of the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge at Tinicum. I commend Jean Diehl for her outstanding service. She is among Pennsylvania's finest, and I am honored to bring forth her particular accomplishments at the Tinicum Refuge before this body and our Nation today.

EMERGENCY ROOMS HAVE REACHED A BREAKING POINT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a New York Times editorial entitled, "Emergency in the Emergency Rooms" into the RECORD. This article emphasizes the fact that our Nation's emergency rooms and hospitals are seriously ill-equipped to manage major disasters such as the human costs of natural disasters or the occurrence of pandemic influenza. They are also failing to meet the challenge of increased demand by the poor who must use the emergency room for primary care because they cannot afford or do not have health insurance.

According to the Institute of Medicine, about 500,000 (five hundred thousand) ambulances are being redirected from full emergency rooms to others far away. Furthermore, patients awaiting admission to the hospital may spend from eight hours to two days in the emergency rooms before a hospital bed becomes available. Not only are our emergency rooms filled past capacity, but they also lack the services of critical specialists such as neurosurgeons, further crippling the ability of hospitals to immediately treat patients in medical crisis.

The editorial identifies a few causes for the emergency room crisis. First, the number of people seeking treatment in emergency rooms has increased sharply over the past decade. Also, in the same time period, some 700 hospitals and 425 emergency departments have been forced to close due to cost pressures. More importantly, the result of these situations is serious overcrowding, only worsened by a massive influx of patients who seek routine care in emergency rooms because they are either uninsured or on Medicaid but incapable of finding doctors who agree to treat them.

This issue has grave consequences on the United States population as a whole, but it particularly affects the more than 60 million plus uninsured people in the United States, a population that will increase as employers are gradually eliminating health coverage. Ultimately, the United States will suffer greatly at the hands of large scale disasters if we do not improve our preparedness in hospitals and emergency rooms.

Some proposals to develop our emergency rooms include an end to diverting seriously ill patients to far away hospitals and alternatively diverting poor patients who congest emergency rooms seeking standard care. Of course, this would necessitate expanding health insurance coverage to the millions of uninsured and offering more primary care clinics and doctors to underserved neighborhoods. However, in the long run, the addressing of the emergency room crisis will cost the United States much, much less than the consequences.

[From the New York Times, June 21, 2006]

EMERGENCY IN THE EMERGENCY ROOMS

The nation's emergency rooms have been stretched thin for at least a decade or more, but a new analysis suggests that they have reached a breaking point. Their plight underscores how dreadfully unprepared we are to cope with a major disaster like pandemic influenza or mass casualties from a terrorism attack.

The crisis in emergency medical care was laid bare in three reports issued last week by the Institute of Medicine, a unit of the National Academy of Sciences. Half a million times a year ambulances are diverted from emergency rooms that are full and sent to others farther away. Emergency room patients who need admission to the hospital often spend eight hours or more—sometimes even two days or more—on gurneys in the hallways, waiting for a hospital bed to open up.

Some emergency rooms lack the services of key specialists, such as neurosurgeons, who shy away from emergency room duty because many uninsured patients can't pay and their malpractice premiums would skyrocket because of the risky nature of emergency cases. What is not known is how many people die as a result of delays in treatment or inadequate care under chaotic conditions. No measurement system tracks such data.

The emergency room crisis has many causes, none of them easily or cheaply resolved. The number of people seeking treatment in emergency rooms has jumped sharply over the past decade or so, from 90 million in 1993 to 114 million in 2003. Over the same period, cost pressures forced the closing of some 700 hospitals, almost 200,000 hospital beds and 425 emergency departments. The result is severe crowding, exacerbated by a huge influx of poor people seeking routine care who are either uninsured or on Medicaid but unable to find doctors willing to treat them. By law, emergency rooms must accept all patients, whether they have insurance or not.

The institute's experts have many proposals for easing the situation, ranging from new regional systems to improve the flow of patients to the most appropriate and least crowded emergency rooms to an infusion of money to cover unpaid emergency care and to bolster preparedness for large-scale disasters. The most important change would be to stop diverting seriously ill ambulance patients and divert instead the poor patients who clog emergency rooms seeking routine care. That would require extending health coverage to the uninsured and providing more primary care clinics and doctors in poor neighborhoods.

RECOGNIZING LARRY W. WEIGLER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Colonel Larry W. Weigler, Vice Wing Commander of the Missouri Air National Guard in St. Joseph, MO. Colonel Weigler will retire from the 139th Airlift Wing, St. Joseph, MO effective May 3, 2006 after more than 36 years of dedicated service in the Air National Guard.

The Colonel has been a member of the armed services since 1969 when he enlisted in the Missouri Air National Guard as an aircraft mechanic. In 1972 he received an Officer's commission to become an aircraft pilot. During his exemplary career Colonel Weigler participated in numerous overseas deployments including Operation Desert Storm and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending the career of Colonel Larry W. Weigler, who exemplifies stellar qualities of dedication and service to Northwest Missouri and the United States of America.

IN MEMORY OF JAMES LEE RACKERS

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I inform the House of the death of Mr. James Lee Rackers of Jefferson City, MO.

Mr. Rackers was born in Jefferson City, on December 27, 1933, son of Lee and Helen Heislen Rackers. He attended Central Missouri State University and graduated from Lincoln University in 1956, with a Bachelor of Science degree in Secondary School Education. He earned his masters in Secondary School Administration from the University of Missouri-Columbia. He was united in marriage to Nancy Brettschneider on November 24, 1955. They were blessed with four wonderful children, three sons and one daughter.

Mr. Rackers began his career teaching at Helias High School in the fall of 1956. He was the head basketball and track coach and assistant football coach. He was the Athletic Director from 1966 until 1967, when he became Assistant Principal. In 1971 Jim became the

first lay principal at a Catholic secondary school in Missouri. Jim was principal until 1992, when he became Helias' first Chief Administrator. In 1997 he became the first Director of Development for Helias High School and Executive Director of the Helias Foundations. On May 1, 1998, the newly constructed Field House was named the James L. Rackers Field House in honor of his years of dedication and loyalty to Helias High School.

Along with his successful career, Mr. Rackers was an active member of St. Peter Catholic Church and was also a member of numerous professional and community organizations. Mr. Rackers was a member in the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Missouri Association of Secondary School Principals, North Central Association, National Catholic Education Association, Committee on Accredited Schools Non-Public, and the Missouri Council for American Private Education. He received numerous awards; including the 1991 Communicator of the Year Award from the Public Relations Society of America, 1997 Immaculate Conception Outstanding Alumni Award, 1997 Certificate of Appreciation for outstanding services to students in Support of Vocational Education at Nichols Career Center, and 25 year Silver Service Award of the Missouri Association of Secondary School Principals.

Mr. Speaker, James Lee Rackers was a valuable leader in all aspects of his life. He was a genuine human being who would do anything for anyone. I know the Members of the House will join me in extending heartfelt condolences to his family: his wife, Nancy; his three sons, Dennis, John, and Timothy; his daughter Maureen; and all of his grandchildren.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 2006, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes Nos. 289, 290, and 291.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes Nos. 289, 290, and 291.

TRIBUTE TO ESSAY WINNER, MISS KATIE HORTON

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINIOS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, every year in my district, I ask students in grades 8th and 12th to participate in an essay contest. This year's contest focused on the issue of protecting our Nation from terrorism.

I am pleased that so many students chose to enter this essay contest. Unfortunately, however, there can only be one winner in each group: 8th grade and 12th grade. This year's 8th grade winner was Sean Doherty from Elmhurst, Illinois. He attends St. Charles Borromeo School in Bensenville, Illinois. The 12th grade winner was Katie Horton from Addison Trail High School. She lives in Addison, Illinois.

This is Miss Katie Horton's essay, entitled: "How does the Homeland Security Agency protect us from Terrorism?" is as follows:

Terrorism is an epidemic that continues to spread throughout the world. In the United States, terrorism is a danger that the government and its people must face everyday. The government works hard to expand its knowledge of terrorist activities and to protect America from terrorist attacks. It is crucial for the government, and the people of the United States to identify ways to reduce the threat of terrorism.

This can occur in many ways, including more background checks of people who enter this country, more security at our borders, increasing intelligence gathering in countries that support terrorists, make it easy, or offer rewards, for citizen's to report suspected terrorist activities, educating people on what to look for, and working with other countries governments to eliminate the threat of terrorism.

A group that has been on everyone's mind lately is the terrorist group called al-Qaeda. The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks has stated that al-Qaeda is responsible for many terrorist attacks against the citizens, the government, and military forces of the United States and many other locations around the world (Wikipedia). Osama bin Laden is one of the founders of the al-Qaeda organization and has been held responsible for the September 11th attacks and many other attacks world wide.

The Department of Homeland Security is trying hard everyday to make terrorist movements a thing of the past. The department follows a six-point agenda. The first point is to increase overall preparedness. Since the terrorist attack on 9–11, the United States has increased security in all government and government related buildings and has better prepared and trained employees to know what to do in case of a terrorist attack. The second point is to create better transportation security systems. Since 9–11, the government has increased security at all airports, train stations, and subways. The third point is to strengthen border security to enforce immigration laws. The American government does not want anyone entering the United States who could be a threat to the American public. Currently, the government is trying to enact laws to make sure that illegal immigrants are either departed or are on a path to become legal U.S. citizens. The fourth point is to enhance information sharing among partners. This point helps establish better communication because that is a key to stay safe. When all anti-terrorist groups combine and share information it becomes possible for the groups to protect one another. The fifth point is to improve financial management, human resources and to improve technology. This point helps the government continue to fight terrorist to the best of its ability. The sixth, and last point, is to realign the Department of Homeland Security organization to maximize mission performance. There needs to be more communication between the different divisions of Homeland Security so good decisions are made and we have the greatest chance of stopping terrorists before they strike (Department of Homeland Security).

As a way to help stop terrorism, the government passed the Patriot Act. The Patriot Act is an act to help protect people against terrorism. There are many parts to this act. The act allows law enforcement to gather information on the criminals and their supporters, destroy immediate dangers, and to plan arrests, before letting the terrorist know. This allows the government to convict the terrorists before they have time to leave the scene of the crime. The act also allows investigators to receive business records in order to convict terrorists. For example, they can receive records from banks to see who the people are that are aiding the terrorists. The Patriot Act allows investigators to receive search warrants to search not only where the terrorist act was carried out, but also where the terrorist act was planned. Also, the government now punishes people who house terrorists, punishes terrorists who attack transit systems, and also punishes bioterrorists (Department of Justice).

Even though the United States has many precautions against terrorists, many more can be put into place. Traveling by airplane is a very common way of transportation. America has done a lot to secure the safety of the airplane passengers, yet more can be done. Airlines must train their attendants to be aware of terrorists and be prepared with knowledge of what to do once a terrorist is encountered. Individual pilots must think of ways to have flight attendants alert them when they sense signs of danger and airlines must also provide a way to alert the airport of possible dangers without the attacker knowing. Also, Requirements for passports should be changed. A thorough background check should be done before one can receive a passport. Thousands of people come to the United States each year. The border patrol needs to be stricter on who they let into the United States. By controlling who is allowed to enter the U.S. many job opportunities would be created. It would cost a lot of money, but would save lives. Many people come to the United States on a one-month visa for education or work. The government needs to pay attention to these people to make sure they are not staying longer then they are supposed to. People should be forced to check in periodically and provide contact information so the government can ensure that they are still legally in this country. If people cannot provide this information, they should not be allowed into the country or should be deported immediately. Another option would be to issue a national identity card, much like a state drivers license so that any policeman, citizen, could verify if the person is in the country legally.

The government handles many pressures every day and should be rewarded for that. Yet, government officials must always stay on top of things and communicate with all levels of government while keeping up with current technology. America is a truly an amazing country with a lot more potential.

RECOGNIZING HARRY BROERMANN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Harry Broermann. Over the past 70 years, Harry has served dutifully as a member and Leader in Missouri 4–H. Harry joined the Farmer City 4–H Club as a young boy and has continued his service to the organization over the last 70 years.

In taking over the leadership of the Farmer City 4–H Club that was founded by his father, Harry and his wife served over hundreds of children and young adults in Northwest Missouri. Harry led the organization in the completion of service projects, organization of social functions, and has attended meetings all throughout Missouri. With a passion for history and genealogy, Harry has been instrumental

in developing the strong sense of history and community that are important to the educational mission of 4–H.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in recognizing Harry Broermann, one of Missouri's finest citizens. Harry's commitment to the community is remarkable, and I am honored to represent him in the United States Congress.

IN HONOR OF STATE REPRESENTATIVE GERALD A. BUCKWORTH

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to State Representative Gerald A. Buckworth, who after 26 years of service in the State House has chosen not to seek another term in office. Throughout his political, professional, and private life, he has tirelessly worked to better the Delaware community

In addition to raising four children, and six grandchildren, with his wife Vicki, he served as a teacher, principal, and coach in the Caesar Rodney School District for more than 30 years. His extensive involvement in the Delaware public school system made him one of the General Assembly's foremost authorities on public education. His dedication to helping Delaware youth has eased the transition to adulthood for many young Delawareans. He is a key supporter of the State Police Cadets, a program in which college students learn skills in preparation for careers in law enforcement. Without a doubt, one of his top priorities has always been encouraging children to realize their goals.

As his thirteen consecutive terms in office demonstrate, he has been a prominent and well-respected member of the Delaware General Assembly. In addition to serving 5 years as the Majority Whip, he also served on multiple committees including: appropriations, corrections, joint finance, labor, public safety, and tourism. Additionally, he chaired the Family Law Commission, a General Assembly organization that examines family court proceedings in an effort to make recommendations for improvement.

I congratulate and thank State Rep. Gerald Buckworth for his valuable contributions and many years of admirable service to the State of Delaware. I am sure that as he begins to spend more time with his family and enjoy retirement, that he will remain an active and influential member of the community. Thank you, for all you have done and continue to do for the people of our State.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY AND LIFE OF CON CASSIDY, DEDICATED COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there are few among us who have given more of themselves to making the world a better place than Con Cassidy, who passed away last year on September 24, 2005. As we continue to mourn the passing of our dear friend Con, I want to take a few moments to remember his life and his work in the community he served so faithfully in so many different ways.

One of Con's greatest pleasures during his lifetime was helping those in need. He leaves behind an impressive list of accomplishments that most people can only dream of achieving in their lifetime. Con will be remembered for many reasons, not the least of which is his inspirational leadership that has had a profound effect on people trying to better their lives. Even with all of his work in public service and with community organizations, Con also endeared himself to many because of his generous spirit and wise counsel. Whether it was a local concern or just a relaxed visit with an old friend, Con's friends always knew they would find the support and guidance they were looking for in a chat with Con. While in his presence, you were immediately put at ease with his warm smile, his firm handshake, his reassuring voice and his admirable character.

We have all felt his loss in one way or another, however those individuals that have special needs due to unforeseen circumstances or serious illness are the ones that will suffer most from the loss of their friend, Con. Anyone who knew Con knew that he was a person who spent countless hours volunteering his time and energy to benefit individuals and organizations in need.

The Con Cassidy Foundation has been established by a group of his friends and family in his honor with the hope of continuing his tradition of giving. The "Make a Wish Foundation" will be the primary benefactor of proceeds raised and will be given in Con Cassidy's name. Con's legacy and his tradition of giving will endure in the wonderful work being done by the Foundation established in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, as the Con Cassidy Foundation gathers to honor his memory and life on June 22—the anniversary of his birthday—I ask my colleagues to join me in tribute for all he has done to strengthen our community and better the lives of others. Con Cassidy's life is truly an eloquent statement about what one committed citizen can do.

CONGRESSMAN RANGEL APPLAUDS PRESIDENT BUSH FOR SIGNING PROCLAMATION DECLARING JUNE AS CARIBBEAN HERITAGE MONTH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend President Bush for his support of the resolution that acknowledges the contributions of Caribbean peoples in America and declares June as Caribbean Heritage Month. I also would like to congratulate the Honorable BARBARA LEE for her efforts in bringing about this initiative, receiving 81 co-sponsors and getting this monumental legislation passed in both chambers of Congress. As one of the co-sponsors, I am extremely proud to be a part of the effort to recognize the Caribbean-Americans nationwide who have been a colorful thread of our Nation's fabric.

This proclamation recognizes the millions of Caribbean peoples in the United States for their contributions to American society since its foundation. As a representative of a large Caribbean constituency, I have always felt the need to advocate on behalf of this distinctive community while educating others that Caribbean cultures have influenced our educational and political structures as well as popular culture.

Since 1619, immigrants from the Caribbean islands began to populate America, bringing with them elements of cultural, religious and linguistic diversity. I appreciate the emphasis that this resolution places on shedding light on our Nation's history as many great political thinkers, such as President Alexander Hamilton, were born in the Caribbean. This little known fact was largely unheard of because of the taboos, discrimination and racism that existed in our country's past.

Today, as our Nation's third border, Caribbean nations and our relations with them are fundamental to our interdependent successes in sharing medical advancements, fighting terrorism and promoting diversity appreciation.

In celebration of Caribbean Heritage month, this June, I will promote participation in local festivities. I am glad to support activities such as parades, carnivals and festivals that are being held in my district and nationwide in true Island fashion and flair.

RECOGNIZING SCOTT FLORENCE FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Scott Florence, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 495, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Scott has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Scott has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Scott Florence for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO JIM WILLIAMS

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the service of Jim Williams, the Director of the US-VISIT program at the Department of Homeland Security. Mr. Williams is leaving his position in the coming weeks to become the Commissioner of the

Federal Acquisition Service at the General Services Administration. I want to thank him for his years of public service and his leadership at the Department of Homeland Security.

Since May 2003, Mr. Williams has managed a team to create and maintain the US-VISIT program, a critical border management program that collects point-of-entry and exit information on visitors traveling to and from the United States. The program uses biometric identifiers and digital photographs to aid legitimate tourists, students and business travelers entering the United States, while making it more difficult for those who might do harm to the United States or enter and stay in the country illegally. Though the job of completing the full installation of US-VISIT program is still underway, so far, in two and a half years, it has processed nearly 60 million visitors to date and denied entry to more than 1,100 criminals and immigration violators at our ports of entry, reduced wait times at several land border ports of entry, and provided information to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement leading to the apprehension of more than 200 aliens who overstayed their visas.

Mr. Williams has been a model public servant and leader. He has left a tremendous imprint on the US-VISIT program, and on the many people who work with him at US-VISIT and across the government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and our colleagues to join me in a salute to Jim Williams and the talented team at US-VISIT.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK R. KENNEDY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, had bad weather not delayed my flight back to Washington on Monday, (June 19, 2006), my votes on the following rollcall votes would have been as follows:

Rollcall vote No. 289, H.R. 5540—"yes".

Rollcall vote No. 290, H.R. 5504—"yes".

HOUSTON ASTROS VISIT WALTER REED ARMY HOSPITAL

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, 2006, for the second year in a row, I joined many of my colleagues from our Texas Congressional Delegation at a barbeque hosted by the Houston Astros and the USO for injured soldiers at the Walter Reed Army Hospital. The team held a similar event at the Bethesda Naval Hospital. I cannot speak highly enough of the Astros' players, managers, staff, and the owner Drayton McLane for taking time to visit the wounded troops.

Until the Astros hosted the event last year, no other Major League teams had done such an event, and while many players have visited since last years' barbeque, the Astros are the only team to visit the troops as a group. It was remarkable to see players interacting with the troops—many of whom are close in age—and each taking away something valuable from the experience.

The troops at Walter Reed and Bethesda are among the most seriously wounded, many being injured by improvised explosive devices, rocket propelled grenades, and other battlefield hazards. Many are confined to beds, wheel chairs, or rehabilitation facilities, and the opportunity to be outside having lunch with Major League Baseball players was a tremendous morale boost. The Astros' organization provided hats, and players autographed items and took photos with the troops, but most importantly, they spent time talking with the injured soldiers.

After last years visit, Astros' players commented in several newspaper columns on the optimism of the wounded soldiers and the perspective visiting with the soldiers gave them. Mr. McLane said it was the most moving experience in his 12 years of owning the team.

With Memorial Day weekend approaching, I think it is important that we all realize what a sacrifice the men and women of our Armed Forces make each and every day. As Franklin Delano Roosevelt once said, "Those who have long enjoyed such privileges as we enjoy forget in time that men have died to win them."

The men and women of our military endure a tremendous burden so that we may enjoy the freedoms we often take for granted. It was an honor to join the Astros' organization at Walter Reed and it reminded each person there that war has a price. Memorial Day represents one day of national awareness and reverence, honoring those Americans who died while defending our Nation and its values. While we should honor these heroes every day for the sacrifices they have made for our Nation, it is especially important that we do so on Memorial Day.

To use an appropriate metaphor, the Astros' stepped up to the plate for our injured troops at Walter Reed and Bethesda. On this Memorial Day, let's follow their example. Please keep our troops and their families in your prayers, and remember the sacrifices so many have made to defend our great Nation.

RECOGNIZING ANDREW BRADFORD FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Andrew Bradford, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 495, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Andrew has been very active with his troop, participating in many Scout activities. Over the many years Andrew has been involved with Scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Andrew Bradford for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO BAYAUD INDUSTRIES

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding work being done by Bayaud Industries, a non-profit organization dedicated to creating employment and training services to individuals with mental, emotional, physical, and economic disabilities and challenges in the City of Denver and throughout Colorado. Celebrating its 37th anniversary this year, Bayaud has been able to help over 5,000 individuals find jobs and currently serves over 300 each year.

Bayaud uses an integrated approach to help those who have had minimal success in the mainstream work environment mostly because of the stigma associated with disability and mental illness. This approach includes a comprehensive vocational evaluation to assess skills and capabilities, work adjustment and personal adjustment training, and general office skills training. Bayaud also provides job placement services for its clients, and even works with the City of Denver to help move people from welfare to work.

Helping those who are disabled to find and keep work is good for both individuals and our economy. Employment gives people a sense of accomplishment and the satisfaction that they are contributing to their community. Sadly, according to the National Mental Health Association, "the unemployment rate in the United States for individuals with disabilities is approximately 75 percent; the unemployment rate for individuals with psychiatric disabilities is even higher at 80 percent." With training and assistance from organizations like Bayaud, people with disabilities are able to hold a job and contribute to the economy of our country.

Mr. Speaker, Bayaud Industries should be considered a model for how we help all our citizens become productive. Bayaud is ensuring that the disabled of my community are able to play a vital role. I commend the important work this organization is doing and I know that both those in the disabilities and business communities have benefited greatly from the good work it has done for over the past 37 years.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 20, 2006, I was absent due to a family obligation. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following way:

"Aye" on rollcall No. 295, an amendment by Mr. SCHIFF to H.R. 5631, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007.

"Nay" on rollcall No. 296, an amendment by Mr. KING to H.R. 5631, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007.

"Nay" on rollcall No. 297, an amendment by Mr. CHOCOLA to H.R. 5631, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007.

"Nay" on rollcall No. 298, an amendment by Mr. FLAKE, No. 2 to, H.R. 5631, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007.

''Nay'' on rollcall No. 299, an amendment by Mr. FLAKE, No. 3, to H.R. 5631, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007.

''Aye'' on rollcall No. 300, an amendment by Mr. HINCHEY, No. 1, to H.R. 5631, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007.

''Aye'' on rollcall No. 301, an amendment by Mr. HINCHEY, No. 2, to H.R. 5631, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007.

''Nay'' on rollcall No. 302, an amendment by Mr. FLAKE, No. 6, to H.R. 5631, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007.

''Nay'' on rollcall No. 303, an amendment by Mr. FLAKE, No. 7, to H.R. 5631, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007.

''Nay'' on rollcall No. 304, an amendment by Mr. FLAKE, No. 9, to H.R. 5631, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007.

''Yea'' on rollcall No. 305, final passage of H.R. 5631, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 19, 2006 I missed rollcall votes Nos. 289, 290, and 291. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on H.R. 5540, H.R. 5504, and H. Res. 826.

RECOGNIZING BLAKE WILLIAMS FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Blake Williams, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 495, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Blake has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Blake has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Blake Williams for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize World Refugee Day, which is the international community's day of remembrance and action on behalf of the more than 20 million refugees, who have been driven from their homes because of war, famine, and natural disaster. World Refugee Day is intended to raise awareness of the plight of these millions of people, but more importantly, it is about the recognition that we have the power to help them and that we must.

To Americans who are blessed with the comforts of 21st Century living and an abundance of food, it is difficult to conceive of the intolerable and degrading existence in which nearly all refugees live. Today, as individuals and as a Nation, we must pledge to redouble our efforts to work with our allies, the United Nations and other regional organizations to help alleviate the suffering of the world's refugees and to address the causes that have created the world's refugee population.

As we speak, millions of Darfurians in Sudan have been driven out of their homes by the armed Janjaweed militia. Huddled in pitiful camps and under constant threat of attack, the Darfur refugees live on inadequate food and with little or no shelter. Their crops are destroyed. Their livestock have been killed and thrown into wells, poisoning the water. Their villages have been burned to the ground. Darfurian women are systematically raped, including young girls who venture out of the refugee camps for firewood.

What we are seeing in the largest country on the African continent is genocide: a calculated means of annihilating a group of people, robbing them of their chance at livelihood. International aid workers and a thin force of African Union peacekeepers are all that stands between them and death.

Addressing the refugee crisis is not only a humanitarian endeavor; it also contributes to our national security. Refugee camps have long been recognized as prime breeding grounds for extremism. As we have seen throughout the last century, wars that force large numbers of people from their homes result in regional instability, threatening American interests and our security. American and international aid can do much to ensure that refugee camps do not become the birthplace of more violence and terrorism,

While refugees are most often associated with war, it is important to recognize today that natural disasters also force people out of their homes. The Asian tsunami and the Pakistani earthquakes have created millions of displaced people and desertification and rising sea levels which are the result of climate change will create millions more.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to associate the word ''refugee'' with a nameless, faceless person. We must remember that refugees are mothers, fathers and children, whose lives have been destroyed by war nature's wrath.

Today we acknowledge our common humanity and pledge that every day be a day of action on behalf of those who have no voice.

DECLARING THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL PREVAIL IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

SPEECH OF

HON. ANTHONY D. WEINER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, as we stand here today, there is no way to argue that this war in Iraq was not badly undermined by bad planning based on bad intelligence and an abject failure to organize the international community in a meaningful way.

In short, the American people and Congress would clearly answer this question in the same way. If we knew then what we know today would we have done everything the same? Certainly not.

This is a common sense message despite the fact that the Administration is reluctant to see it. I would suggest that there is another thing that we all agree upon: the extraordinary work of the men and women who are over there fighting on our behalf, and the remarkable heroism they've shown in the face of a mission that seems to constantly change and the hostility of many Iraqis.

Yesterday, we mourned the 2,500th fatality. There have been 18,000 injuries and those of us in New York have lost 118 of our neighbors.

I believe the military mission in Iraq has been completed and our troops should be redeployed in a way to preserve the accomplishments that they've achieved and to further our objectives of defeating terrorism and stabilizing the region.

At the outset of the war the President articulated and many of us agreed that Saddam Hussein had to be removed. Our military achieved that. And there have been elections in Iraq that our military helped make happen.

Standing up of the infrastructure has been painfully slow. A Brookings Institution study that came out today showed that we still have not reached pre-war levels of oil production or available electric power.

Yet to the extent that roads and bridges and infrastructure have been created or restored in Iraq, it was through the good work of the men and women of the United States Armed Forces. There have been reports of over 30,000 Iraqi civilian deaths, clean water is scarce, and unemployment hovers above 50 percent.

The question we have today as inartfully and politically posited as my friends on the other side articulate it, is how do we honor the work that has been done so far and how do we adapt to the situation that we've found?

This notion of barreling ahead while our troops become the target of so many attacks is misguided. The number of daily attacks by insurgents in May of 2003 was 5; in May of 2006 it was 90. The total number of insurgents has increased from 3,000 to 20,000 during the same time period. And Iraq has become a training ground for jihadists, with an increase in the number of foreign fighters from 100 in May 2003 to 1,500 in May 2006.

I support the position of Congressman JACK MURTHA and General Anthony Zinni, and agree with General George Casey, who said in September 2005 that, ''the perception of occupation in Iraq is a driving force behind the insurgency.'' Now the burden lies with the Iraqi people, and our troops standing in the middle of this battlefield have become targets rather than a force for stability and peace.

As Mr. MURTHA has observed, 100,000 Shi'as fighting 20,000 Sunnis amounts to civil war, even if we choose to call it ''sectarian violence.'' Incidents between warring Iraqi factions are up from 20 in May of last year to 250 in May of this year.

We should redeploy our troops to the horizon of the battle, out of harm's way, but close

enough to ensure that in the future the insurgents and terrorists do not take hold in Iraq.

It is time for our military presence in the Middle East to be converted to a powerful quick-reaction force outside of Iraq. 80 percent of Iraqis want us out of their country and 47 percent say killing Americans is justified.

Then, we should reallocate the funds being spent in Iraq, which dwarfs the combined budgets of all other programs in place to fight terrorism, and re-engage with the countries around the world that rallied behind us in the wake of 9/11 but were alienated by our conduct in Iraq.

Some have suggested that taking the target off the backs of our troops by removing them from the center of this conflict would lead to chaos. Implicit in that critique is the suggestion that we don't have chaos today. Our troops' presence there, I believe, is allowing Iraq's citizens a convenient excuse for failing to take responsibility for their destiny.

The Iraqi people clearly would like us to leave and permit them to govern. Our troops have expressed the same sentiment. And it is clear that if we are to reclaim our place on the world stage as a unifying force for democratic values and the ideals of our country, the way to start is to redeploy so we can be ready for future challenges.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT (BOB) LECLERCQ

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Robert (Bob) Leclercq as he completes his distinguished career as a firefighter in Garden City, Michigan.

Bob has dedicated his life to helping the citizens of Michigan. Upon graduation from East Garden City High School in 1970, he joined the National Guard as a Medical Corpsman in the Mobile Army Surgical Hospital, Unit 2077, of Detroit. Bob began his career as a firefighter in Garden City on October 30, 1979. During 23 years of honorable and dedicated service, he advanced through the ranks from Firefighter to Engineer to Lieutenant and ultimately to Captain.

For two decades, Bob has vigorously pursued additional education and specialized training, including Advanced Firefighting, EMT Specialist, Pump Operator, and Hazardous Materials courses. He has also served as Trustee, Secretary, and currently as President on the International Association of Fire Fighters, Local 1911 Executive Board. In addition, Bob started two beneficial community programs: one, which teaches CPR classes; the second, which takes blood pressures at the senior tower. In 1986, the Jaycees recognized Bob's contributions with the Michigan's Top Ten Outstanding Young People Award.

At this milestone in Bob's life, let us reflect upon the decades of his dedication; let us remember the scores of lives which have been touched by his benevolence; and let us not forget the bravery and courage with which he served and protected. His friends and family are inspired by his accomplishments, honored by his loyalty, and ennobled by his exemplary love for neighbor and community.

Mr. Speaker—Bob's wife, Brenda, his children, Bob Jr. and Sherri, and his grandson, Drake, have ample reason to celebrate. In honor of his commitment to protecting all the citizens of Michigan and of his legendary dedication to improving the lives of Garden City residents, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Bob for his years of service to our community and our country.

DECLARING THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL PREVAIL IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

SPEECH OF

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this resolution will not ensure any success in Iraq. It will not bring our troops home. It will only signal the death of true, honest debate within the walls of this great Chamber.

For many more years than any of us have been alive, this House, the People's House, has been democracy's citadel for intelligent, meaningful, real debate that has led to solutions to some of history's most important and vexing crises.

The charade that many on this floor are attempting to pass as a debate today does a great disservice to those monumental American leaders who have spoken from this same floor over the past two centuries. It does a great disservice to the American public, which expects its leaders to lead, not pander. And it does a great disservice to our military men and women who are depending on us to work together and complete our mission so that they may complete their mission and come home. Today's so called debate is politics at its worst—we're playing politics while U.S. men and women are being killed, wounded and kept away from their families.

Mr. Speaker, I remember lying in a military hospital bed just home from Vietnam while Congress played politics—it was disdainful then and when I think of those brave men and women I've visited at Walter Reed Hospital, Bethesda Hospital and Ramstein Hospital in Germany—it makes me sick today. Let's do our job and bring our troops home as soon as possible.

For weeks we have been told, and the American people have been promised, by the Republican majority that there would be a debate on this floor on the Iraq war. Instead, we get what the news is reporting as "Republican election year strategy." Mr. Speaker, this charade represents a shameless dereliction of our duties and a missed opportunity to provide the American public with the open and honest debate they have been demanding for the past 3 long years now.

This feel-good resolution ignores the issues most important to the men and women serving in Iraq, their families and the taxpayers who have already been billed nearly half a trillion dollars.

It ignores the issues raised by some of our most respected generals. Just listen to what a few have said about the Administration's rush to war:

"We are paying the price for the lack of credible planning, or the lack of a plan."—General Anthony Zinni

"What we are living with now is the consequences of successive policy failures."—Lieutenant General Greg Newbold

"They pressed for open warfare before the diplomacy was finished. It was a tragic mistake. It's a strategic blunder."—General Wesley Clark

This resolution ignores the lack of accountability and oversight that's led to some of the most egregious and embarrassing examples of waste, fraud and abuse on record, such as:

$9 billion in missing reconstruction funds.

$263 million in excessive or unsubstantiated costs for importing gasoline into Iraq.

Over $20 million for items that weren't delivered, including:

Security for civilian flights at Baghdad International Airport that never occurred; nonexistent pipeline employees; old and broken down trucks; spray-painted Iraqi cranes passed off as new; police trucks; and a refurbished police academy and library. And millions more have been wasted at taxpayer expense due to no-bid and over-billed contracts awarded by the Bush administration.

This resolution ignores how the civilian leadership of the Defense Department grossly miscalculated the armor and equipment needs of our troops before sending them into combat, which resulted in:

40,000 troops who didn't have basic Kevlar vests or the ceramic plates needed for full protection, which left parents and spouses to buy body armor for their loved ones;

30,000 Marines who needed twice as many heavy machine guns, more fully protected armored vehicles and more communications equipment to perform their operations successfully;

Soldiers who were issued boots with cheap and soft soles that quickly wore out, thus having to sew material to the bottom of their boots out of desperation;

Soldiers who went to combat with inadequate or poor field radios, ammo carriers, weapon lubricant, socks and even rifle slings;

Military units that were deployed without the necessary armor needed to protect ground vehicles, making them vulnerable to IEDs. And when our troops jerry-rigged them with steel playing, they often flipped or rolled-over, injuring or killing soldiers;

And soldiers who subsequently had to sift through garbage dumps for scrap metal to uparmor ground vehicles.

Mr. Speaker, if you are in charge, you are responsible. That is why several respected generals have cast a vote of no confidence with our civilian leadership of the Defense Department for its lack of planning:

Rumsfeld and his team turned what should have been a deliberate victory in Iraq into a prolonged challenge.—Major General John Batiste.

I do not believe Secretary Rumsfeld is the right person to fight that war, based on his absolute failures in managing the war against Saddam in Iraq.—Major General Charles H. Swannack, Jr.

They only need the military advice when it satisfies their agenda.—Lieutenant General John Riggs

If I was President I would have relieved him three years ago.—Lieutenant General Paul K. Van Riper

Two and a half more years of that leadership was too long for my nation, for my Army, and for my family.—Major General Paul Eaton

Mr. Speaker, we need to be working nonstop to bring our troops home as soon as possible, not to score political points while they

are fighting a war. And we need to be working to keep them as safe as possible until they are home.

For starters, we need to send a loud message to the insurgents that we will not occupy Iraq and that we will not control Iraq's oil—a message that we want to leave Iraq as much as they want us to leave. Instead, Mr. Speaker, the President has given every impression that the U.S. military has become an occupying force. We are in the process of building a gigantic new U.S. embassy in Baghdad that will span 104 acres, the size of nearly 80 football fields. This does not give the impression that we are winding things down in Iraq. It says to insurgents that we want a permanent military presence and it serves as a recruiting tool to sign up more insurgents. Moreover, it provides no incentives for the Iraqi government to assume more responsibility for the security of its country.

On my last visit to Iraq everyone I spoke with—privates, sergeants and the officers in charge of training the Iraqi security forces—want the Iraqis to assume more of the security responsibilities. Our military has done its job—more often than not in two, three or four tours of deployment—an unconscionable demand on our troops, an unconscionable demand on their families and an unconscionable demand on their communities. And make no mistake—it's taking a toll on our military. Continuous deployment in Iraq has hurt military personnel and their families, and strained recruiting and retention. Consider some of the latest statistics on active duty personnel and selected reserves as well as on recruiting and retention:

Each month the equivalent of one battalion is lost due to deaths and wounds.

All the Army's available active duty combat brigades have served at least a 12-month tour in Iraq or Afghanistan.

At least half of those combat brigades have completed their second tour of duty.

By next year the Army projects that it will be short 3,500 active duty officers, primarily captains and majors.

Approximately 3,500 airmen, as well as sailors, are currently performing Army missions they were not adequately trained to do.

Ninety-seven percent of the National Guard combat and special operations battalions have been mobilized since September 11th.

The average tour for National Guard members is 342 days.

Continuous deployment has damaged readiness for mission skills necessary in the war on terror outside those required in Iraq. Consider some of the latest statistics:

Forty percent of all the Army's and Marine Corps' ground equipment is deployed to Iraq. That equipment is wearing out 2 to 9 time's peacetime rate.

Humvees that are designed for 14 years of operation needs are being overhauled or replaced in just 3 years.

The Army has lost over 100 tanks and armored vehicles and over 1,000 vehicles since the start of the war.

If the war in Iraq ended today, it would take the Army more than 2 years to repair or replace its damaged equipment.

The Marine Corps has determined that equipment deployed to Iraq has suffered such significant damage and wear and tear that 80 percent of it will need to be replaced.

In excess of $50 billion is needed to repair and replace equipment damaged or lost in Iraq for the Army and Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, stay the course is not a strategy for success and we're not doing our job by being a rubber stamp for the Administration. Each day, it becomes more apparent that the Administration does not have, nor has it ever had, a clear, concise and realistic strategy for ending large scale U.S. involvement in Iraq. The American people deserve a clear explanation of what we are doing in Iraq. They deserve to know what the President is going to do to reduce the incredible physical, emotional and financial burden that all Americans are bearing. If this Congress and the President expect the American people to continue making these sacrifices, then there must be a strategy for success.

Mr. Speaker, we must set the bar and identify what it will take for us to accomplish the mission in Iraq. When the Iraqi people conclude the process of amending their constitution, or by September 30, 2006, we must begin the process of redeployment as soon as practicable. This is a workable approach that tracks a timeline set by the Administration. That is why I have introduced H. Con. Res. 348, which would do just that. This legislation is a bipartisan, comprehensive plan to redeploy American forces out of Iraq and send a clear message to the Iraqi people that the United States has no plans to be a permanent occupying force and we have no designs on Iraqi oil. Six Republicans have signed onto this bill. This bipartisan measure has been introduced in the Senate (S. Con. Res. 93), making it the only bicameral approach to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I did not support the President's plan to invade Iraq. I considered it to be an unnecessary distraction from hunting down those responsible for the attacks of September 11th. But, as the U.S. has entered its fourth year in Iraq, this is where we are and now we must find a rational and reasonable way out of this mess.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an honest debate about this important issue and while the majority plays politics our men and women serving in Iraq are in terrible danger.

Rhetorical attempts to obfuscate failed tactical decisions in Iraq with the global war on terror will do nothing to solve the problem that is before us today. Nor will it correct this body's failure to provide its constitutional oversight responsibility that has led to the billions of American taxpayer dollars that have either been misused or remain unaccounted for in our efforts to rebuild Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, global terrorism remains a grave national security threat to the United States. However, the war in Iraq and this resolution is a distraction from our struggle against terrorism. As the President continues his stay the course strategy in Iraq, the Taliban is regaining strength in Afghanistan. If we are to prevail in the war on terrorism we must refocus our efforts on terrorist hotbeds, such as Afghanistan.

The brave men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces are the best-equipped, best-trained and most professional fighting forces in the world. They have been performing their jobs courageously and honorably and their morale remains high. These men and women deserve our thanks and our respect. They deserve better than this sham resolution.

Mr. Speaker, give this House back to the people for real debate on our policy in Iraq.

IN MEMORY OF FIRST LIEUTENANT RYAN T. SANDERS, UNITED STATES ARMY

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Army First Lieutenant Ryan T. Sanders, an American hero who gave his life in defense of liberty and freedom. He made the ultimate sacrifice so that others might know freedom, and I am humbled by his bravery and selflessness.

First Lieutenant Ryan Sanders was killed on June 11, 2006 while conducting combat operations when a roadside bomb exploded near his Abrams tank in Baghdad, Iraq. He was 27 years old. First Lieutenant Sanders was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 66th Armor Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division at Ft. Hood, Texas.

In keeping with Eagle Scout tradition, he placed the safety and well being of others above his own. His family is dedicated to American ideals of freedom and democracy as he is the third of four sons to serve in the Persian Gulf region.

First Lieutenant Sanders is survived by his wife, Jennifer Sanders; his parents, Jim and Kay Sanders of Richardson; his brothers, Mike, Jeff, and Greg Sanders; and his grandparents, Truett and Joyce Sanders of San Angelo. I extend my deepest condolences to each of them.

First Lieutenant Sanders leaves behind a legacy marked by courage, integrity and character. May God bless and comfort all those he loved, and may they know the gratitude of the American people.

DAN DANIEL CHARITY GOLF TOURNAMENT

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 2006, the organizers of the Dan Daniel Charity Golf Tournament, held their 18th tournament at the Andrews Air Force Base Golf facility, named for our beloved and honored colleague from Virginia who died serving his 10th term in Congress. Dan Daniel's unqualified support for the fighting men and women of this nation is legendary.

Dan was the first Chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee, House Armed Services Committee and also served as the Chairman of the Morale, Welfare and Recreation Panel. He was a man who cared deeply about military readiness and quality of life issues, (exchanges, commissaries, child care centers, bowling alleys, libraries, and golf courses).

Dan was an avid golfer; and while this tournament is held in his honor . . . it is for the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States. This year, the tournament, together with Averett University, of Danville, Virginia, and the Professional Golf Association of America (PGA) hosted numerous special heroes from the Walter Reed Army Hospital and the Bethesda Naval Center to a special day of

fun, relaxation, golf and dinner. The former Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff, General Richard Meyer and Mrs. Meyer joined in the day's festivities to salute our troops. Mr. Speaker, all who played with these wounded warriors feel deeply humbled and proud.

All funds generated by this tournament are spent at the Andrews Air Force Base facility to support the base morale, welfare and recreation activities. Profits from the tournament are directed to supporting military scholarship programs. This tournament has strong support from the Congress, business and military resale community.

Our Nation is strong because of the brave members of the Armed Forces. Those with us from Walter Reed and Bethesda are among a very special group who have demonstrated, through their personal courage and sacrifice that our nation remains strong and determined. These proud patriots continue to inspire this generation of America.

The PGA is a true friend of our military forces and their families. We often see pictures of our soldiers hitting golf balls in the deserts of Afghanistan, Iraq and off ships at sea. The PGA constantly provides guidance, instruction, training and certification to our military golf managers and golf course operators.

Mr. Paul Bogin, Chief Operating Officer of the PGA, is retiring at the end of June. Mr. Paul Bogin's outstanding leadership has significantly advanced the interest of golf, especially in the Special Olympics, The National Amputee Golf Outings, minority golf and inner city youth programs. His leadership has improved all aspects of military golf, both here at home and also at bases located overseas. The military courses operate with non-appropriated funds and at no expense to the taxpayer.

The PGA and National Amputee Golf Association conduct clinics at Veterans Hospitals and teach physical therapist how to use golf as a rehabilitative program for the disabled. Efforts are now underway to develop a program for our wounded military.

Mr. Bogin's dedication, leadership and devotion have improved the game of golf, individual golfers, and the military. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the founders and supporters of this great golf event and I congratulate the PGA, sponsors and players, especially our wounded warriors who played in this tournament. I wish Paul Bogin continued success, best wishes and a happy retirement.

I ask my colleagues to join me in commending the organizers of the Dan Daniel Golf Tournament, and Mr. Bogin, for their continuing dedication to our military forces.

TRIBUTE TO TED RYAN

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of an outstanding individual, Ted Ryan. Mr. Ryan was one of amateur radio's most prolific teachers, instructing thousands from 1964 to 2000. He also pioneered the teaching of ham radio in the Los Angeles Unified School District.

He was born on March 15, 1929, in Detroit, Michigan. He served in World War II in Panama, and earned the Legion of Merit for his work on a gunnery system. He studied at the University of Southern California and California State University, Northridge.

Ted Ryan started his extensive amateur radio career in 1964, teaching free licensing classes at the San Fernando Amateur Radio Club, W6SD. The club grew to one of the largest and best run in the country because of his skill and competence. From 1970 to 1982, he taught electric shop and ham radio at John Burroughs Junior High School. After retiring from teaching full-time, he continued to teach at the Red Cross.

Mr. Ryan saw ham radio as more than just an interesting hobby. He told his students that, if they were drafted, a ham radio license could ''put a microphone instead of a rifle'' in their hands. He was fond of saying that amateur radio saved the lives of many of his students during the Vietnam War. Mr. Ryan also emphasized the importance of public service, and taught his students to be ready to go onto emergency power in the case of an emergency.

Ted Ryan is also remembered for his kindness and devotion to his students. He liked to be called ''Grandpa,'' and told his students ''Grandpa loves you.'' He always came to school early and stayed late, often inviting students to his house on Saturday mornings for tutoring sessions and extra help.

Mr. Ryan touched the lives of all he knew. I am proud to honor the memory of Ted Ryan, ham radio license number WB6JXY.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LARRY D. TERRY, PH.D.

HON. STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Larry D. Terry, a leader in the fields of public administration and social research. On Saturday, June 17, 2006, this beloved father, mentor, scholar, educator, and friend passed away. The passing of a loved one is always a great loss to family and friends. When that loss is so sudden, and when that person has touched and affected the lives of so many, it is incumbent upon us to stop and remember such a person with gratitude and respect.

Today I come before you to express condolences to the family and friends of Larry D. Terry, Ph.D., but also to celebrate the life of a youth from Oklahoma, who grew in prominence to become a vital leader in his field and one of the most distinguished graduates of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and the State University of Blacksburg, Virginia.

Larry grew up in a family where religion and spirituality were foundations of family life, and educational achievement was stressed. At Lincoln University of Jefferson, Missouri, he majored in political science and earned his bachelor of arts degree. In 1978, he received his master of science degree from the University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, where he majored in community development. In 1989, he earned a Ph.D. in public administration and public affairs at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, where he specialized in organization theory and behavior.

Dr. Terry had a most distinguished professional career as adjunct professor, assistant professor, associate professor, full professor, assistant dean, university provost and university vice president, however his students will best remember him as a dynamic teacher who cared about their success and demanded excellence. His curriculum vitae tells the story of his professional life and his commitment to his students, his universities and to the local, State and Federal agencies and organizations throughout the country that he served.

I met Dr. Larry Terry during his 12-year tenure at the Maxine G. Levin College of Urban Affairs at Cleveland State University. He was not only on staff at the university—he was my constituent both where he lived and worked. He was also a visionary. Dr. Terry understood his role in preparing students to be ethical, responsible administrators. He understood the relationship between quality service delivery, an informed and active citizenry, and a strong democratic government. While working with public and private partners, he sought methods of best practices and leadership to insure the success of those partnerships.

Dr. Terry was a distinguished scholar with wide-ranging interests, evidenced by publications encompassing academic articles, books, and book reviews. He was the youngest and the first African American editor for the Public Administration Review, a leading journal. In 1999, he was the youngest person to be inducted into the National Academy of Public Administration. Dr. Terry was also a special friend and mentor for African American students, particularly males, who saw in Dr. Terry the possibilities for themselves.

For all of the students who had the good fortune to know him, Dr. Larry Terry was an advisor, mentor, and friend. As assistant dean for graduate programs, at Levin College, he was responsible for the college's Ph.D. program. During his tenure, more Ph.D. students enrolled and graduated than at any other time in the history of the program.

In 2001 Dr. Terry left Cleveland State University for the position of associate provost at the University of Texas at Dallas. There he faced new challenges, new opportunities and new successes. At the time of his death he was vice president for business affairs at the university.

Although we are saddened by the loss of someone we loved and respected, especially one so young and full of potential, today I join Larry's children: Larry II, Felice, Jacob, and Gavin; his family and friends in celebrating the life of a hero. I celebrate the life of a vital Black man who seized the opportunity to expand his knowledge, broaden his horizons through service, and leave a lasting legacy through written words and lessons shared with students.

The torch has now been passed to his students, to make our world a better place. And to Dr. Larry D. Terry's colleagues, I urge you to celebrate his life by expanding on his many good works. His legacy will continue.

May God bless Dr. Larry D. Terry.

LARRY WINN, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

SPEECH OF

HON. JERRY MORAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 2006

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of a distinguished Kansan, Edward Lawrence ''Larry'' Winn, Jr. Congressman Winn honorably represented the residents of the Third Congressional District of Kansas from 1967 until 1985. His career in Congress was marked by his care for the Kansans he represented and accentuated by noteworthy accomplishments.

Kansans are people that know the value of a hard day's work—Congressman Winn included. During his eighteen years of service in Congress, Congressman Winn always worked to ensure taxpayer's dollars were spent wisely. He knew the folks back home had worked hard and expected their taxes to not be wasted. The Treasury Department recognized Congressman Winn's efforts for fiscal responsibility by awarding him the Golden Bulldog Award each year he served.

Congressman Winn also made sure that Kansans were well-informed about what was happening in Washington. As a former radio broadcaster, Congressman Winn taped a weekly radio program that was distributed to local broadcasters in Kansas. His popularity and reputation for excellence in constituent service was evident by frequently seeing ''I visited Congressman Larry Winn in Washington'' bumper stickers.

During his service in the House, Congressman Winn was a strong supporter of our nation's space program. As a member of the House Committee on Space and Aeronautics, Congressman Winn's support for space exploration and scientific discovery, helped give NASA the resources it needed to achieve the great accomplishments it did.

I am proud to be a sponsor of legislation to recognize this fine Kansan. For his dedication to the people of Kansas and our nation, it is appropriate that Congress honor Congressman Winn by designating the United States Post Office at 6029 Broadmoor Street in Mission, Kansas, as the ''Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building.''

INTRODUCTION OF THE PREVENTION MEDICINE FOR A HEALTHIER AMERICA ACT OF 2006

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would improve the long-term health of Americans and reduce the skyrocketing health care costs in our nation. One of the best ways we can accomplish these goals is to encourage companies to implement programs that prevent disease and encourage healthy lifestyles.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am introducing the Preventive Medicine for a Healthier America Act of 2006. This legislation would increase the number of individuals who pursue preventive medicine careers, encourage businesses to offer wellness programs for their employees, and provide public awareness on the importance of preventive medicine.

Preventive medicine physicians are an important resource in the quest to educate patients and communities of health risks, detect symptoms in the early stages of disease, and encourage preventive action. Unfortunately, the number of preventive medicine residency programs and individuals pursuing preventive medicine degrees has significantly decreased in recent years.

As a result, the Preventive Medicine for a Healthier America Act would offer up to $20,000 in loan forgiveness for individuals who become board certified in preventive medicine. Medical school is an expensive undertaking and too many medical students are forced to pursue professions that will provide instant financial benefits. They often must do this simply to payoff student loans. By providing up to $20,000 in loan forgiveness for pursuing preventive medicine, this legislation would help ensure a talented pool of preventive medicine physicians.

Businesses are another important component in the fight to prevent disease among Americans. As businesses realize the financial benefits and productivity improvements involved with the health of their employees, more and more are becoming interested in preventive medicine. Wellness and preventive health programs can be expensive initially. However results over the long-term have saved companies hundreds of thousands of dollars and several have even seen cost savings in the millions.

The Preventive Medicine for a Healthier America Act would provide tax incentives for companies that implement a wellness program for their employees. Qualified businesses that implement wellness programs would be able to claim a tax credit for every employee that participates. A certain percentage of their employees would have to participate for a company to be eligible for the credit, and there are specific requirements to ensure employees benefit. In turn, employees would stay healthier and businesses can see a significant reduction in their health care costs.

Public awareness regarding the importance of preventive medicine is also a key to the prevention of disease. My bill also would require the Department of Health and Human Services to carry out a national education campaign to encourage the use of preventive health screenings. Providing education would encourage individuals to take responsibility for their health and offer information on how to prevent illness for themselves and for their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce the Preventive Medicine for a Healthier America Act which would reduce the risk of disease, encourage a healthier America, and help curb the rising cost of health care for our businesses. It is important we realize as a Nation that taking care of ourselves today will pay the dividends of tomorrow.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS' 2006 ''STAMP OUT HUNGER'' NATIONAL FOOD DRIVE

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, June 6th was National Hunger Awareness Day, a day when our Nation acknowledged that more than 38 million Americans, including nearly 14 million children, still go hungry every day.

As a Member of Congress and as one of the Co-Chairs of the House Hunger Caucus, I am committed to ending hunger in the United States and around the world. I know we can end hunger once and for all if we only have the political will to do so.

Mr. Speaker, it is with gratitude and pleasure that I rise to specifically acknowledge the efforts of the National Association of Letter Carriers (NALC) toward feeding the hungry in the United States and its jurisdictions. On Saturday, May 13, the NALC executed its 14th annual ''Stamp Out Hunger'' national food drive. Millions of American generously left food donations next to their mail slots for pick-up that Saturday. Local letter carriers throughout the country collected, processed and distributed 70,493,150 pounds of donated food along their regular postal routes.

The 70.5 million pounds of food has gone to restock our Nation's food banks, pantries and shelters. This national network of agencies assist our children, elderly, working poor, disabled and unemployed who struggle to obtain nutritious meals for themselves and their families.

Some of this food was donated by residents of the 3rd Congressional District of Massachusetts to the Greater Boston Food Bank and the Worcester County Food bank, Together, they serve 887 soup kitchens, food pantries, shelters and other agencies.

This drive exemplifies the types of partnerships between government, the private sector and civil society that our country needs. The United States Postal Service and Campbell Soup Company teamed up with the NALC to deliver almost 118 million post-cards promoting the drive, and to enable the pick-up and distribution of donations.

I commend the efforts of over 200,000 letter carriers, great American public servants on and off the job, toward helping our needy. Their efforts should serve as an inspiration and as a model to our fellow Americans and to the federal government. I hope that the work of our Nation's letter carriers spurs other Americans to work together toward the achievable goal of ending hunger in this wealthiest of nations.

TRIBUTE TO JUDY JONES

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. McCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address this body with a heavy heart. Judy Jones, the mother of my dear friend Melinda Little, passed away on Sunday, June 18, 2006 with her family by her side.

Judy was a proud Texan, a native Houstonian and a staunch Republican. She graduated from the first graduating class of Bellaire High School in 1958, attended the University of Houston, and for the last fifteen years, she worked at the Texas Association of Public Employee Retirement Systems.

Judy was also a founding member of Heritage Republican Women's club and spent years working in grassroots for the Republican Party in Harris County and also statewide. She chaired two successful campaigns to elect her husband Sonny Jones to the Texas House of Representatives as the first Republican to be elected to that body since Reconstruction, and she worked tirelessly to successfully give Harris County and Texas a Republican majority.

Judy loved life. She will always be remembered for the love she gave to her husband Sonny and her three children Melinda, Michael and Maggie. She will also be remembered for the love she received from her family and friends, her wonderful sense of humor and her joy in celebrating the holidays. Judy will truly be missed.

GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in the days after 9/11, the United States took the last action our enemies thought we would take—we took the fight to them. They believed that our partisan bickering would provide them with the protection they needed to continue to operate. They were wrong. Our armed forces struck hard at the very heart of their operation—disrupting their terrorist network and bringing down their leaders.

They are an enemy without borders, and believed they could find sanctuary in any number of countries that would provide safe haven. They operated camps and training grounds half way around the world, far away from any U.S. military presence. Today, we have them on the run. Saddam Hussein has been captured and Zarqawi is dead. In their place stands the very thing our enemies fear the most—democracy. Instead of a fascist dictator is a newly elected Prime Minister, and fear and oppression has been replaced with an emerging economy.

However, our enemies continue to fight . . . but why? Does their resolve stem from some military, political or strategic error on our part? To the contrary, it's our doubt that gives them strength.

Al Qaeda has declared Iraq as the battleground between democracy and their hatred of our way of life . . . but they know that their war cannot be won on the battlefield. Instead, their war is waged in the minds of every American. By definition terrorism is the spreading fear and doubt through violence . . . and that's what they are trying to do.

Since the days immediately following 9/11, solidarity has once again given way to partisanship. Despite our successes, this has given the terrorists the foothold they need. Unlike before 9/11, our forces are at their front door, poised to strike before they can do any more harm. But the terrorists believe the day is well within their grasp where they can resume operations without fear of intervention by the U.S. and our allies. A day when they can tumble a newborn democracy and another one more than 200 years old. If we let this day come and allow the fight to return to our shores, we have not only failed those who lost their lives on 9/11 and the those who died fighting for our freedom, but our families, friends and everything we hold dear. I look forward to the day when our friends in the Middle East can stand on their own. They have already proven to be dedicated allies, but their future and the future of our friendship still hangs in the balance.

Some would rather abandon our friends and everything we have accomplished, hoping that this act of good faith will somehow appease a foe proven to be without mercy. But I know our borders and our communities should not be our front lines . . . and in our retreat, this would be the next battleground. It's happened before, and it would happen again.

We didn't choose this fight, but we are in it. It is a war of freedom against tyranny. We have to stand together and prove to these killers they can't win. It's our job to keep our nation safe, and we will.

HONORING SCIENTISTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER MEDICAL CENTER

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor three champions of medical research and health care innovation in this country, Doctors William Bonnez, Richard Reichman and Robert Rose, virologists in the Infectious Diseases Division of the Department of Medicine at the University of Rochester Medical Center (URMC).

The URMC has a long legacy of medical innovation and groundbreaking research. These three doctors have continued that tradition with their research into the human papillomavirus (HPV), laying the groundwork for the recent FDA approval of a cervical cancer vaccine that will protect against two of the most prevalent cancer-causing strains of HPV.

After years of research and clinical trials during the 1990s, Doctors Bonnez, Reichman, and Rose were able to create a ''virus-like particle'' that imitated the real papillomavirus. Though it was not infectious, the virus-like particle induced the immune system to respond as if a real virus were launching an attack. This breakthrough at the URMC, created the foundation for other scientists to build upon. The fruits of URMCs basic research were reaped on June 8, 2006, when the Food and Drug Administration approved Gardasil, the vaccine designed to block strains of the sexually transmitted HPV known to cause 70 percent of cervical cancer cases.

Every year approximately 5.5 million people contract sexually transmitted HPV infections from their partners. In fact, three out of every four sexually active people will get an HPV infection at some point during their lifetime. In some age groups, such as sexually active men and women under the age of 30, it is estimated that 40 percent of people are currently infected. HPV causes about 9,700 new cases of cervical cancer in women annually. In addition, each year, cervical cancer kills nearly 4,000 women in the U.S. and more than 288,000 women worldwide. Through the work of Doctors Bonnez, Reichman, Rose and others, we will see these statistics drop dramatically in the years ahead, and millions of lives worldwide will be saved.

As a microbiologist I understand the critical importance of developing new vaccines to fight the diseases that plague our Nation and countries around the world. And when there are major medical breakthroughs, like the approval of Gardisil, we should celebrate the years of basic research that went into development of this life saving vaccine. That is why it gives me great pleasure to come before the House of Representatives to recognize and pay tribute to the tireless efforts made by three doctors—William Bonnez, Richard Reichman and Robert Rose—at URMC.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF SGT JOSÉ M. VELEZ

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Sgt. José M. Velez, a brave young man who made the ultimate sacrifice serving in Iraq.

Sgt. Velez grew up in East Harlem and made the Bronx his home. In 2004, he enlisted in the U.S. Armed Forces in order to serve and protect the country he loved so dearly.

Sgt. Velez was assigned to the 773rd Transportation Company, based in Fort Totten, Queens. Unfortunately, on June 9, 2006, he met an untimely death as he was killed in the line of fire only one month after touching down in Iraq.

A truck driver by profession, Sgt. Velez was described by those who knew him best as honorable, kind, intelligent and fearless. He leaves behind two children, Melody and Christopher Velez. May they read these words that I speak today and be proud of the tremendous sacrifice their father made for his country.

The death of Sgt. Velez once again reminds us of the great cost of war. As I speak before you today, 2,500 American troops have given their lives in this war, which has no end in sight. Like so many other children, Melody and Christopher have lost a father and like so many other parents, Mr. and Mrs. Velez have lost a son. And, sadly, with the falling of another soldier, America has lost more of its potential to become an even greater Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Velez has inspired me with his courage and conviction. Learning of his valor in the face of adversity has further motivated me to push relentlessly for peace.

As we mourn the life of this brave soldier, let us remember the sacrifices of all our service members and work to ensure that their heroic deeds are never forgotten.

For his heroism and service to his country, I ask my colleagues to join me in mourning the loss of Sgt. José M. Velez.

IN HONOR OF CARIBBEAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH, 2006

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 71 and Ranking Member of the House International Relations Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, I rise to pay tribute to the designation of June as National Caribbean-American Heritage Month. I also congratulate Rep. BARBARA LEE (D–CA) for her successful leadership in ensuring unanimous passage of H. Con. Res. 71 in both the House and Senate, and extend my thanks to the numerous bipartisan cosponsors who helped make passage possible. Caribbean-American Heritage month honors the tremendous contributions of Caribbean-Americans to our Nation's fabric, and recognizes that our nations are bound together by cultural ties, social and economic links, and common values.

People of Caribbean heritage are found in every State of the Union, including large populations, in New York, and have been contributing to our Nation's success since the American colonies. My constituents of Caribbean heritage have contributed to our great country in the fields of education, fine arts, business, literature, journalism, sports, fashion, politics, government, the military, music, science, technology, and other areas, and help illustrate the ongoing contribution of immigrants and their descendants to our Nation's fabric and success. Caribbean-Americans enrich and strengthen our society.

I encourage all citizens to participate in the celebration of Caribbean-American Heritage month and to learn more about the contributions of Caribbean-Americans and our strong ties to Caribbean nations. I also congratulate and join Caribbean-Americans in their celebration of their rich heritage.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. PETER'S CATHOLIC CHURCH

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, The Columbia Star reported on June 16, 2006 an article highlighting the 100 year Birthday Bash to celebrate 100 years of St. Peter's Catholic Church in Columbia, South Carolina, occupying its present building on Assembly Street. Jennifer Miskewicz, an anchor from WIS News 10 and member of St. Peter's, presided over the day's events.

St. Peter's Church is the Mother Church of the Midlands of South Carolina being established in 1821.

A brief history of the church is a testamonial to the importance of the church to the citizens of South Carolina.

The earliest record of Catholics in Columbia, South Carolina, is in association with Father James Wallace who in the early 1800's became Professor of Mathematics and Astronomy at the newly-formed South Carolina College. It is said that during his tenure Fr. Wallace celebrated Mass for the small but growing community of Catholics in the Midlands. (He is buried in St. Peter's churchyard.)

In 1820 the Diocese of Charleston was established. It included all of South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia. Early in 1821 the newly-appointed Bishop John England sent Father Dennis Corkery to pastor and attend the welfare of a group of Irish immigrants working on the Columbia Canal. This was the beginning of St. Peter's Parish. By 1824 work began on a small brick church designed by renowned architect Robert Mills. The cornerstone of that building can still be seen in the vestibule of the present church.

Since it was the only parish in the Midlands and Upstate in those early years, the pastors of St. Peter's traveled by horseback to serve small groups of Catholics throughout that vast territory. For the most part, Catholics in the South at that time were of humble circumstances, many operating small farms, some retail stores and a fraction of them employed at some of the developing state institutions. Few commanded positions of influence. This changed gradually, and by 1852, the construction of the State House and other public buildings brought additional Catholics to Columbia. Among these was John R. Niernsee, a native of Austria who became the architect for the State House. (He is buried in St. Peter's churchyard.)

AN EDUCATIONAL MISSION

As Columbia established itself, St. Peter's Parish grew and began to focus attention and energy on an educational ministry. In 1848 Father Jeremiah O'Connell became pastor of St. Peter's and soon founded St. Mary's College for young men and the Academy of the Immaculate Conception for young women. In 1859 the Ursuline sisters began teaching in these institutions. That same year, the church was renovated and enlarged to almost twice its original size.

The Civil War quickly put a halt to this progress, and on February 17, 1865, Union troops entered the city. Fire then destroyed not only much of Columbia but also the college and academy, along with the rectory and parish records. The church was damaged but not destroyed. The schools continued in operation from various locations initially through the efforts of General William T. Sherman and later through the hospitality of other churches and residents of Columbia. A rectory was evenutally provided through the aid of the newly established Catholic Association of Columbia. In 1872 St. Peter's Cemetary was begun on land donated near the public cemetery on Elmwood Avenue. The parish then remained in steady operation to the end of the nineteenth century despite the difficulties associated with the years of the Reconstruction Era.

A NEW BUILDING AND GROWTH

The beginning of the twentieth century found the old church in such deterioated condition that the parishioners decided to build a new and enlarged one. Frank P. Milburn, a prominent architect working at the time on the construction of the State House dome, was engaged to design and oversee the project. The cornerstone for a new English Gothic style church was laid in 1906. It was dedicated by Bishop Northrup on January 17, 1909. The total cost of the church including all its furnishings was $60,506.64. The pastor, Father Thomas Hegarty, inspired and guided the community throughout the project. (He is buried in a side chapel in the vestibule of the church.) That same building continues to serve the community as its place of worship now into the twenty-first century.

In 1911, a lot on the corner of Assembly and Taylor Streets was purchased and a new rectory was built. With the assistance of the Knights of Columbus a new school building was erected in 1919. In 1920, St. Peter's helped establish a new parish in the Shandon area first known as St. Francis de Sales, later renamed St. Joseph. Monsignor Martin Murphy, a beloved pastor for over a quarter of the last century, helped found St. Martin de Porres Parish, Providence Hospital, and St. Patrick's Chapel.

TOWARD A NEW CENTURY

In 1964 the parish received its first American-born pastor, Monsignor William Croghan. During those same years many of the reforms initiated by the Second Vatican Council were introduced and implemented in the parish. St. Peter's witnessed increased lay involvement in the parish. St. Peter's witnessed increased lay involvement in the work of the church, particularly in ecumenical activties, outready projects for the poor, and efforts for justice and peace. The interior of the church was remodeled during these years, but its more modern design proved to be inconsistent with the architectural style of the building. In later years it was again restored.

Since 1985 Monsignor Leigh Lehocky has been pastor of St. Peter's. On September 11, 1987, the parish had the great privilege of receiving Pope John Paul II where he greated over 550 representatives from parishes throughout the diocese. The Pope's visit to Columbia also included an ecumenical dialogue with leaders from some twenty-six other Christian churches. Monsignor Lehocky, as diocesan Vicard for Ecumenism, has continued the spirit of the Pope, involving the parish in the work for Christian unity. On January 14, 1996, St. Peter's welcomed Cardinal Joseph Bernardin of Chicago, himself a child of the parish, to celebrate its 175th anniversary. In 1992, Bishop David Thompson dedicated the new parish school.

The history of Catholic Christians at St. Peter's touches into three centuries. Its life in Christ Jesus makes it ever ancient and yet always new.

TRIBUTE TO MR. JOSHUA MARC JACOBSON

HON. THOMAS G. TANCREDO

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate a young man from Greenwood Village, Colorado, Mr. Joshua Marc Jacobson. Joshua recently earned a Congressional Award Gold Medal.

The Congressional Award program challenges talented young men and women to be active in their communities, develop leadership skills, and challenge themselves physically and to go on expeditions domestically or internationally.

Josh completed over 400 hours of community service with the most rewarding project being a food drive that he organized as the chapter president of Future Business Leaders of America. His personal development goals were achieved through part-time work with local businesses. There he was able to develop skills in leadership that he will be taking with him as an intern for a U.S. Congressional

Campaign this summer. Josh completed his physical fitness requirements by playing varsity tennis in high school, after years of hard work to achieve his goal. Josh also took a six week long trip to Israel and Poland to complete his expedition requirements.

Josh should be commended for his commitment to community and his desire to become a future leader. I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTING IN NEVADA AND SEMIPALATINSK: SHARED LEGACY, SHARED LESSONS

HON. SHELLEY BERKLEY

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the symposium, Nuclear Weapons Testing in Nevada and Semipalatinsk: Shared Legacy, Shared Lessons, Ambassador Saudabayev and I expressed our concern over the continuous proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world, and therefore, declare the following:

During the cold war, in the second part of the 20th century, the lands of Nevada and Kazakhstan became sites for nuclear weapons testing by the United States and the Soviet Union, and many of our citizens became victims of the radioactive fallout and other contaminants that resulted from the testing. These people tragically came to know the destructive force of weapons of mass destruction. As a result of 928 nuclear tests at the Nevada Test Site, along with more tests at other U.S. proving grounds, and 456 nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk Test Site, many thousands of innocent Americans and Kazakhs suffered. Many continue to this day to suffer the consequences of nuclear testing.

In 1991, the people of Kazakhstan, under the leadership of President Nursultan Nazarbayev, permanently shut down the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site and took the courageous decision to voluntarily renounce the world's fourth largest nuclear arsenal. Kazakhstan has so far remained the only country to make such a decisive and wise move which showed the way to a safer world. The United States, at the direction of both Democratic and Republican presidents, has maintained a moratorium on nuclear testing, has reduced its nuclear arsenal, and has aided in decommissioning nuclear weapons abroad.

Unfortunately, the age of nuclear weapons development has not ended. To the contrary, the specter of nuclear weapons is spreading. Today, the aspirations of a number of countries, and of international terrorist organizations, to acquire nuclear weapons are becoming ever more threatening to the future of humankind. Against this background, we are grateful to Kazakhstan for its outstanding contribution to global security. Kazakhstan's leadership and its cooperation with the United States to advance the cause of nonproliferation should serve as an example for other countries. The victims of nuclear testing in Nevada and Semipalatinsk are eternal reminders to the nations of the world to reject developing nuclear weapons, the modern Sword of Damocles that has imperiled humanity for too long, and to join together to rid the world of the threat of nuclear holocaust.

We are most pleased to report that today's Symposium in Las Vegas, Nevada is another step toward further empowering the people of the United States and Kazakhstan to lead all people away from the threat of nuclear weapons, and redress the consequences of earlier nuclear testing. We pledge to work together to strengthen international cooperation to achieve nonproliferation, as we recognize this is the only path we can take to make our planet safe for all nations to pursue a better future for their people.

TRIBUTE TO FATHER LUKE PALUMBIS

HON. RICHARD W. POMBO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct honor of welcoming Father Luke Palumbis to offer the Morning Prayer in the Chamber of the U.S. House of Representatives. Today marks the first day of summer and indeed the sun is shining down upon the Capitol as we open the morning hour, as we do each day the House of Representatives is in session, with a prayer to express our tremendous gratitude and to instill the strength to act resolutely and with sound judgment with the day's proceedings.

I am pleased to have Father Palumbis here to give thanks and prayer to the proceedings of the House. He has taken the time to fly from Stockton, California, where he serves the Greek Orthodox community of Saint Basil. This is a historic occasion as it is the first time an Orthodox clergyman from the west coast has given the Morning Prayer, and I am pleased he comes from California's 11th Congressional district.

A canonically ordained priest of the Eastern Orthodox Church, Father Palumbis graduated from Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, in Brookline, MA, with a Master in Divinity in 2003, and is currently enrolled in a Master in Theology Thesis program at the same institution. Previously Father Palumbis attended the University of Portland, in Portland, OR, where he earned a Bachelor of Business Administration and was a member of the university's intercollegiate basketball team.

Father Palumbis is married to his wife Eleni Palumbis and they are awaiting the birth of their first child next month. I wish them both the very best of health and happiness back home in Stockton.

CONGRATULATING BUD FAYE

HON. ROB SIMMONS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate my good friend, Bud Faye of Groton, Connecticut for his being recognized as the 2005 Connecticut Small-Business Champion by the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB). I have long considered Bud to be a shining example of what an American small business owner should be, so I am glad that NFIB has recognized his successful career with this prestigious award.

For 22 years, Bud has owned Pop and Mum's Restaurant-Car Wash-Laundromat and Dry Cleaning in Groton. Here, one of his proudest innovations was establishing a link between the gas dryers used in his laundromat and the hot water supply for this car wash. As a result, on a busy day he can rely on the excess heat from the dryers in use to heat the hot water for the car wash operation.

When he is not running his business, Bud is active in the community, co-chairing the Groton Business Association and the Military Community Council. He was the driving force behind the formation of the NFIB/Connecticut Southeastern Area Action Council—a group of active small-business owners in southeastern Connecticut. Bud even worked to make computers at a local high school available so residents of a local retirement home can e-mail friends and family. These efforts have consistently helped make southeastern Connecticut a better place not only to do business, but to live.

In addition to his work in these areas, the people of Connecticut and in fact the entire nation will long be indebted to Bud for his tireless efforts to help save the Groton-New London Naval Submarine Base from closure. First in 1993 and again in 2005, Bud helped to form and lead a group of local business owners and community leaders who lobbied against the base closure plan—a plan that would have led to the loss of tens of thousands of jobs and removed billions of dollars from Connecticut's economy. Bud's efforts clearly demonstrated deep local support for the base, which was an important factor when the decision was made to keep it open.

Each year, NFIB singles out a small-business owner in all 50 States for special recognition and honors them with its prestigious Small-Business Champion award. Bud Faye is a worthy recipient of this award, and I am proud to add my voice to the countless others that have thanked him for helping make Groton a better place to live, work, and raise a family.

Thank you, Bud, and congratulations.

TRIBUTE TO ROGER S. MEIER

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a distinguished American, Roger S. Meier, who died on June 5, 2006 at the age of 80.

Mr. Meier, a fourth-generation Oregonian who lived most of his life in Portland, was a descendant of the founders of the Meier & Frank Company. He graduated from Yale University and married Laura Schwartz of New York City in 1952. He worked at Meier & Frank as a director and vice president until the store was sold to the May Company in 1965.

Mr. Meier was the president and chief executive officer of AMCO, Inc., a privately owned investment company for more than 30 years. The Governor of Oregon appointed him to the Public Employees' Retirement Board in 1970,

and he also served through appointment on the Oregon Investment Council from 1973 to 1986 as chairman. The Oregonian observed that unpaid public service has rarely, if ever, generated such a profound financial benefit for Oregonians.

Mr. Meier served with distinction as chairman of the board of trustees for the Portland Art Museum, and as director of Pacific Western Bank, Pac West Bancorp, NI Industries, Fred Meyer, Inc., Key Bank of Oregon, Red Lion Inns, Key Trust Company of the Northwest and The Acorn Family of Funds. Mr. Meier also gave generously of his time and talents through his service on the boards of the Catlin Gabel School, University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, Good Samaritan Hospital, the Oregon Historical Society and the Legacy Health Systems Retirement Trust.

Mr. Meier is survived by his wife, Laura, his daughters, Alix Goodman and Jill Garvey, his sons-in-law, Tom Goodman and Tony Garvey, and four grandchildren—Laura and Caroline Garvey, and Andrew and Reed Goodman. He is also survived by his nieces and their spouses, Lynn Meier Novelli and Michael Novelli, Mary Meier Ryan and Dan Ryan, and Muffie Meier; and his grand-nephews Alexander Mansfield Novelli and J. Allen Meier Ryan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our sympathy to the entire Meier family. Roger Meier was a national treasure who loved his community and his country and served them exceedingly well. He will always be missed and never be forgotten.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE-LONG ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MR. RUDOLPH BERTHOUD AND THE LEGACY OF HIS SERVICE AS A TUSKEGEE AIRMAN

HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today deeply honored and humbled to recognize the contributions of one of the 140 remaining Tuskegee Airmen, Mr. Rudolph Berthoud. To understand the achievements and sacrifice of Mr. Berthoud, I feel it is incumbent upon me to discuss the accomplishments of the elite group of fighters to which Mr. Rudolph Berthoud belonged.

In thinking of the Tuskegee Airmen I am reminded of the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who once said that if a man is called to be a street sweeper, he should sweep streets so well that all the hosts of heaven and earth will pause to say, ''Here lived a great street sweeper who did his job well.'' The Tuskegee Airmen were called to a task far greater, both dangerous and unprecedented. As the first black combat pilots to serve in the air force they served just as Dr. King's metaphorical street sweeper.

The Tuskegee Airmen flew and defended their country so well that their allies, as well as their opposition, knew them for their skill. One of the fighter squadrons that made up the all black 332nd fighter group was the only fighter group in World War II that never lost a fighter. The courage and commitment of the Tuskegee Airmen led to President Truman's decree to desegregate the U.S. Armed Forces less than a decade after the end of World War II.

As a Tuskegee Airman, Mr. Berthoud was an American hero in the truest sense. He fought to defeat the destructive and xenophobic powers of his day that sought to extinguish the flames of freedom and liberty. Mr. Berthoud joined this prestigious group in 1942 at the tender age of 18. He received an assignment to the 477th Medium Bomber Unit which was the first black bomber unit in the United States Air Force. After receiving an official discharge, Mr. Berthoud bravely remained in service for a total of 3 years, rising to the rank of Second Lieutenant. Upon leaving the Armed Forces, Mr. Berthoud continued with public service, returning to New York City, where he was born in 1924, to join the New York City Police Department.

Tuskegee University recently recognized Mr. Berthoud for his service as a Tuskegee Airman. On May 14, 2006, Mr. Berthoud and 11 other Tuskegee Airmen received honorary doctorates in honor of the legacy of their service and numerous achievements. Today, Mr. Berthoud is a proud member of the national and Atlanta chapters of the Tuskegee Airmen, Inc. Mr. Berthoud has remained a committed member of Fountain of Faith Missionary Baptist Church in Riverdale, Georgia, for more than 10 years and served on many auxiliaries: the Feeding Ministry, the R.B. Newman Male Chorus, Men of Faith, and an officer for the Trustee Board.

By honoring a man who so nobly served our nation abroad, in the face of discrimination at home and doubt in his equal ability, we are turning a page in history books yet written. Mr. Berthoud remains a modest and humble man and is truly deserving of this honor. I join Fountain of Faith Missionary Baptist Church in saluting a national hero who calls the 13th Congressional District of Georgia home.

COMMENDING THE PATRIOT GUARD RIDERS

SPEECH OF

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 2006

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 731, commending the Patriot Guard Riders for their response to the unwelcome, disrespectful and distasteful protests occurring at the funerals of fallen servicemen across our country. America's fallen heroes deserve respect. America's fallen heroes have earned respect. I am pleased that the sanctity of their sacrifice along with the sanctity of each fallen hero's family and friends being able to mourn their loss while celebrating the life of their lost loved one in dignified burial ceremonies is being protected through the selflessness and commitment of the Patriot Guard Riders.

Since August of 2005 the Patriot Guard Riders have protected the families and friends of America's fallen soldiers from radical protesters who have sought to disrupt a sacrosanct time of mourning and ritual. Clad in leather and proudly waving the red, white, and blue, the Patriot Guard Riders impose a daunting wall to all who attempt or intend to disrupt funeral proceedings. With a membership based solely on respect for fallen heroes, their families, and their communities, the Patriot Guard Riders have sought to rise above the jeers of protesters with the revving of motorcycle engines, thereby preserving the dignity of a military funeral.

I commend the Patriot Guard Riders for their loyal allegiance to the principles of integrity and to the preservation of the sanctity of service. I join my colleagues in support of the Patriot Riders and in support of House Resolution 731.

INTRODUCTION OF AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced the African Development Foundation Act of 2006.

This legislation re-authorizes the African Development Foundation (ADF) and reaffirms the great work it does in Africa for entrepreneurs, small businesses and micro/credit community programs.

For more than 20 years, the African Development Foundation has been a powerful example of both the compassion and the innovation of the American people as it has helped the poor across Africa.

The Foundation is a unique and highly effective program. It is the only United States Government agency working directly at the grassroots, supporting African-designed and African-driven solutions to economic and social problems.

The ADF enables individuals and groups to get out of poverty by putting their own ideas to work, not someone else's.

In 2005, ADF's investments across Africa created more than 110,000 jobs for poor Africans, generated $70 million in gross revenues for enterprises, and almost 65 percent of micro and small entrepreneurs assisted by ADF were women.

ADF is demonstrating that African entrepreneurs and farmers can compete in the global marketplace. It is helping them improve quality to meet international standards and to increase quantity to meet demand.

ADF-assisted groups had $35 million in export sales in 2005. For example thousands of poor, small farmers in Uganda have been taught how to grow vanilla. Moreover, they are getting significant value-added by curing and grading it for the international market, where it competes favorably with Madagascar and other producers.

In Tanzania, ADF is helping several thousand small sugar cane producers improve their income. Mtibwa Sugar has increased its gross export revenues by 423 percent over the past 3 years, from US$1.188 million during FY 2002 to US$5.034 million in FY 2005. In the Ruembe Outgrowers Association, sugar cane yields per hectare are up 30 percent and cumulative export sales stand at US$4.7 million.

The number of participating cane farmers has increased by 50 percent since project inception and the income of the 1,440 growers has almost doubled as a consequence of ADF's investment.

The Foundation's community enterprise investments are supporting grassroots solutions to local problems and empowering communities to take control of their own development.

For example, over the past several years, ADF has empowered rural communities in Guinea to plan and undertake the construction of scores of health clinics, primary schools and wells.

In Jigawa State, in northern Nigeria, ADF supported community construction of 400 low cost homes for families who had lost their traditional structures in floods.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally impressed and inspired by the African Development Foundation's work with those living with HIV/AIDS.

For example:

In Swaziland, where almost 40 percent of adults are infected with the AIDS virus, ADF is improving nutrition and providing income-generating opportunities for widows and orphans affected by helping them produce and market vegetables.

In Ghana, ADF funded the training of almost 1,500 youth who conducted peer counseling on HIV/AIDS to more than 200,000 young people.

In Plateau State, Nigeria, ADF funded a pilot program to adapt and extend a faith-based life skills training program in the public secondary schools. About 500 teachers were trained in the new curriculum and more than 25,000 students received year-long training.

In Tanzania, ADF has experimented with supporting schemes that extend micro-credit to people living with HIV/AIDS and enabling them to start informal businesses and undertake income-generating activities.

Mr. Speaker, there is a very high demand for the African Development Foundation to expand their work. A dozen African governments and two private corporations are actually matching the U.S. Government's funding, dollar-for-dollar, for ADF to undertake projects in their countries. Demand for its services greatly exceeds resources. Currently, ADF has a total of $22.0 million in annual cash commitments and specific requests.

Newly elected President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf has requested USADF to help in rebuilding Liberia and restoring hope through creating small businesses and community enterprises that can provide meaningful jobs to ex-combatants, women and youth.

Additionally, the Governments of Burundi and the Democratic Republic of the Congo have also requested USADF to assist in their post-crisis transition and development. Also, the Government of Burkina Faso has requested ADF assistance in community and enterprise development and is committed to matching USG funding with funds from the Islamic Development Bank.

Mr. Speaker, the work of the African Development Foundation is a powerful example of the goodwill of the American people, and it is one of the most effective foreign assistance programs we have.

I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting their efforts and co-sponsor the African Development Foundation Act of 2006.

THE DEFICIT REDUCTION AND EFFECTIVE LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO ACT OF 2006

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to introduce the Deficit Reduction and Effective Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006. The United States is facing structural deficits of $300 billion to $400 billion; a rising mountain of debt, held increasingly by foreign interests; and a $3 trillion tax-cut agenda of measures yet to be renewed or enacted. We have all of this and more, but no effective tools to deal with any of these problems. In fact, this year, for the fourth time since the Budget Act was passed, and for the third time in the last 5 years, Congress has failed to pass a concurrent budget resolution, much less a 5-year plan.

That's why today I am introducing this bill. It contains a package of tools to get the budget crisis under control and help get the budget back in balance.

My legislation reinstates the two-sided Pay-As-You-Go (PAYGO) rules. It allows reconciliation to be used only to reduce the deficit. My bill provides members with the information they need to review legislation before voting on it. Finally, a well-crafted expedited rescission authority could be a useful budget tool—and I have brought to the floor and voted for versions of that authority in the past when there were other budget enforcement tools in place, as well. That's why my bill includes expedited rescission authority, but addresses the broader budget control issues as well.

Let me review some of the details of my bill. If we are in earnest about bringing down the deficit, we need rules designed to reduce the deficit. Congress created the reconciliation process to make it easier to reduce the deficit by setting up special procedures for hard-to-pass budget cuts, yet this Congress now uses reconciliation to pass legislation that enlarges the deficit. The Republican bill granting the president expedited rescission authority, H.R. 4890, could become an accessory to that outcome. A President with expedited rescission powers could push a big spending bill, call members of Congress when a vote was coming up, solicit their support, and if it was not forthcoming, back up his request with a thinly veiled threat—the rescission of something that members dearly wanted for their districts.

My bill addresses these concerns in several ways. First, it prohibits reconciliation procedures from being used to increase the deficit. Second, it prohibits the President or anyone in the executive branch from wielding rescission threats as a bargaining tool on other legislation.

If we are serious about rooting out wasteful spending—and I think we should be—we need to provide members with adequate time to look over legislation before voting on it. The Republican Rules Committee routinely waives the rules to rush bills to the floor hours or even minutes after bills providing for billions of dollars are finalized. My bill requires that members have copies of a bill to review at least 24 hours prior to a vote, and a full three days for a bill with earmarks, unless two-thirds of the House votes to waive that rule. In addition, my bill contains earmark reform provisions from H. Res. 659, Representative OBEY's bill, that will make publicly available relevant details about any earmarks contained in a bill, including who sponsored the provision and who benefits from it.

I am convinced that we can reduce the deficit while protecting vital entitlement programs from expedited rescission authority and the sort of summary changes that fast-track provisions would permit. H.R. 4890 allows the President to propose line-item rescissions even to entitlement programs such as Social Security, veterans' benefits, and Medicare. My bill would protect these programs.

The Deficit Reduction and Effective Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006 will put in place these measures we need to address our budget crisis. Merely granting the President expedited rescission authority alone, as H.R. 4890 provides, will do little to require that Congress set budget priorities, put the budget on the path back to balance, and stick to its budget promises.

VOTING RIGHTS REAUTHORIZATION ACT

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed by the Republican leadership's decision to pull this important bipartisan legislation from Floor debate this week. The Voting Rights Act has made a significant difference in ensuring the full inclusion of minorities in the American political process. The legislation pulled today will extend for 25 years key provisions that are set to expire in 2007. While this country has a rich history of valuing the right to vote, it, unfortunately, has a checkered past in ensuring the full access that the Constitution guarantees.

The Voting Rights Act was signed into law 5 months after voting rights protesters were beaten as they walked from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama on what became known as ''Bloody Sunday.'' Earlier this week, I held a forum on the need to extend the Voting Rights Act. I heard personal stories from my colleagues in Congress and members of the civil rights community that illustrate the need to extend this legislation. I commend Congressmen JOHN CONYERS, MEL WATT and other members of the Judiciary Committee for their hard work on this bill. I hope that the Republican Leadership can resolve its issues with this landmark legislation and bring it to the House floor as soon as possible.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 22, 2006 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 23

1 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold a closed briefing on State Department and Defense Department cooperation overseas.
S–407, Capitol

JUNE 27

10 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine implementation of the Energy Policy Act provisions on enhancing oil and gas production on Federal lands in the Rocky Mountain Region.
SD–366

Finance
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Eric Solomon, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy.
SD–215

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
Business meeting to markup H.R. 5386, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007.
SD–124

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Office of Personnel Management, focusing on whether the Office of Personnel Management is positioned to be the Federal government's leader in personnel policy today and in the future.
SD–342

Aging
To hold hearings to examine if medical tourism can reduce health care costs relating to the globalization of health care.
SD–106

Joint Economic Committee
To hold hearings to examine prospects for U.S. economic expansion.
2118 RHOB

10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the use of presidential signing statements, which are issued when a president signs new laws.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Judiciary
Constitution, Civil Rights and Property Rights Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the continuing need for Federal examiners and observers to ensure electoral integrity.
SD–226

Appropriations
Energy and Water Subcommittee
Business meeting to markup H.R. 5427, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007.
SD–138

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Transportation Subcommittee
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the current state of progress and future outlook relating to SAFETEA-LU implementation.
SD–538

JUNE 28

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold an oversight hearing on Environmental Protection Agency regional inconsistencies.
SD–628

Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine Native American Housing Programs.
SR–485

Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine hedge funds and independent analysts.
SD–226

10 a.m.
Foreign Relations
Business meeting to consider an original bill, to exempt from certain requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 U.S. exports to India of nuclear materials, equipment and technology, the nominations of Earl Anthony Wayne, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to Argentina, Gaddi H. Vasquez, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as U.S. Representative to the United Nations Agencies for Food and Agriculture, John Clint Williamson, of Louisiana, to be Ambassador at Large for War Crimes Issues, Michael E. Ranneberger, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kenya, Eric M. Bost, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa, W. Stuart Symington IV, of Missouri, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Djibouti, Gayleatha Beatrice Brown, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Benin, Robert O. Blake, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Maldives, Robert D. McCallum, Jr., of Georgia, to be Ambassador to Australia, and Leslie V. Rowe, of Washington, to be Ambassador to Papua New Guinea, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Solomon Islands and Ambassador to the Republic of Vanuatu.
SD–419

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider proposed Older Americans Act Amendments of 2006, S. 3546, Dietary Supplement and Nonprescription Drug Consumer Protection Act, S. 707, to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity, S. 757, to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to make grants for the development and operation of research centers regarding environmental factors that may be related to the etiology of breast cancer, and any pending nominations; to be followed by a hearing on biodefense.
SD–430

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Mickey D. Barnett, of New Mexico, Katherine C. Tobin, of New York, and Ellen C. Williams, of Kentucky, each to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service.
SD–342

10:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Marc Spitzer, of Arizona, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
SD–366

2 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Kimberly Ann Moore, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, and Bobby E. Shepherd, of Arkansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine S. 1812, to amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to provide for the conjunctive use of surface and ground water in Juab County, Utah, S. 1965, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain buildings and lands of the Yakima Project, Washington, to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District, S. 2129, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and improvements of the Gooding Division of the Minidoka Project, Idaho, S. 2470, to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the A&B Irrigation District in the State of Idaho, S. 2502, to provide for the modification of an amendatory repayment contract between the Secretary of the Interior and the North Unit Irrigation District, S. 3404, to reauthorize the Mni Wiconi Rural Water Supply Project, H.R. 2383, to redesignate the facility of the Bureau of Reclamation located at 19550 Kelso Road in Byron, California, as the ''C.W. 'Bill' Jones Pumping Plant'', and H.R. 4204, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer ownership of the American River Pump Station Project.
SD–366

JUNE 29

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–562

JULY 12

10 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine USDA dairy programs.
SR–328A

JULY 13

2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine unmanned aerial systems in Alaska.
SD–562

JULY 19

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine high performance computing.
SD–562

POSTPONEMENTS

JUNE 28

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine antitrust concerns relating to credit card interchange rates.
SD–226

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

House Committees ordered reported 30 sundry measures.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6189–S6322

Measures Introduced: Ten bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3546–3555, and S. Res. 519. **Page S6283**

Measures Reported:

S. 3549, to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to strengthen Government review and oversight of foreign investment in the United States, to provide for enhanced Congressional Oversight with respect thereto. (S. Rept. No. 109–264)

S. 3237, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Intelligence Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System. (S. Rept. No. 109–265)

S. 2321, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Louis Braille. **Page S6281**

Measures Passed:

Congratulating the Miami Heat: Senate agreed to S. Res. 519, congratulating the Miami Heat for winning the National Basketball Association Championship. **Pages S6321–22**

National Defense Authorization: Senate continued consideration of S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Page S6191**

Withdrawn:

Pursuant to the order of June 20, 2006, failing to receive 60 votes in the affirmative, the following amendments were withdrawn:

By 52 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 179), Kennedy Amendment No. 4322, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage. **Pages S6191–S6203**

By 45 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 180), Enzi Amendment No. 4376, to promote job creation and small business preservation in the adjustment of the Federal minimum wage. **Pages S6191, S6203–04**

Pending:

McCain Amendment No. 4241, to name the Act after John Warner, a Senator from Virginia. **Page S6191**

Levin Amendment No. 4320, to state the sense of Congress on the United States policy on Iraq. **Pages S6204–39**

Kerry Amendment No. 4442, to require the redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq in order to further a political solution in Iraq, encourage the people of Iraq to provide for their own security, and achieve victory in the war on terror. **Pages S6191, S6239–74**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, June 22, 2006; that there be a period of 60 minutes for debate thereon; following conclusion of that debate, the Minority Leader will be recognized to speak for 15 minutes, following that period of debate, the Majority Leader will be recognized to speak for 15 minutes; following which, Senate will vote on Levin Amendment No. 4320, to be followed by a vote on Kerry Amendment No. 4442 (both listed above), to be followed by a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill; provided further, that Senators be authorized to file second-degree amendments until 10:30 a.m. **Page S6322**

Messages From the House: **Page S6280**

Measures Referred: **Page S6280**

Executive Communications: **Pages S6280–81**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S6281–83**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6283–85**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6285–89**

Additional Statements: Pages S6276–79

Amendments Submitted: Pages S6289–S6320

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: Page S6320

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S6320–21

Privileges of the Floor: Page S6321

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—180) Pages S6203, S6203–04

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 11:36 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, June 22, 2006. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6322.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 3237, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Intelligence Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System. (Committee approved a written report to accompany the bill.); and

A list of 3,741 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

FREIGHT RAILROAD INDUSTRY

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine concluded a hearing to examine economics, service, and capacity in the freight railroad industry, after receiving testimony from JayEtta Z. Hecker, Director, Physical Infrastructure, Government Accountability Office; W. Douglas Buttrey, Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation; Dale Schuler, National Association of Wheat Growers, Carter, Montana, on behalf of sundry organizations; Glenn English, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and John B. Ficker, National Industrial Transportation League, both of Arlington, Virginia; John L. McIntosh, Olin Corporation, Clayton, Missouri, on behalf of the American Chemistry Council; and Edward R. Hamberger, Association of American Railroads, Washington, D.C.

HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness concluded a hearing to examine accelerating the adoption of health information technology, focusing on efforts to improve efficiency, reduce medical errors, increase the quality of medical care, and provide better information for patients and physicians, after receiving testimony from former Representative Newt Gingrich, on behalf of the Center for Health Transformation; Carolyn M. Clancy, Director, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Department of Health and Human Services; Mark Leavitt, Certification Commission for Healthcare Information Technology, Chicago, Illinois; John Halamka, Healthcare Information Technology Standards Panel, Boston, Massachusetts; Michael Raymer, GE Healthcare, Seattle, Washington; Kevin Hutchinson, SureScripts LLC, Alexandria, Virginia; and Terry Ragon, InterSystems Corporation, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Philip D. Moeller, of Washington, and Jon Wellinghoff, of Nevada, each to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

WILDLAND FIRE SUPPRESSION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests concluded a hearing to examine the Government Accountability Office report entitled "Wildland Fire Suppression—Lack of Clear Guidance Raises Concerns About Cost Sharing Between Federal and Nonfederal Entities" (GAO–06–570), after receiving testimony from Robert A. Robinson, Managing Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; Lynn Scarlett, Deputy Secretary of the Interior for Policy; Mark Rey, Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment; and Anne Heissenbuttel, National Association of State Foresters, Washington, D.C.

CHEMICAL SITE SECURITY

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine inherently safer technology in the context of chemical site security, focusing on the release of hazardous chemicals from industrial facilities and how to prevent such releases and to improve preparedness and response capabilities, after receiving testimony from Senator Biden; Lisa P. Jackson, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Trenton; Dennis C. Hendershot, American Institute of Chemical Engineers, Furlong, Pennsylvania; Philip J. Crowley, Center for American Progress, Washington, D.C.; David A. Moore, Acutech Consulting Group, Alexandria, Virginia; and Charlie Cott, Missouri Farmers

Association, Columbia, on behalf of the Agricultural Retailers Association.

TREATY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (the ''Corruption Convention''), adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on October 31, 2003 (Treaty Doc. 109–06), after receiving testimony from Samuel M. Witten, Deputy Legal Adviser, Department of State; Bruce C. Swartz, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Department of Justice; and Alan P. Larson, Transparency International-USA, and William A. Reinsch, National Foreign Trade Council, both of Washington, D.C.

METHAMPHETAMINE TRAFFICKING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, Export and Trade Promotion and the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps and Narcotics Affairs concluded joint hearings to examine international methamphetamine trafficking, after receiving testimony from John P. Walters, Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Anne W. Patterson, Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs; and Karen P. Tandy, Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice.

FEDERAL RECOGNITION

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 480, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe, and S. 437, to expedite review of the Grand River Band of Ottawa Indians of Michigan to secure a timely and just determination of whether that group is entitled to recognition as a Federal Indian tribe, after receiving testimony from Senators Warner, Allen, and Levin; Representative James P. Moran; R. Lee Fleming, Director, Office of Federal Acknowledgment, Department of the Interior; Stephen R. Adkins, Chickahominy Indian Tribe, Charles City, Virginia; Helen C. Rountree, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia; Ron Yob, Grand River Bands of Ottawa Indians, Grand Rapids, Michigan; David Willerup, Westwood Reformed Church, Muskegon, Michigan; and Michael J. O'Connor, Virginia Petroleum, Convenience and Grocery Association, Richmond, Virginia.

COPYRIGHT PROTECTION

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine if Congress can protect copyright and promote innovation relating to the analog hole, focusing on the technology gap known as the analog hole that creates a disconnect between the analog past and the digital future, after receiving testimony from LeVar Burton, Directors Guild of America, Los Angeles, California; Dan Glickman, Motion Picture Association of America, Gary J. Shapiro, Consumer Electronics Association and Home Recording Rights Coalition, and Gigi B. Sohn, Public Knowledge, all of Washington, D.C.; Chris Cookson, Warner Bros. Entertainment, Inc., Burbank, California; and Matthew Zinn, TiVo Inc., Alviso, California.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Property Rights held a hearing to examine policy and perspectives and views from the field regarding reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act, receiving testimony from Gerald A. Reynolds, Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights; Donald M. Wright, North Carolina State Board of Elections, Raleigh; John J. Park, Jr., Office of the Attorney General of Alabama, Montgomery; Debo P. Adegbile, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., New York, New York; David T. Canon, University of Wisconsin Department of Political Science, Madison; and Carol M. Swain, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

Hearing recessed subject to the call.

NOMINATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Neil M. Gorsuch, of Colorado, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators Allard and Salazar, testified and answered questions on his own behalf.

NOMINATION

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Steven C. Preston, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Durbin, testified and answered questions on his own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to consider pending intelligence matters.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

MANAGING RETIREMENT ASSETS

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine ways to ensure that seniors do not outlive their savings and efforts to manage retirement assets, focusing on consumer preparedness, risks in retirement, stock market volatility, and the value of annuities, after receiving testimony from Ben Stein, Los Angeles, California, on behalf of the National Retirement Planning Coalition; C. Robert Henrikson, MetLife, Inc., Long Island City, New York; Stephen P. Utkus, Vanguard Center for Retirement Research, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania; and Leroy Gilbertson, AARP, Washington, D.C.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 13 public bills, H.R. 5655–5667; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 431; and H. Res. 882–884 were introduced. **Pages H4423–24**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H4424**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 885, providing for consideration of H.R. 5638, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the unified credit against the estate tax to an exclusion equivalent of $5,000,000 and to repeal the sunset provision for the estate and generation-skipping taxes (H. Rept. 109–517); and

H. Res. 886, providing for consideration of H.R. 4890, to amend the Congressional and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of budget authority (H. Rept. 109–518). **Page H4423**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Father Luke Palumbis, St. Basil Greek Orthodox Church, Stockton, California. **Page H4331**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Amending the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 to require data with respect to Federal financial assistance to be available for public access in a searchable and user friendly form: H.R. 5060, amended, to amend the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 to require data with respect to Federal financial assistance to be available for public access in a searchable and user friendly form; **Pages H4335–38**

Second Higher Education Extension Act of 2006: H.R. 5603, to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965; **Pages H4338–40**

Senior Independence Act of 2006: H.R. 5293, amended, to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2007 through 2011; **Pages H4340–57**

Recognizing the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the passage of the Food and Drugs Act for the important service it provides to the Nation: H. Con. Res. 426, amended, to recognize the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the passage of the Food and Drugs Act for the important service it provides to the Nation; **Pages H4357–59**

Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006: H.R. 5573, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide additional authorizations of appropriations for the health centers program under section 330 of such Act, by a (2/3) yea-and-nay vote of 424 yeas to 3 nays, Roll No. 306; and **Pages H4359–65, H4371–72**

Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2006: H.R. 5574, amended, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals, by a (2/3) yea-and-nay vote of 421 yeas to 4 nays, Roll No. 307. **Pages H4365–68, H4372**

Suspensions—Proceedings Postponed: The House completed debate on the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further consideration of the measure is expected to resume tomorrow, Thursday, June 22nd:

Supporting efforts to increase childhood cancer awareness, treatment, and research: H. Res. 323, amended, to support efforts to increase childhood cancer awareness, treatment, and research. **Pages H4368–71**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:28 p.m. and reconvened at 2:30 p.m. **Page H4371**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings today and appear on

pages H4371–72, H4372. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Committee Meetings

TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel and the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on International Relations held a joint hearing on trafficking in persons. Testimony was heard from Ambassador John R. Miller, Director, Office To Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, Department of State; and the following officials of the Department of Defense: Gail H. McGinn, Performing the Duties as Principal Deputy Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness; and Thomas F. Gimble, Principal Deputy Inspector General; and COL Robert K. Boyles, USAF, former Principal Assistant Responsible for Contracting—Forces, Joint Contracting Command—Iraq/Afghanistan, U.S. Central Command.

SPACE AND U.S. NATIONAL POWER

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on space and U.S. national power. Testimony was heard from LTG C. Robert Kehler, USAF, Deputy Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, Department of Defense; Ed Morris, Director, Office of Space Commercialization, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

INTERNET PRIVATE RECORDS ACCESS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "Internet Data Brokers and Pretexting: Who Has Access to Your Private Records?" Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

In refusing to give testimony at this hearing, the following individuals: John Strange; Jay Patel, Ed Herzog; Skipp Porteous; Michele Yontef; Carlos Anderson; Laurie Misner; Tim Berndt; James Welker; Patrick Baird; and Steven Schwartz, invoked Fifth Amendment privileges.

Hearing continues tomorrow.

UNIVERSAL SERVICE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet held a hearing entitled "Universal Service: What Are We Subsidizing and Why? Part 1: The High-Cost Fund." Testimony was heard from Donald B. Marron, Acting Director, CBO; Tom Navin, Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, FCC; and public witnesses.

COMMERCIAL INSURANCE MODERNIZATION

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled "Commercial Insurance Modernization." Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BANK SECRECY ACT'S IMPACT ON MONEY SERVICES BUSINESSES

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled "Bank Secrecy Act's Impact on Money Services Businesses." Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Treasury: Don Carbaugh, Acting Associate Director, Regulatory Policy and Programs, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; Eileen C. Mayer, Director, Fraud/Bank Secrecy Act, Small Business/Self-Employed Division, IRS; and Ann F. Jaedicke, Deputy Comptroller, Compliance Policy; and public witnesses.

ALASKA NATIVE CORPORATIONS/FEDERAL PROCUREMENT

Committee on Government Reform: and the Committee on Small Business held a joint hearing entitled "Northern Lights and Procurement Plights: The Effect of the ANC Program on Federal Procurement and Alaska Native Corporations." Testimony was heard from Representative Young of Alaska; David Cooper, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management, GAO; Calvin Jenkins, Deputy Associate Deputy Administrator, Office of Government Contracting and Business Development, SBA; Frank M. Ramos, Director, Small Business Programs, Office of the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense; Melodee Stith, Associate Director, Acquisition and Financial Assistance, Office of Acquisition and Property Management, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

DEEP WATER ROYALTY RELIEF

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Energy and Resources held a hearing entitled "Deep Water Royalty Relief: Mismanagement and Coverups." Testimony was heard from the following Attorneys in the Department of the Interior: Milo Mason and Geoffrey Heath; and public witnesses.

SECURITY DEPARTMENT TERRORISM PREPAREDNESS

Committee on Homeland Security: Held a hearing entitled "DHS Terrorism Preparedness Grants: Risk-Based or Guess-Work?" Testimony was heard from

the following officials of the City of New York: Michael Bloomberg, Mayor; and Raymond W. Kelly, Commissioner, Police Department; the following officials of the District of Columbia: Anthony Williams, Mayor; and Edward D. Reiskin, Deputy Mayor, Public Safety and Justice; and George Foresman, Under Secretary, Preparedness, Department of Homeland Security.

RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY; DEMOCRACY IN LATIN AMERICA

Committee on International Relations: Ordered reported adversely H. Res. 846, Requesting the President and directing the Secretary of State to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to strategies and plans either designed to cause regime change in or for the use of military force against Iran.

The Committee also held a hearing on Democracy in Latin America: Successes, Challenges and the Future. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of State: Paula J. Dobriansky, Under Secretary, Democracy and Global Affairs; and Adolfo Franco, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, U.S. Agency for International Development; and public witnesses.

U.S. ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS TO EGYPT

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Middle East and Central Asia continued hearings to Review U.S. Assistance Programs to Egypt, Part II. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

RESOLUTIONS OF INQUIRY; AND MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Ordered reported the following measures: H. Res. 819, Requesting the President and directing the Attorney General to submit to the House of Representatives all documents in the possession of the President and the Attorney General relating to requests made by the National Security Agency and other Federal agencies to telephone service providers requesting access to telephone communications records of persons in the United States and communications originating and terminating within the United States without a warrant; H. Res. 845, adversely, Requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, documents relating to the termination of the Department of Justice's Office of Professional Responsibility's investigation of the involvement of Department of Justice personnel in the creation and administration of the National Security Agency's warrantless surveillance program, including documents relating to Office of Professional Responsibility's request for and denial of security clearances; and H.R. 5520, amended, Veterans Identity Protection Act.

OVERSIGHT—CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution held an oversight hearing on the Implementation of the Crime Victims' Rights Provisions of the Justice for All Act. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 512, To require the prompt review by the Secretary of the Interior of the longstanding petitions for Federal recognition of certain Indian tribes; H.R. 854, amended, To provide for certain lands to be held in trust for the Utu Utu Gwaitu Paiute Tribe; H.R. 2069, Utah Recreational Land Exchange Act of 2005; H.R. 2134, Commission To Study the Potential Creation of a National Museum of the American Latino Community in Washington, D.C.; H.R. 2925, amended, To amend the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991 to extend the authority for drought assistance; H.R. 3085, amended, To amend the National Trails System Act to update the feasibility and suitability study originally prepared for the Trail of Tears National Historic Trail and provide for the inclusion of a new trail segments, land components, and campgrounds associated with that trail; H.R. 3817, Valle Vidal Protection Act of 2005; H.R. 4165, To clarify the boundaries of Coastal Barrier Resources System Clam Pass Unit FL–64P; H.R. 4275, To amend Public Law 106–348 to extend the authorization for establishing a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor veterans who became disabled while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States; H.R. 4294, amended, Natural Resource Protection Cooperative Agreement Act; H.R. 4301, Blunt Reservoir and Pierre Canal Land Conveyance Act of 2005; H.R. 4376, amended, Springfield Armory National Historic Site, Massachusetts Act of 2005; H.R. 4612, amended, Wright Brothers-Dunbar National Historic Park Designation Act; H.R. 4761, amended, Domestic Energy Production through Offshore Exploration and Equitable Treatment of State Holdings Act of 2006; H.R. 4947, amended, Cahaba River National Wildlife Refuge Expansion Act; H.R. 5057, amended, To authorize the Marion Park Project and Committee of the Palmetto Conservation Foundation to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia, and its environs to honor Brigadier General Francis Marion; H.R. 5061, Paint Bank and Wytheville National Fish Hatcheries Conveyance

Act; H.R. 5079, amended, North Unit Irrigation District Act of 2006; H.R. 5094, Lake Mattamuskeet Lodge Preservation Act; H.R. 5232, Cherry Valley National Wildlife Refuge Study Act; H.R. 5312, amended, Indian Health Care Improvement Act Amendments of 2006; H.R. 5340, amended, Upper Mississippi River Basin Protection Act; H.R. 5411, To direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a demonstration program to facilitate landscape restoration programs within certain units of the National Park System established by law to preserve and interpret resources associated with American history; H.R. 5622, amended, Coral Reef Conservation Legacy Act of 2006; S. 260, Partners for Fish and Wildlife Act; and S. 1496, Electronic Duck Stamp Act of 2005.

OVERSIGHT—FOREST HEALTH: INSECTS AND DISEASES

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health held an oversight hearing on Addressing Forest Insects and Disease: A Growing National Problem, "GAO Report on Invasive Forest Pests." Testimony was heard from Daniel Bertoni, Assistant Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, GAO; the following officials of the USDA: Paul Eggert, Associate Deputy Administrator, Plant Protection Quarantine, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; and Jim Hubbard, Deputy Chief, State and Private Forestry, Forest Service; and public witnesses.

PERMANENT ESTATE TAX RELIEF ACT

Committee on Rules: The Committee granted, by voice vote, a closed rule on H.R. 5638, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the unified credit against the estate tax to an exclusion equivalent of $5,000,000 and to repeal the sunset provision for the estate and generation-skipping taxes, and for other purposes, proving 1 hour of debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Budget now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The rule waives all points of order against the bill, as amended. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Ryan of Wisconsin, Spratt, and Thompson of California.

LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO ACT

Committee on Rules: The Committee granted, by voice vote, a closed rule on H.R. 4890, to amend the Congressional and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of budget authority, providing 1 hour of debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution shall be considered as adopted. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Hulshof, Issa, and Pomeroy.

OVERSIGHT—AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL MODERNIZATION

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held an oversight hearing on Air Traffic Control Modernization: The Present and Future. Testimony was heard from Representative Waters; the following officials of the Department of Transportation: Russell Chew, Chief Operating Officer, Air Traffic Organization and Robert Pearce, Acting Director, Joint Planning and Development Office, both with the FAA; and Todd Zinser, Acting Inspector General; Gerald Dillingham, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, GAO; and a public witness.

OVERSIGHT—VETERANS HEALTH RECORDS SECURITY

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held an oversight hearing on Safeguarding Veterans' Medical Information within the Veterans Health Administration. Testimony was heard from BG Michael J. Kussman, M.D., USA, (Ret.), Deputy Under Secretary, Health, Department of Veterans Affairs; and a public witness.

BRIEFING—GLOBAL UPDATES/HOTSPOTS

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to receive a briefing on Global Updates/Hotspots. The Committee was briefed by departmental witnesses.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 2006

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on District of Columbia, to hold hearings to examine the local budget request for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, 10:30 a.m., SD–138.

Full Committee, business meeting to mark up H.R. 5384, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, H.R. 5521, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and to consider 302(b) subcommittee allocations of budget outlays and new budget authority for fiscal year 2007, 1 p.m., SD–106.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine reauthorization of the Iran Libya Sanctions Act, 3:30 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Trade, Tourism, and Economic Development, to hold hearings to examine the state of the U.S. tourism industry, 10 a.m., SD–562.

Full Committee, business meeting to mark up S. 2686, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and for other purposes, 2 p.m., SH–216.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine S. 2747, to enhance energy efficiency and conserve oil and natural gas, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine S. 574, to amend the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act of 1994 to increase the authorization of appropriations and modify the date on which the authority of the Secretary of the Interior terminates under the Act, S. 1387, to provide for an update of the Cultural Heritage and Land Management Plan for the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, to extend the authority of the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor Commission, to authorize the undertaking of a special resource study of sites and landscape features within the Corridor, and to authorize additional appropriations for the Corridor, S. 1721, to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to extend the authorization for certain national heritage areas, S. 2037, to establish the Sangre de Cristo National Heritage Area in the State of Colorado, and S. 2645, to establish the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Clean Air, Climate Change, and Nuclear Safety, to hold oversight hearings to examine the regulatory processes for new and existing nuclear plants, 9:30 a.m., SD–628.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine energy security in Latin America, 9:30 a.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Clifford M. Sobel, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Federative Republic of Brazil, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine new ideas for making the medical liability system work better for patients, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine effort to assure healthy initiatives in health information technology, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to consider the report on the Indian Lobbying Misconduct Investigation, and other pending matters, 9:30 a.m., SR–485.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights, to hold hearings to examine the AT&T and BellSouth merger and its meaning for consumers, 3 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: business meeting to consider pending VA legislation, 10 a.m., SR–418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold a closed briefing regarding intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Armed Services, hearing on military power of the People's Republic of China, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, to continue hearings entitled ''Internet Data Brokers and Pretexting: Who Has Access to Your Private Records?'' 2 p.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Economic Security, Infrastructure Protection, and Cyber security, to mark up H.R. 5604, SAFE Truckers Act of 2006, 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Prevention of Nuclear and Biological Attack, hearing entitled ''Reducing Nuclear and Biological Threats at the Source,'' 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on House Administration, hearing entitled ''You Don't Need Papers To Vote?'' Non-citizen voting and ID requirements in U.S. elections, 10 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on International Relations, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations, to mark up the following measures: H. Res. 860, Calling on the Government of Germany to take immediate action to combat sex trafficking in connection with the 2006 FIFA World Cup; H.R. 4319, Assistance for Small and Medium Enterprises in Sub-Saharan African Countries Act of 2005; H.R. 4780, Global Online Freedom Act of 2006; H.R. 5382, Central Asia Democracy and Human Rights Promotion Act of 2006; and H.R. 5652, African Development Foundation Act; followed by a hearing on Can Religious Pluralism Survive in the Middle East: The Plight of Religious Minorities? 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, hearing on H.R. 2679, Public Expression of Religion Act of 2005, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims, oversight hearing entitled ''Is the Labor Department Doing Enough To Protect U.S. Workers?'' 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, oversight hearing on the Reauthorization of the National Park System Advisory Board, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Water and Power, oversight hearing on Securing the Bureau of Reclamation's Water and Power Infrastructure: A Consumer's Perspective, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, oversight hearing on the Future of the Federal Courthouse Construction Program: Results of a GAO Study on the Judiciary's Rental Obligations, 11 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to mark up H.R. 4843, Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2006, 10:15 a.m.; followed by an oversight hearing on the legal implications of the theft from a VA employee's home of personal data regarding millions of veterans, active duty military personnel, and spouses, 10:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures, hearing on the Impact of International Tax Reform on U.S. Competitiveness, 10 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, hearing entitled ''Path Ahead for the CIA,'' 9 a.m., and, executive, hearing entitled ''The CIA Director as HUMINT Manager,'' 10:30 a.m., H–405 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 2766, National Defense Authorization, that there be a period of 60 minutes for debate thereon; following conclusion of that debate, the Minority Leader will be recognized to speak for 15 minutes, following that period of debate, the Majority Leader will be recognized to speak for 15 minutes; following which, Senate will vote on Levin Amendment No. 4320, to be followed by a vote on Kerry Amendment No. 4442, to be followed by a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, June 22

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 4890—Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Berkley, Shelley, Nev., E1244
Berman, Howard L., Calif., E1240
Boozman, John, Ark., E1224
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E1245
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E1223
Brown, Henry E., Jr., S.C., E1227
Campbell, John, Calif., E1229
Castle, Michael N., Del., E1230, E1232, E1235
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E1222
Crenshaw, Ander, Fla., E1242
Davis, Susan A., Calif., E1225
DeGette, Diana, Colo., E1236
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E1243
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1244
Fattah, Chaka, Pa., E1228
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1222, E1230, E1231, E1232, E1233, E1234, E1235, E1236, E1237
Green, Gene, Tex., E1236
Gutknecht, Gil, Minn., E1219
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1222
Honda, Michael M., Calif., E1221
Hulshof, Kenny C., Mo., E1228
Hyde, Henry J., Ill., E1232, E1234
Jackson-Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1229
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1225, E1227
Jones, Stephanie Tubbs, Ohio, E1240
Kennedy, Mark R., Minn., E1236
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E1221
King, Peter T., N.Y., E1235
Knollenberg, Joe, Mich., E1241
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E1237, E1245
Levin, Sander M., Mich., E1222
McCaul, Michael T., Tex., E1241
McCotter, Thaddeus G., Mich., E1238
McGovern, James P., Mass., E1224, E1241
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1231, E1234
Meek, Kendrick B., Fla., E1223
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1223
Moran, Jerry, Kans., E1241
Napolitano, Grace F., Calif., E1236
Ortiz, Solomon P., Tex., E1239
Oxley, Michael G., Ohio, E1223
Pombo, Richard W., Calif., E1228, E1244
Rahall, Nick J., II, W.Va., E1221
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1224, E1225, E1227, E1229, E1230, E1233, E1235
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E1237
Scott, David, Ga., E1245
Serrano, José E., N.Y., E1242
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E1239
Simmons, Rob, Conn., E1224, E1244
Skelton, Ike, Mo., E1231, E1233
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E1242
Spratt, John M., Jr., S.C., E1246
Sweeney, John E., N.Y., E1219
Tancredo, Thomas G., Colo., E1243
Tanner, John S., Tenn., E1223
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1221, E1238
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E1219
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1246
Weiner, Anthony D., N.Y., E1237
Weldon, Curt, Pa., E1230, E1232, E1235
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E1243

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.