NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1394, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to exclude from gross income of individual taxpayers discharges of indebtedness attributable to certain forgiven residential mortgage obligations.

S. 1499

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1499, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to reduce air pollution from marine vessels.

S. 1515

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1515, a bill to establish a domestic violence volunteer attorney network to represent domestic violence victims.

S. 1641

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1641, a bill to amend Public Law 87–383 to reauthorize appropriations to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl and to offset or prevent the serious loss of important wetland and other waterfowl habitat essential to the preservation of migratory waterfowl, and for other purposes.

S. 1882

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1882, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish various programs for the recruitment and retention of public health workers and to eliminate critical public health workforce shortages in Federal, State, local, and tribal public health agencies.

S. 2087

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2087, a bill to amend certain laws relating to Native Americans to make technical corrections, and for other purposes.

S. 2198

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2198, a bill to require the Architect of the Capitol to permit the acknowledgment of God on flag certificates.

S. 2201

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2201, a bill to provide for the penalty-free use of retirement funds for mortgage delinquency relief.

AMENDMENT NO. 3397

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3397 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3043, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3398

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3398 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3043, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SMITH, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. SNOWE, Mrs. LINCOLN and Mr. KERRY):

S. 2209. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue code of 1986 to provide incentives to improve America's research competitiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to join with my friend and colleague from Montana, Senator BAUCUS, to introduce the Research Credit Improvement Act of 2007. We are joined by a bipartisan group of our Finance Committee colleagues: Senators CANTWELL, CRAPO, KERRY, SMITH, LINCOLN, and SNOWE. As its title suggests, the purpose of this legislation is to extend permanently and to improve the research credit, which is set to expire in just a short time, at the end of 2007.

Our Nation has benefited greatly in recent years from strong economic growth. I believe it is vital for all Americans to realize that this economic growth did not just happen by accident. Rather, it is based on several factors, and one of the more important of these is innovation.

Innovation certainly does not just happen either. It is the result of several specific ingredients. Chief among those ingredients is the amount of research and development occurring in the economy. Where does R&D come from? It comes from individuals, companies, and governments who are willing to invest time and money.

Research and development is very expensive for companies to undertake. By its very nature, research activities seldom result in success immediately. There are many dead ends and much frustration on the way to the discovery of a product that can lead to profits.

Moreover, many times a firm's efforts to find innovative solutions to life's problems result in good discoveries for mankind, but little or no immediate or even intermediate rewards for the company undertaking the research. For this reason, most economists agree that even private research and development activities can create a common good, and one that should be partially subsidized by the public.

The original research credit was enacted over 25 years ago to encourage an increase in R&D activity and to help subsidize the common good that often is derived from research and innovation.

Just as today's economic health is a byproduct of the innovation that came from yesterday's investment in R&D, our future economic health will depend on the amount of innovation we harvest from our investment in research activities today, tomorrow, and into the future.

Years ago, our country had the clear edge on the rest of the industrialized world when it came to having the most nurturing environment to foster research and development. We had more than our share of the scientists, researchers, and other skilled workers to engage in R&D. We had plenty of capital. We had world-class facilities. And we had the biggest market for products right here in the U.S. All the ingredients for innovation were right here, and few other countries could match our research environment. Thus, there was little thought of going anywhere else to perform research.

Sadly, this is no longer the case. Many of our trading partners now possess equal, and sometimes, superior environments to promote research to those we have here in the U.S. More importantly, many of these trading partners now offer strong tax and other incentives designed to lure research to those nations and away from our shores.

Without a strong and effective research incentive of our own, I fear that the United States is at risk of losing its leadership position in innovation. The consequences of this could be very serious for our future economic growth and job creation, as well as for long-term prosperity and national security.

Unfortunately, as I mentioned earlier, our research credit is set to expire in just a few weeks, at the end of December. Once again, American businesses are finding themselves in the all-too familiar position of wondering if the Congress is going to extend the research credit, and if so, when and for how long.

This perennial guessing game that we force our research-intensive firms to play every year or two is getting old. Moreover, it makes the research credit far less effective than it would otherwise be if it were a constant. While it is true that there is some level of confidence among the users of the research credit that this incentive will be extended, everyone knows that the chances of the credit's renewal are not certain, especially in today's volatile legislative climate.

Therefore, the legislation we are introducing today once again provides for the credit to be made permanent. A permanent credit can help our economy develop the new technologies that will enhance existing capital inputs and make workers more productive. The result will be a stronger economy at home, and a more competitive Nation abroad.

In assessing the health of our economy, we find an important correlation

between economic growth and inflationary pressures. One sure way to have strong economic growth without the pain of inflation is to increase productivity. Most productivity gains are derived from technological advances, which reduce the cost of producing goods and services, and thereby help maintain low consumer prices.

An additional benefit of productivity growth is a corresponding increase in corporate profits. Such increases lead to higher returns on savings and investment, and higher wages for workers. I believe the greatest benefit of increased R&D is productivity growth, which in turn forms the foundation of higher living standards.

Productivity growth also largely determines our society's long-term economic welfare. Our ability to deal with budgetary challenges, such as Social Security, Medicare, and other entitlements, depends critically on the future direction of our productivity.

My home State of Utah is a good example of how important research and innovation is to state economies, and to our future prosperity. Utah is home to various firms that invest a high percentage of their revenue in R&D. There are thousands of employees working in Utah's technology based companies, with thousands more working in other sectors that engage in R&D.

According to a recent article in one of Utah's major newspapers, the Deseret Morning News, the number of Utah high tech and life sciences companies grew at the astonishing rate of more than 10 percent—from 3,900 to 4,300—over the period of September 2005 to September 2006. These industries in Utah employ more than 62,000 workers, with average pay that is 66 percent higher than the statewide average nonagricultural wage. About 3,000 of these jobs are new ones added in the past year.

These are the kinds of jobs and the kind of job growth that Utah, and all of the United States, needs for this new century. The jobs and companies in the high tech and life sciences sectors in Utah and around America are diverse. But they have several things in common. They are clean, they are high-paying, and they require an educated workforce. The vast majority of these companies export products, helping to offset our trade imbalance. Most importantly, however, is the fact that all of these jobs depend on innovation as their lifeblood. R&D is in the very DNA of these companies.

One more thing all these highly desirable high tech jobs have in common is that America is at risk of losing them if we are not careful to maintain an environment that nurtures innovation and the other vital ingredients that gave rise to these jobs in the first place. To my way of thinking, keeping a strong and viable research credit is a key part of this environment.

Since 1981, when the research credit was first enacted, the Federal Government has joined in partnership with large and small businesses to ensure that research expenditures are made in the United States. This enhances domestic job creation, and helps the United States to internalize more of the economic benefits from the research credit.

It seems clear that to continue to grow our economy we must maintain and enhance our position as the world leader in technological advances. The worst thing we could do is to let it slip. Consequently, robust R&D spending should permeate our economy. We simply must continue to invest in research and development, and the Federal Government needs to reaffirm its role as a partner with the private sector.

While the research credit has proven to be a powerful incentive for companies to increase research and development activities, it unfortunately does not work perfectly. There are several reasons for this, but a major one is that the original, or traditional, credit is calculated using a base period from the mid-1980s. This reference period is becoming more distant and thus less relevant to the business operations of more companies each year. For example, many companies have had major changes in their business models over the past two decades. Yet, the traditional credit still requires a calculation that references revenue from this set of years from two decades ago.

This has been a growing problem for a number of years. To address it, Congress last year included an alternative to the traditional credit that instead of referencing the old base period, is based on the taxpayer's most recent three years of research activity. This credit, known as the simplified alternative credit, has provided a meaningful tax incentive for firms with significant and growing amounts of research expenditures that were not getting much, if any, benefit from the traditional credit.

Based on many discussions with companies that use the research credit, it appears that the alternative simplified credit is now being used by more companies than is the traditional credit. This is true even though the alternative simplified credit is set at 12 percent, while the traditional credit is set at 20 percent.

Therefore, Senator BAUCUS and I have decided to introduce a change in the research credit that would phase out the traditional credit, even as we increase the benefits of the alternative simplified credit. Specifically, our bill would continue the traditional credit for two more years, and then would eliminate this method of computing the research credit, beginning in 2010. At the same time, however, the bill would increase the alternative simplified credit from the 12 percent current rate to 16 percent in 2008, 18 percent in 2009, and 20 percent for 2010 and thereafter.

We believe this gradual transformation from the increasingly obsolete traditional credit to a single more relevant and strong alternative simplified credit should create a smooth and generous transition, both for traditional credit companies and for firms that find the new alternative simplified credit to be more beneficial.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in this effort. We have had widespread bipartisan support for extending the research credit here in the Senate. In fact, the Senate in 2001 passed a permanent research credit, but its permanence unfortunately was downgraded to another extension in conference with the House bill.

I believe that if we allow the research credit to expire, we will see the negative effects manifest in lower economic growth, fewer jobs created, fewer innovative products created, and lost opportunities as research activities move to other countries with more attractive incentives. Again, we should never forget that our Nation's future economic health is dependent on the innovations of today and tomorrow.

The United States needs to continue to be the world's leader in innovation. We cannot afford to allow other countries to lure away the research that has always been done here. We cannot afford to have the lapses in the research pipeline that would result if we fail to extend this credit before it expires on December 31. We need to make the credit permanent so we can increase the growth rate of our economy. And, we need to improve and simplify the credit so that it is more effective.

Enacting this legislation would mean more and better jobs for American workers. Innovation and new technology resulting from American research and development will continue to improve the standard of living for every person in the U.S. and around the world.

Mr. President, 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. 2209

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 ''Research Credit Improvement Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. SIMPLIFICATION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CREDIT.

(a) TRANSITION TO FULLY-IMPLEMENTED SIMPLIFIED CREDIT FOR QUALIFIED RESEARCH EXPANSES.—

(1) PHASEOUT OF TRADITIONAL CREDIT.—Section 41(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''20 percent'' each place it appears and inserting ''the applicable percentage'', and

(B) by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

''For purposes of this subsection, the term 'applicable percentage' means 20 percent with respect to taxable years beginning in 2008 and 2009.''.

(2) PHASEIN OF SIMPLIFIED CREDIT.—Section 41(c)(5)(A) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''12 percent'' and inserting ''the applicable percentage'', and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'applicable percentage' means 16 percent with respect to taxable years beginning in 2008 and 18 percent with respect to taxable years beginning in 2009.''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2007.

(b) FULLY-IMPLEMENTED SIMPLIFIED CREDIT FOR QUALIFIED RESEARCH EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 41 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to credit for increasing research activities) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) DETERMINATION OF CREDIT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38, the research credit determined under this section for the taxable year shall be equal to 20 percent of so much of the qualified research expenses for such taxable year as exceeds 50 percent of the average qualified research expenses for the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined.

''(2) SPECIAL RULE IN CASE OF NO QUALIFIED RESEARCH EXPENSES IN ANY OF 3 PRECEDING TAXABLE YEARS.—

''(A) TAXPAYERS TO WHICH PARAGRAPH APPLIES.—The credit under this section shall be determined under this paragraph if the taxpayer has no qualified research expenses in at least 1 of the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined.

''(B) CREDIT RATE.—The credit determined under this paragraph shall be equal to 10 percent of the qualified research expenses for the taxable year.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 41 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (c).

(c) UNIFORM REIMBURSEMENT RATES FOR ALL CONTRACT RESEARCH EXPENSES OTHER THAN AMOUNTS PAID FOR BASIC RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 41(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to contract research expenses) is amended—

(A) by striking ''65 percent'' and inserting ''80 percent'', and

(B) by striking subparagraphs (C) and (D).

(2) BASIC RESEARCH PAYMENTS.—Section 41(b) of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5) and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) BASIC RESEARCH PAYMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of basic research payments by the taxpayer, paragraph (3)(A) shall be applied by substituting '100 percent' for '80 percent'.

''(B) BASIC RESEARCH PAYMENTS DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'basic research payment' means, with respect to any taxable year, any amount paid in cash during such taxable year by a corporation to any qualified organization for basic research but only if—

''(I) such payment is pursuant to a written agreement between such corporation and such qualified organization, and

''(II) such basic research is to be performed by such qualified organization.

''(ii) EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENT THAT RESEARCH BE PERFORMED BY THE ORGANIZATION.—In the case of a qualified organization described in clause (iii) or (iv) of subparagraph (C), subclause (II) of clause (i) shall not apply.

''(C) QUALIFIED ORGANIZATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'qualified organization' means any of the following organizations:

''(i) EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—Any educational organization which—

''(I) is an institution of higher education (within the meaning of section 3304(f)), and

''(II) is described in section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii).

''(ii) CERTAIN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS.—Any organization not described in clause (i) which—

''(I) is described in section 501(c)(3) and is exempt from tax under section 501(a),

''(II) is organized and operated primarily to conduct scientific research, and

''(III) is not a private foundation.

''(iii) SCIENTIFIC TAX-EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS.—Any organization which—

''(I) is described in section 501(c)(3) (other than a private foundation) or section 501(c)(6),

''(II) is exempt from tax under section 501(a),

''(III) is organized and operated primarily to promote scientific research by qualified organizations described in clause (i) pursuant to written research agreements, and

''(IV) currently expends substantially all of its funds or substantially all of the basic research payments received by it for grants to, or contracts for basic research with, an organization described in clause (i).

''(iv) CERTAIN GRANT ORGANIZATIONS.—Any organization not described in clause (ii) or (iii) which—

''(I) is described in section 501(c)(3) and is exempt from tax under section 501(a) (other than a private foundation),

''(II) is established and maintained by an organization established before July 10, 1981, which meets the requirements of subclause (I),

''(III) is organized and operated exclusively for the purpose of making grants to organizations described in clause (i) pursuant to written research agreements for purposes of basic research, and

''(IV) makes an election, revocable only with the consent of the Secretary, to be treated as a private foundation for purposes of this title (other than section 4940, relating to excise tax based on investment income).

''(D) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this paragraph—

''(i) BASIC RESEARCH.—The term 'basic research' means any original investigation for the advancement of scientific knowledge not having a specific commercial objective, except that such term shall not include—

''(I) basic research conducted outside of the United States, and

''(II) basic research in the social sciences, arts, or humanities.

''(ii) TRADE OR BUSINESS QUALIFICATION.—For purposes of applying paragraph (1) to this paragraph, any basic research payments shall be treated as an amount paid in carrying on a trade or business of the taxpayer in the taxable year in which it is paid (without regard to the provisions of paragraph (3)(B)).

''(iii) CERTAIN CORPORATIONS NOT ELIGIBLE.—The term 'corporation' shall not include—

''(I) an S corporation,

''(II) a personal holding company (as defined in section 542), or

''(III) a service organization (as defined in section 414(m)(3)).''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 41 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (e).

(B) Section 41(f) of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (6).

(d) PERMANENT EXTENSION OF CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 41 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subsection (h).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 45C(b) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 41 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsections (d), (f), and (g) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

(2) Paragraphs (2)(A) and (5) (as redesignated by subsection (b)(2)) of section 41(b) of such Code are each amended by striking ''subsection (f)(1)'' and inserting ''subsection (d)(1)''.

(3) Sections 45C(d)(3), 45G(e)(2), and 936(h)(5)(C)(i)(IV)(c) of such Code are each amended by striking ''section 41(f)'' and inserting ''section 41(d)''.

(4) Section 54(l)(3)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 41(g)'' and inserting ''section 41(e)''.

(5) Section 170(e)(4)(B)(i) of such Code is amended by striking ''subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B) of section 41(e)(6)'' and inserting ''clause (i) or (ii) of section 41(b)(4)(C)''.

(6) Sections 197(f)(1)(C), 197(f)(9)(C)(i)(II), and 280C(b)(3) of such Code are each amended by striking ''section 41(f)(1)'' and inserting ''section 41(d)(1)''.

(7) Section 280C(b)(3) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 41(f)(5)'' and inserting ''section 41(d)(5)''.

(8) Section 280C(b)(3) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 41(f)(1)(B)'' and inserting ''section 41(d)(1)(B)''.

(9) Section 280C(c)(1) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 41(e)(2)'' and inserting ''section 41(b)(4)(B)''.

(10) Section 280C(c)(2)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 41(a)(1)'' and inserting ''section 41(a)''.

(11) Sections 936(j)(5)(D) and 965(c)(2)(C)(i) of such Code are each amended by striking ''section 41(f)(3)'' and inserting ''section 41(d)(3)''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2009.

(g) STUDY OF COMPLIANCE WITH SUBSTANTIATION REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, conduct a study of taxpayer compliance with the substantiation requirements for claiming the credit allowed under section 41 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, including a study of—

(1) whether taxpayers maintain adequate record keeping to determine eligibility for, and correct amount of, the credit,

(2) the impact of failure to comply with such requirements on the oversight and enforcement responsibilities of the Internal Revenue Service, and

(3) the burdens imposed on other taxpayers by failure to comply with such requirements.

The Secretary shall report the results of such study to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, including any recommendations for administrative or legislative actions which could be taken to improve compliance with such requirements.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, back in 1962, Marshall McLuhan wrote, ''The new electronic interdependence recreates the world in the image of a global village.'' Certainly, 40 years later, that concept is truer than ever. As we prepare for the future in this global village, we need to affirm America's leadership role in the world.

The United States accounts for one-third of the world's spending on scientific research and development, ranking first among all countries. While this is impressive, relative to

GDP, though, America falls to sixth place. And the trends show that maintaining American leadership in the future depends on increased commitment to research and science.

Asia has recognized this. Asia is plowing more funding into science and education. China, in particular, understands that technological advancement means security, independence, and economic growth. Spending on research and development has increased by 140 percent in China, Korea, and Taiwan. In America, it has increased by only 34 percent.

Asia's commitment is already paying off. More than a hundred Fortune 500 companies have opened research centers in India and China. I have visited some of them. I was impressed with the level of skill of the workers whom I met there.

China's commitment to research, at $60 billion in expenditures, is dramatic by any measure. Over the last few years, China has doubled the share of its economy that it invests in research. China intends to double the amount committed to basic research in the next decade. Currently, only America beats out China in numbers of researchers in the workforce.

Today, I am pleased to join with my colleague on the Finance Committee, Senator HATCH, to introduce the Research Competitiveness Act of 2007. This bill would improve our research competitiveness in four major areas. All four address incentives in our tax code. Government also supports research through Federal spending. But I am not addressing those areas today.

First, our bill improves and simplifies the credit for applied research in section 41 of the tax code. This credit has grown to be overly complex, both for taxpayers and the IRS. Beginning in 2008, our bill would create a simpler credit for qualifying research expenses that exceed 50 percent of the average expenses for the prior 3 years. This simplified credit would phase in over 3 years.

Just as important, the bill makes the credit permanent. Because the credit has been temporary, it has simply not been as effective as it could be. Since its creation in 1981, it has been extended 11 times. Congress even allowed it to lapse during one period.

The credit last expired in December of 2005. After much consternation and delay, Congress passed a 2-year extension just last month, extending the credit for 2006 and 2007. These temporary extensions have taken their toll on taxpayers. In 2005, the experts at the Joint Committee on Taxation wrote: ''Perhaps the greatest criticism of the R&E credit among taxpayers regards its temporary nature.'' Joint Tax went on to say, ''A credit of longer duration may more successfully induce additional research than would a temporary credit, even if the temporary credit is periodically renewed.''

Currently, there are three different ways to claim a tax credit for qualifying research expenses. First, the ''traditional'' credit relies on incremental increases in expenses compared to a mid-1980s base period. Second, the ''alternative incremental'' credit measures the increase in research over the average of the prior 4 years.

Both of these credits have base periods involving gross receipts. Under the new tax bill enacted last month, a third formula was created, which does not rely on gross receipts and is available only for 2007. Our bill simplifies these credits and will move all taxpayers to the ''Alternative Simplified Credit,'' which is based on research spending without reference to gross receipts. The current formulas hurt companies that have fluctuating sales. It hurts companies that take on a new line of business not dependent on research.

This new simpler formula in our bill would not start until 2008. That start date would give companies plenty of time to adjust their accounting. The current formula would be available to companies for 2 years, and then it would phase out.

The main complaint about the existing credits is that they are very complex, particularly the reference to the 20-year-old base period. This base period creates problems for the taxpayer in trying to calculate the credit. It creates problems for the IRS in trying to administer and audit those claims.

The new credit focuses only on expenses, not gross receipts. It is still an incremental credit, so that companies must continue to increase research spending over time. Further, this bill adds a mandate for a Treasury study to look at substantiation issues and ensure that current recordkeeping requirements assist the IRS without unduly burdening the taxpayer.

A tax credit is a cost-effective way to promote R&E. A report by the Congressional Research Service finds that without government support, investment in R&E would fall short of the socially optimal amount. Thus CRS endorses Government policies to boost private sector R&E.

Also, American workers who are engaged in R&E activities benefit from some of the most intellectually stimulating, high-paying, high-skilled jobs in the economy.

My own State of Montana has excellent examples of this economic activity. During the 1990s, about 400 establishments in Montana provided high-technology services, at an average wage of about $35,000 per year. These jobs paid nearly 80 percent more than the average private sector wage, which was less than $20,000 a year during the same period. Many of these jobs would never have been created without the assistance of the R&E credit.

Our research bill would also establish a uniform reimbursement rate for all contract and consortia R&E. It would provide that 80 percent of expenses for research performed for the taxpayer by other parties count as qualifying research expenses under the regular credit.

Currently, when a taxpayer pays someone else to perform research for the taxpayer, the taxpayer can claim one of three rates in order to determine how much the taxpayer can include for the research credit. The lower amount is meant to assure overhead expenses that normally do not qualify for the R&E credit are not counted. Different rates, however, create unnecessary complexity. Therefore, our bill creates a uniform rate of 80 percent.

The second major research area that this bill addresses is the need to enhance and simplify the credit for basic research. This credit benefits universities and other entities committed to basic research. It benefits the companies or individuals who donate to them. Our bill provides that payments under the university basic research credit would count as contractor expenses at the rate of 100 percent.

The current formula for calculating the university basic research credit—defined as research ''for the advancement of science with no specific commercial objective''—is even more complex that the regular traditional R&E credit. Because of this complexity, this credit costs less than ½ of 1 percent of the cost of the regular R&E credit. It is completely under-utilized. It needs to be simplified to encourage businesses to give more for basic research.

American universities have been powerful engines of scientific discovery. To maintain our premier global position in basic research, America relies on sustained high levels of basic research funding and the ability to recruit the most talented students in the world. The gestation of scientific discovery is long. At least at first, we cannot know the commercial applications of a discovery. But America leads the world in biotechnology today because of support for basic research in chemistry and physics in the 1960s. Maintaining a commitment to scientific inquiry, therefore, must be part of our vision for sustained competitiveness.

Translating university discoveries into commercial products also takes innovation, capital, and risk. The Center for Strategic and International Studies asked what kind of government intervention can maintain technological leadership. One source of technological innovation that provides America with comparative advantage is the combination of university research programs, entrepreneurs, and risk capital from venture capitalists, corporations, or governments. Research clusters around Silicon Valley and North Carolina's Research Triangle exemplify this sort of combination.

The National Academies reached a similar conclusion in a 2002 review of the National Nanotechnology Initiatives. In a report, they wrote: ''To enhance the transition from basic to applied research, the committee recommends that industrial partnerships

be stimulated and nurtured to help accelerate the commercialization of national nanotechnology developments.''

In sum, our bill would boost both applied and basic research. It would boost research by businesses big and small. And it would foster research by for-profit and nonprofits alike.

McLuhan's quote about the global village was taken by many at the time as a wake-up call to a changing world. Since then, many more leaders in this village have emerged. Let us work to see that the next big technological advance is discovered here in America. Only through continued commitment to research can we ensure that it is.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. DODD):

S. 2212. A biff to support the establishment and operations of Teachers Professional Development Institutes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation, along with my colleague from Connecticut, Mr. DODD, that will strengthen the content and pedagogy knowledge of our present K–12 teacher workforce and thus ultimately raise student achievement.

Our proposal would establish eight new Teacher Professional Development Institutes throughout the Nation each year over the next five years based on the model which has been operating at Yale University for over 25 years. Every Teacher Institute would consist of a partnership between an institution of higher education and the local public school system in which a significant proportion of the students come from low-income households. These Institutes will strengthen the present teacher workforce by giving each participant an opportunity to gain more sophisticated content knowledge and a chance to develop curriculum units with other colleagues that can be directly applied in their classrooms. We know that teachers gain confidence and enthusiasm when they have a deeper understanding of the subject matter that they teach and this translates into higher expectations for their students and an increase in student achievement.

The Teacher Professional Development Institutes are based on the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute model that has been in existence since 1978. For over 25 years, the Institute has offered, six or seven 13-session seminars each year, led by Yale faculty, on topics that teachers have selected to enhance their mastery of the specific subject area that they teach. The subject selection process begins with representatives from the Institutes soliciting ideas from teachers throughout the school district for topics on which teachers feel they need to have additional preparation, topics that will assist them in preparing materials they need for their students, or topics that will assist them in addressing the standards that the school district requires. As a consensus emerges about desired seminar subjects, the Institute director identifies university faculty members with the appropriate expertise, interest and desire to lead the seminar. University faculty members, especially those who have led Institute seminars before, may sometimes suggest seminars they would like to lead, and these ideas are circulated by the representatives as well. The final decisions on which seminar topics are offered are ultimately made by the teachers who participate. In this way, the offerings are designed to respond to what teachers believe is needed and useful for both themselves and their students.

The cooperative nature of the Institute seminar planning process ensures its success: Institutes offer seminars and relevant materials on topics teachers have identified and feel are needed for their own preparation as well as what they know will motivate and engage their students. Teachers enthusiastically take part in rigorous seminars they have requested, and as part of the program, practice using the materials they have obtained and developed. This helps ensure that the experience not only increases their preparation in the subjects they are assigned to teach, but also their participation in an Institute seminar gives them immediate hands-on active learning materials that can be used in the classroom. In short, by allowing teachers to determine the seminar subjects and providing them the resources to develop relevant curricula for their classroom and their students, the Institutes empower teachers. Teachers know their students best and they know what should be done to improve schools and increase student learning. The Teacher Professional Development Institutes promote this philosophy.

From 1999–2002, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute promoted a National Demonstration Project to create comparable Institutes at four diverse sites with large concentrations of disadvantaged students. These demonstration projects are located in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Houston, Texas, Albuquerque, New Mexico, and Santa Ana, CA.

Follow-up evaluations have earned very positive results from the teacher participants in the Yale-New Haven Institute, as well as the four demonstration sites. The data strongly support the conclusion that virtually all teachers felt substantially strengthened in their mastery of content knowledge and they also developed increased expectations for what their students could achieve. In addition, because of their involvement in the course selection and curriculum development process, teacher participants have found these seminars to be especially relevant and useful in their classroom practices. Mr. President, 95 percent of all participating teachers reported that the seminars were useful. These Institutes have also served to foster teacher leadership, to develop supportive teacher networks, to heighten university faculty commitments to improving K–12 public education, and to foster more positive partnerships between school districts and institutions of higher education.

Many agree that teacher quality is the single most important school-related factor in determining student achievement. Effective teacher professional development programs that focus on subject and pedagogy knowledge are a proven method for enhancing the success of a teacher in the classroom.

Though a K–12 teacher shortage is forecast in the near-term and many new teachers will be entering our schools, those teachers who are presently on the job will do the majority of teaching in the classrooms in the very near future. For this reason, it is imperative to invest in methods to strengthen our present teaching workforce. Like many professions, the quality of our teachers could diminish if their professional development is neglected. Positive educational achievements occur when coursework in a teacher's specific content area is combined with pedagogy techniques. This is what the Teacher Professional Development Institutes Act strives to accomplish.

The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has already proven to be a successful model for teacher professional development as demonstrated by the high caliber curriculum unit plans that teacher participants have developed and placed on the web, and by the evaluations that support the conclusion that virtually all the teacher participants felt substantially strengthened in their mastery of content knowledge and their teaching skills. Our proposal would open this opportunity to many more urban teachers throughout the nation.

I urge my colleagues to act favorably on this measure. 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 placed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2212

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

SECTION 1. TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part A of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Subpart 6—Teachers Professional Development Institutes

"SEC. 2161. SHORT TITLE.

''This subpart may be cited as the 'Teachers Professional Development Institutes Act'.

"SEC. 2162. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

''(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

''(1) Teaching is central to the educational process and the ongoing professional development of teachers in the subjects they

teach is essential for improved student learning.

''(2) Attaining the goal of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107–110)—having a classroom teacher who is highly qualified in every academic subject the teacher teaches—will require innovative and effective approaches to improving the quality of teaching.

''(3) The Teachers Institute Model focuses on the continuing academic preparation of schoolteachers and the application of what they study to their classrooms and potentially to the classrooms of other teachers.

''(4) The Teachers Institute Model was developed initially by the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute and has successfully operated there for 30 years.

''(5) The Teachers Institute Model has also been successfully demonstrated over a 3-year period in a national demonstration project in cities larger than New Haven.

''(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subpart is to provide Federal assistance to support the establishment and operation of Teachers Institutes for local educational agencies that serve significant low-income student populations in States throughout the Nation—

''(1) to improve student learning; and

''(2) to enhance the quality of teaching and strengthen the subject matter mastery and the pedagogical skills of current teachers through continuing teacher preparation.

''SEC. 2163. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subpart:

''(1) SIGNIFICANT LOW-INCOME POPULATION.—The term 'significant low-income population' means a population of which not less than 25 percent of the individuals included are from families with incomes below the poverty line, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data.

''(2) TEACHERS INSTITUTE.—The term 'Teachers Institute' means a partnership or joint venture between 1 or more institutions of higher education, and 1 or more local educational agencies with significant low-income populations, that is entered into for the purpose of improving the quality of teaching and learning through collaborative seminars designed to enhance both the subject matter and the pedagogical resources of the seminar participants.

''SEC. 2164. AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized—

''(1) to award grants to encourage the establishment and operation of Teachers Institutes; and

''(2) to provide technical assistance, either directly or through the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, to assist local educational agencies and institutions of higher education in preparing to establish and in operating Teachers Institutes.

''(b) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting Teachers Institutes for grants under this subpart, the Secretary shall consider—

''(1) the extent to which the proposed Institute will serve a community or communities that have a significant low-income population;

''(2) the extent to which the proposed Institute will follow the understandings and necessary procedures that have been developed following the National Demonstration Project, as described in section 2166;

''(3) the extent to which the local educational agency has a high percentage of teachers who are unprepared or underprepared to teach the core academic subjects they are assigned to teach; and

''(4) the extent to which the proposed Teachers Institute will receive a level of support from the community and other sources that will ensure the requisite long-term commitment for the success of a Teachers Institute.

''(c) CONSULTATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In evaluating applications under subsection (b), the Secretary may request the advice and assistance of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute or other Teachers Institutes.

''(2) STATE AGENCIES.—If the Secretary receives 2 or more applications from local educational agencies within the same State, the Secretary shall consult with the State educational agency regarding the applications.

''(d) FISCAL AGENT.—For the purpose of this subpart, an institution of higher education participating in a Teachers Professional Development Institute shall serve as the fiscal agent for the receipt of grant funds under this subpart.

''(e) LIMITATIONS.—A grant under this subpart—

''(1) shall provide grant funds for a period not to exceed 5 years; and

''(2) shall not exceed 50 percent of the total costs of the eligible activities, as determined by the Secretary.

''SEC. 2165. ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Grant funds under this subpart may be used—

''(1) for the planning and development of proposals for the establishment of Teachers Institutes;

''(2) for additional assistance to the Teachers Institutes established during the National Demonstration Project for their further development and for their support of the planning and development of proposals under paragraph (1);

''(3) for the salary and necessary expenses of a full-time director to plan and manage the Teachers Institute and to act as liaison between the local educational agency or agencies and the institution or institutions of higher education participating in the Institute;

''(4) to provide suitable office space, staff, equipment, and supplies, and to pay other operating expenses, for the Teachers Institute;

''(5) to provide a stipend for teachers participating in collaborative seminars in the sciences and humanities and to provide remuneration for members of the faculty of the participating institution of higher education leading the seminars; and

''(6) to provide for the dissemination through print and electronic means of curriculum units prepared in the seminars conducted by the Teachers Institute.

''(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may use not more than 50 percent of the funds appropriated to carry out this subpart to provide technical assistance to facilitate the establishment and operation of Teachers Institutes. For the purpose of this subsection, the Secretary may contract with the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute to provide all or a part of the technical assistance under this subsection.

''SEC. 2166. UNDERSTANDINGS AND PROCEDURES.

''A Teachers Institute funded under this subpart shall abide by the following understandings and procedures:

''(1) PARTNERSHIP.—The essential relationship of a Teachers Institute is a partnership between a local educational agency and an institution of higher education. A grantee shall demonstrate a long-term commitment on behalf of the participating local educational agency and an institution of higher education to the support, including the financial support, of the work of the Teachers Institute.

''(2) SEMINARS.—A Teachers Institute sponsors seminars led by faculty of the institution of higher education partner and attended by teachers from the local educational agency partner. A grantee shall provide participating teachers the ability to play an essential role in planning, organizing, conducting, and evaluating the seminars and in encouraging the future participation of other teachers.

''(3) CURRICULUM UNIT.—The seminar uses a collaborative process, in a collegial environment, to develop a curriculum unit for use by participating teachers that sets forth the subject matter to be presented and the pedagogical strategies to be employed. A grantee shall enable participating teachers to develop a curriculum unit, based on the subject matter presented, for use in their classrooms.

''(4) ELIGIBILITY AND REMUNERATION.—Seminars are open to all partnership teachers with teaching assignments relevant to the seminar topics. Seminar leaders receive remuneration for their work and participating teachers receive an honorarium or stipend upon the successful completion of the seminar. A grantee shall provide seminar leaders and participating teachers remuneration to allow them to participate in the Institute.

''(5) DIRECTION.—The operations of a Teachers Institute are managed by a full-time director who reports to both partners but is accountable to the institution of higher education partner. A grantee shall appoint a director to manage and coordinate the work of the Institute.

''(6) EVALUATION.—A grantee shall annually review the activities of the Institute and disseminate the results to members of the Institute's partnership community.

''SEC. 2167. APPLICATION, APPROVAL, AND AGREEMENT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—To receive a grant under this subpart, a Teachers Institute shall submit an application to the Secretary that—

''(1) meets the requirement of this subpart and any regulations under this subpart;

''(2) includes a description of how the Teachers Institute intends to use funds provided under the grant;

''(3) includes such information as the Secretary may require to apply the criteria described in section 2164(b);

''(4) includes measurable objectives for the use of the funds provided under the grant; and

''(5) contains such other information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

''(b) APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) promptly evaluate an application received for a grant under this subpart; and

''(2) notify the applicant within 90 days of the receipt of a completed application of the Secretary's determination.

''(c) AGREEMENT.—Upon approval of an application, the Secretary and the applicant shall enter into a comprehensive agreement covering the entire period of the grant.

''SEC. 2168. REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS.

''(a) REPORT.—Each Teachers Institute receiving a grant under this subpart shall report annually to the Secretary on the progress of the Institute in achieving the purpose of this subpart.

''(b) EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate the activities funded under this subpart and submit an annual report regarding the activities assisted under this subpart to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. The Secretary shall broadly disseminate successful practices developed by Teachers Institutes.

''(c) REVOCATION.—If the Secretary determines that a Teachers Institute is not making substantial progress in meeting the purposes of the grant by the end of the second

year of the grant under this subpart, the Secretary may take appropriate action, including revocation of further payments under the grant, to ensure that the funds available under this subpart are used in the most effective manner.

"SEC. 2169. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated for grants, including planning grants, and technical assistance under this subpart—

''(1) $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;

''(2) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2009;

''(3) $6,000,000 for fiscal year 2010;

''(4) $7,000,000 for fiscal year 2011; and

''(5) $8,000,000 for fiscal year 2012.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2151 the following:

''SUBPART 6—TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTES

''Sec. 2161. Short title.
''Sec. 2162. Findings and purpose.
''Sec. 2163. Definitions.
''Sec. 2164. Authority to make grants.
''Sec. 2165. Eligible activities.
''Sec. 2166. Understandings and procedures.
''Sec. 2167. Application, approval, and agreement.
''Sec. 2168. Reports and evaluations.
''Sec. 2169. Authorization of appropriations.''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 354—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 354

Whereas 35 years ago, on October 18, 1972, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (Public Law 92–500) were enacted;

Whereas those amendments formed the basis of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) (commonly known as the ''Clean Water Act''), the principal Act governing water pollution in the United States;

Whereas substantial improvements to the water quality of the United States have resulted from a successful partnership among Federal, State, and local governments, the private sector, and the public;

Whereas, since 1972, the Federal Government has provided more than $82,000,000,000 to States and communities for wastewater infrastructure and other assistance;

Whereas clean water is a natural resource of tremendous value and importance to the United States;

Whereas there is resounding public support for the continued protection and restoration of United States rivers, streams, lakes, wetlands, and marine waters;

Whereas maintaining and improving water quality is essential to protecting public health, fisheries, wildlife, and watersheds, and for ensuring abundant opportunities for public recreation and economic development;

Whereas it is the responsibility of all levels of government and all citizens to ensure the availability of clean water for future generations;

Whereas water pollution problems persist throughout the United States, and significant challenges lie ahead in the effort to protect and restore the water resources of the United States;

Whereas in the most recent National Water Quality Inventory of the 19 percent of the nations' rivers and streams assessed 45 percent of rivers and streams were impaired, of the 37 percent of the nation's assessed lakes, ponds and reservoirs, 47 percent were impaired and of the 35 percent of the nation's assessed bays and estuaries, 32 percent were impaired; the remainder of the assessed waters met their intended uses;

Whereas further development and innovation of water pollution control programs and advancement of water pollution control research and technology are necessary and desirable; and

Whereas October 18, 2007, is the 35th anniversary of the enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) (commonly known as the ''Clean Water Act''): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, as the United States marks the 35th anniversary, on October 18, 2007, of the enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (Public Law 92–500), which formed the basis for the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) (commonly known as the ''Clean Water Act''), it is the sense of the Senate that all citizens of the United States and all levels of government should—

(1) recognize and celebrate the accomplishments of the United States under that Act; and

(2) recommit to achieving the objectives of that Act of restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the waters of the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3404. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3405. Mr. VOINOVICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3406. Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself and Mr. DEMINT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3407. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3408. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3409. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3410. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3411. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BUNNING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3412. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3413. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3414. Mr. BUNNING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3415. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3416. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3417. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3418. Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. DODD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3419. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3420. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3421. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3422. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3423. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3424. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3425. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3426. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. STEVENS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3427. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3428. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3429. Mr. DORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3430. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3431. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3432. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3433. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3434. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. GREGG) submitted an amendment intended